



NATO
+
OTAN



HANDBOOK



NATO HANDBOOK

Public Diplomacy Division

NATO

1110 Brussels, Belgium

ISBN 92-845-0178-4

HB-ENG-0406

© NATO 2006

NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANISATION (NATO)

MEMBER COUNTRIES

Belgium **Bulgaria** **Canada** **Czech Republic**

Denmark **Estonia** **France** **Germany**

Greece **Hungary** **Iceland** **Italy** **Latvia** **Lithuania**

Luxembourg **Netherlands** **Norway** **Poland**

Portugal **Romania** **Slovakia** **Slovenia** **Spain**

Turkey **United Kingdom** **United States**

The North Atlantic Treaty, signed in Washington in April 1949, created an Alliance for collective defence as defined in Article 51 of the United Nations Charter.
The Treaty is of indefinite duration.

The NATO emblem was adopted as the symbol of the Atlantic Alliance by the North Atlantic Council in October 1953. The circle is the symbol of unity and cooperation and the compass rose suggests the common road to peace taken by the member countries.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Public Diplomacy Division would like to thank the members of the International Staff who contributed their time and expertise to this edition of the NATO Handbook. The Division would also like to thank Mr Nicholas Sherwen, who was the originator of the NATO Handbook. With his dedication and understanding of the Alliance, he has guided readers over the years through the intricacies of this ever-changing organisation.

The NATO Handbook is published by the NATO's Public Diplomacy Division under the authority of the Secretary General as a reference book on the Alliance and on Alliance policies. The formulations used reflect as closely as possible the consensus among the member nations which is the basis for all Alliance decisions. However, the Handbook is not a formally agreed NATO document and therefore may not represent the official opinions or positions of individual governments on every issue discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements	4
Preface	9

PART I

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE ALLIANCE

What is NATO?	15
The origins of the Alliance	16
NATO's fundamental security tasks	18
Facing the changing security environment	20
Conclusion	29

PART II

POLICY AND DECISION-MAKING

CHAPTER 1:	The principal policy and decision-making institutions	33
CHAPTER 2:	Crisis management	43
CHAPTER 3:	The defence planning dimension	51
CHAPTER 4:	Common-funded resources, budgets and financial management	57
CHAPTER 5:	Nuclear policy	65
CHAPTER 6:	The economic dimension	67

PART III

NATO'S CIVILIAN AND MILITARY STRUCTURES

CHAPTER 7:	Civilian organisation and structures	73
CHAPTER 8:	The International Staff's key functions	77
CHAPTER 9:	Military organisation and structures	85
CHAPTER 10:	The International Staff's key functions	101
CHAPTER 11:	Specialised organisations and agencies	107
CHAPTER 12:	Key to the principal NATO committees and policy bodies	111

PART IV

THE ALLIANCE'S ROLE IN PEACEKEEPING AND PEACE-SUPPORT OPERATIONS

CHAPTER 13:	NATO's role in Bosnia-Herzegovina	143
CHAPTER 14:	The Kosovo conflict and the role of KFOR	149
CHAPTER 15:	NATO's role in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*	153
CHAPTER 16:	NATO's role in Afghanistan	155
CHAPTER 17:	NATO's role in Iraq	159
CHAPTER 18:	NATO's role in Darfur	163

PART V

COMBATING NEW THREATS AND DEVELOPING NEW CAPABILITIES

CHAPTER 19:	The Alliance's role in the fight against terrorism and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction	167
CHAPTER 20:	New capabilities	175

PART VI

THE OPENING UP OF THE ALLIANCE TO NEW MEMBER COUNTRIES

CHAPTER 21:	The enlargement process	183
CHAPTER 22:	The Membership Action Plan	189

PART VII

PARTNERSHIP AND COOPERATION

CHAPTER 23:	The Euro-Atlantic Partnership: the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace	193
CHAPTER 24:	NATO and Russia	209
CHAPTER 25:	NATO and Ukraine	219
CHAPTER 26:	Cooperation with countries in the Mediterranean region and the broader Middle East	229
CHAPTER 27:	Cooperation with countries in southeastern Europe	237

PART VIII

NATO-EU RELATIONS

CHAPTER 28:	The strategic partnership between NATO and the European Union	243
--------------------	---	-----

PART IX

THE WIDER INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SECURITY

CHAPTER 29:	NATO's relations with the United Nations	255
CHAPTER 30:	NATO and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe	259
CHAPTER 31:	Cooperation with other international organisations	263
CHAPTER 32:	Cooperation with parliamentary and non-governmental ORGANISATIONS	267

PART X

PROGRAMMES, ACTIVITIES, ORGANISATIONS AND AGENCIES

CHAPTER 33:	Air defence	275
CHAPTER 34:	Airborne early warning	279
CHAPTER 35:	Airspace and air traffic management	283
CHAPTER 36:	Armaments cooperation and planning	285
CHAPTER 37:	Arms control and disarmament	289
CHAPTER 38:	Civil emergency planning	297
CHAPTER 39:	Communication and information systems	303
CHAPTER 40:	Education and training	307
CHAPTER 41:	Electronic warfare	317
CHAPTER 42:	Logistics	319
CHAPTER 43:	Meteorology	329
CHAPTER 44:	Military oceanography	331
CHAPTER 45:	Public Diplomacy communications and information programmes	333
CHAPTER 46:	Public Diplomacy scientific and environmental programmes	339
CHAPTER 47:	Research and technology	347
CHAPTER 48:	Standardization	349

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1	Abbreviations	355
APPENDIX 2	The North Atlantic Treaty	371
APPENDIX 3	Index	377

NOTE: References made in this Handbook to the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia are marked with an asterisk (*) referring to the following footnote: "Turkey recognises the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name".

PREFACE

NATO was created through the signing of the Washington Treaty in 1949. The treaty, a model of brevity and clarity, paved the way for the Alliance's adaptation to the constantly changing dynamic of international security. It provides built-in flexibility and scope for tackling new problems and applying solutions to them that reflect the changing environment. In Article 9, the drafters provided a flexible organisational structure for the Alliance based on a single, authoritative institutional body in the form of a Council responsible for the implementation of the treaty and for the creation of such subsidiary bodies as might be necessary. This foresight has enabled the Alliance to evolve and to adapt itself to new circumstances throughout its history.

NATO underwent a series of reforms and reorganisations during the first forty years of its existence, designed to adapt it to the occasional opportunities that presented themselves to move beyond Cold War constraints in order to place the security of member countries on a more positive and stable foundation. In the relatively short period since the end of the Cold War, the Alliance has undergone a process of much more fundamental transformation, adapting to changes in the security environment of a scope and intensity that few could have foreseen in earlier years.

It was in the 1990s that NATO first responded to the end of the familiar East-West division and its accompanying ideological, political and military adversarial relationships, and to the disappearance of conventional military threats to security in the Euro-Atlantic area. The Alliance defined a new strategic concept, embarked on intensive partnerships with other countries, including former adversaries, and embraced new member countries. In addition, and for the first time, NATO undertook peacekeeping tasks in areas of conflict outside the Alliance, opening the way for a lead role in multinational crisis-management operations and extensive cooperative arrangements with other organisations.

The 11 September 2001 attacks on the United States placed the fight against terrorism at the top of the international agenda, including that of NATO. As a result, the transformation process that characterised the first ten years after the end of the Cold War era took on a more coherent dimension and greater urgency.

Today, the Alliance's response to the new, post-September 11 security environment is based on a clear set of principles agreed upon by member governments. The Allies agree that they must be ready to help to deter, defend, disrupt and protect themselves collectively against terrorist attacks from abroad and that this may include taking action against terrorists and against those who harbour or protect them. They also agree that the Alliance

should not be constrained by predetermined geographical limits: it must have the capacity to act as and where required. Similarly, it may need to provide its assets and capabilities, on a case-by-case basis, to assist with operations conducted by other international organisations or coalitions of countries involving NATO members.

These decisions make wide-reaching demands on the Alliance, not only in terms of acquiring the necessary capabilities, but also in terms of the sustained political will of the member countries to draw the consequences of the policies they have adopted and to provide the means to implement them. The need for reviewing and updating policies and structures will not end with the fulfilment of present commitments. Modernisation and rationalisation will remain factors to contend with on a permanent basis, if only because threats to security and stability themselves are not static.

How the Alliance has met the challenges of the past and how it has set about preparing itself to be able to fulfil equally challenging roles in the future is the subject of this new edition of the NATO Handbook. It provides a comprehensive analysis of the evolution of the Alliance up to autumn 2005, and can be consulted alongside the NATO website (www.nato.int), which offers access to information about subsequent developments affecting the Alliance as well as the texts of official statements and communiqués, and articles and speeches by qualified commentators offering independent evaluation and analysis.

In brief, **Part I** of the Handbook offers an introduction to the Alliance and provides a basic explanation of its origins and fundamental tasks as well as the main spheres of its development since its foundation. It includes a summary account of the policy directions taken by NATO member countries with regard to multinational security, focusing on the more recent post–Cold War era, and examines the principal topics on the Alliance’s agenda in the early years of the 21st century. The main decision-making bodies and the key principles and policies that guide the Alliance are described in **Part II**. This is complemented by **Part III** of the Handbook, where the civilian and military structures and agencies established by NATO to ensure that its tasks can be carried out are explained.

The Alliance’s operational roles in relation to peacekeeping and peace-support are the subject of **Part IV**, which examines the implementation of Alliance decisions with regard to Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,* Afghanistan, the NATO Training Mission in Iraq, and the mission in Darfur, Sudan. **Part V** addresses measures taken by the Alliance to combat the threat from terrorism and from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, and describes the new capabilities that are under development.

A fundamental aspect of NATO strategy since the early 1990s has been the opening up of the Alliance to new members (**Part VI**) and the broadening of contacts and cooperation with non-member countries through a range of bilateral and multilateral relationships and partnerships. An overview of the development and role of these partnerships and practical forms of cooperation is given in **Part VII**, which discusses the evolution of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership based on the complementary pillars of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace programme, as well as the relationships and varying forms of cooperation developed by NATO with Russia, Ukraine, the countries of the Mediterranean Dialogue, southeastern Europe and, more recently, countries from the Middle East, through the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative.

Institutional cooperation has also played a large part in the evolution of regional security, in particular the strategic partnership between NATO and the European Union that is the subject of **Part VIII**, as well as the wider institutional framework for security and cooperation between NATO and the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe and other international organisations. These relationships are described in **Part IX**.

Part X addresses the programmes and activities that are the mainstay of the Alliance's effectiveness in the many different fields of planning and co-operation which together constitute the security agenda of today. Information is provided on the logistics, standardisation, communications, armaments, airspace and air traffic management and air defence activities which make it possible for the forces of NATO member countries and Partner countries to operate together. Information is also given on activities in the field of civil emergency planning and disaster relief, on public diplomacy and communications and information programmes, and on scientific cooperation and cooperation in the environmental and societal spheres which have been refocused in order to address new security challenges directly.

Further information relating to abbreviations in common use are listed in **Appendix 1**.

PART I

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE ALLIANCE

WHAT IS NATO?

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation is an alliance of 26 countries from North America and Europe committed to fulfilling the goals of the North Atlantic Treaty signed in Washington on 4 April 1949.

In accordance with the Treaty, the fundamental role of NATO is to safeguard the freedom and security of its member countries by political and military means. NATO safeguards the Allies' common values of democracy, individual liberty, the rule of law and the peaceful resolution of disputes and promotes these values throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. It provides a forum in which countries from North America and Europe can consult together on security issues of common concern and take joint action in addressing them.

Relations between North American and European members of the Alliance are the bedrock of NATO. These countries share the same essential values and interests and are committed to the maintenance of democratic principles, making the security of Europe and that of North America indivisible.

The Alliance is committed to defending its member states against aggression or the threat of aggression and to the principle that an attack against one or several members would be considered as an attack against all.

NATO remains an inter-governmental organisation in which each member country retains its sovereignty. All NATO decisions are taken jointly by the member countries on the basis of consensus. NATO's most important decision-making body is the North Atlantic Council, which brings together representatives of all the Allies at the level of ambassadors, ministers or heads of state and government. Each member country participates fully in the decision-making process on the basis of equality, irrespective of its size or political, military and economic strength.

The Allies therefore retain scope for independent action with respect to joint decisions and joint actions. However, Allied decisions, once taken, enable unified and concerted action to be reinforced by political solidarity. This was manifest, for example, in the decisions taken to provide assistance to the United States after the attacks of 11 September 2001. For the first time in its history, NATO invoked Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which stipulates that an armed attack against one or more members of the Alliance is considered as an armed attack against all. All the members of the Alliance vehemently condemned the attacks and provided support to the United States in its response.

NATO has no operational forces of its own other than those assigned to it by member countries or contributed by Partner countries for the purpose of carrying out a specific mission. It has a number of mechanisms available to

it for this purpose – the defence planning and resource planning processes that form the basis of cooperation within the Alliance, the implementation of political commitments to improved capabilities, and a military structure that combines the functions of a multinational force planning organisation with an Alliance-wide system of command and control of the military forces assigned to it. In other words, under the command of NATO's strategic commanders, the Organisation provides for the joint planning, exercising and operational deployment of forces provided by the member countries in accordance with a commonly agreed force planning process. In sum, an important part of NATO's role is to act as a catalyst for generating the forces needed to meet requirements and enabling member countries to participate in crisis management operations which they could not otherwise undertake on their own.

Dialogue and cooperation with non-NATO countries have helped to overcome the divisions of the Cold War era and to extend security and stability well beyond NATO's borders. The Alliance is deepening and broadening its cooperation with Russia and Ukraine and with other Partner countries – some of which have since become members – as well as with countries in the Mediterranean Dialogue programme and in the broader Middle East. It is also reinforcing cooperation with other international organisations and, in particular, with the European Union, with which it is developing a strategic partnership. NATO's structures and mechanisms provide the framework for these varying forms of cooperation, which are an integral part of the day-to-day activity of the Alliance.

The origins of the Alliance

From 1945 to 1949, faced with the pressing need for economic reconstruction, Western European countries and their North American allies viewed with concern the expansionist policies and methods of the USSR. Having fulfilled their own post-war undertakings to reduce their defence establishments and demobilise their forces, Western governments grew increasingly alarmed as it became clear that the Soviet leadership intended to maintain its own military forces at full strength. Moreover, in view of the declared ideological aims of the Soviet Communist Party, it was evident that appeals for respect for the United Nations Charter, and for respect for the international settlements reached at the end of the Second World War, would not guarantee the national sovereignty or independence of democratic states faced with the threat of outside aggression or internal subversion. The imposition of undemocratic forms of government and the repression of effective opposition and basic human and civil rights and freedoms in many Central and Eastern European countries, as well as elsewhere in the world, compounded these fears.

Between 1947 and 1949 a series of dramatic political events brought matters to a head. These included direct threats to the sovereignty of Norway, Greece, Turkey and other Western European countries, the June 1948 coup in Czechoslovakia, and the illegal blockade of Berlin which began in April of the same year. The signature of the Brussels Treaty in March 1948 marked the determination of five Western European countries – Belgium, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom – to develop a common defence system and to strengthen the ties between them in a manner which would enable them to resist ideological, political and military threats to their security.

The Brussels Treaty represented the first step in the post-war reconstruction of western European security and brought the Western Union Defence Organisation into being. It was also the first step in the process leading to the signature of the North Atlantic Treaty in 1949 and the creation of the North Atlantic Alliance.

Negotiations with the United States and Canada then followed on the creation of a single North Atlantic Alliance based on security guarantees and mutual commitments between Europe and North America. Denmark, Iceland, Italy, Norway and Portugal were invited by the Brussels Treaty powers to become participants in this process. These negotiations culminated in the signature of the Washington Treaty in April 1949, which introduced a common security system based on a partnership among these 12 countries. In 1952, Greece and Turkey acceded to the treaty. The Federal Republic of Germany joined the Alliance in 1955 and, in 1982, Spain also became a member of NATO. In 1990, with the unification of Germany, the former German Democratic Republic came under the security protection of the Alliance as an integral part of the united country. The Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland joined NATO in 1999. In 2003 seven more countries (Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia) were invited to begin accession talks and formally acceded to the treaty in March 2004.

The North Atlantic Alliance was founded on the basis of a treaty between member states entered into freely by each of them after public debate and due parliamentary process. The Treaty upholds their individual rights as well as their international obligations in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. Through the treaty, member countries commit themselves to sharing the risks and responsibilities of collective security and undertake not to enter into any other international commitments which might conflict with the treaty.

Since NATO's creation more than half a century ago, its central focus has been to provide for the immediate defence and security of its member countries. Today this remains its core task, but its main focus has undergone

fundamental changes to enable the Alliance to confront new threats and meet new challenges.

NATO's fundamental security tasks

NATO's essential and enduring purpose, set out in the Washington Treaty, is to safeguard the freedom and security of all its members by political and military means. Based on common values of democracy, human rights and the rule of law, the Alliance has striven since its inception to secure a lasting peaceful order in Europe. However, the achievement of this aim can be jeopardised by crisis and conflict outside the Euro-Atlantic area. The Alliance therefore not only ensures the defence of its members but contributes to peace and stability beyond the geographical space defined as the North Atlantic Treaty area through partnerships and crisis management operations.

The guiding principle by which the Alliance works is common commitment and mutual cooperation among sovereign states in support of the indivisibility of security for all its members. Solidarity and cohesion within the Alliance, through daily cooperation in both the political and military spheres, guarantee that no single member country is forced to rely upon its own national efforts alone in dealing with basic security challenges. Without depriving member countries of their right and duty to assume their sovereign responsibilities in the field of defence, the Alliance enables them through collective efforts to meet their essential national security objectives.

NATO's fundamental security tasks are described in the Alliance's Strategic Concept. It is the authoritative statement of the Alliance's objectives and provides the highest level of guidance on the political and military means to be used in achieving them. It remains the basis for the implementation of Alliance policy as a whole. However, changing threats and threat perceptions have resulted in a continuous process of adaptation of this strategy to ensure that the political framework, military structures and military capabilities needed to deal with modern security challenges are all in place.

The Strategic Concept, first published in 1991, differed dramatically from preceding documents both in content and form. It maintained the security of its members as NATO's fundamental purpose but combined this with the specific obligation to work towards improved and expanded security for Europe as a whole through partnership and cooperation with former adversaries. In addition, it was issued as a public document, open for discussion and comment by parliaments, security specialists, journalists and the broader public. The Strategic Concept was revised in 1999, committing the Allies not only to common defence but to the peace and stability of the wider Euro-Atlantic area. It comprises the following political elements:

- a broad approach to security, encompassing political, economic, social and environmental factors, as well as the Alliance's defence dimension
- a strong commitment to transatlantic relations
- maintenance of Alliance military capabilities to ensure the effectiveness of military operations
- development of European capabilities within the Alliance
- maintenance of adequate conflict prevention and crisis management structures and procedures
- effective partnerships with non-NATO countries based on cooperation and dialogue
- the enlargement of the Alliance and an open door policy towards potential new members
- continuing efforts towards far-reaching arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements

This broad definition of security recognises the importance of political, economic, social and environmental factors in addition to the defence dimension. Partnership and cooperation with other countries, cooperation with other regional and international organisations such as the United Nations, and the strategic partnership that is evolving between NATO and the European Union all contribute to the establishment of mutually reinforcing and complementary relations and to more effective conflict prevention and crisis management.

The specific tasks of the Alliance are also described in the Strategic Concept. They are as follows:

To provide one of the indispensable foundations for a stable Euro-Atlantic **security** environment, based on the growth of democratic institutions and commitment to the peaceful resolution of disputes, in which no country would be able to intimidate or coerce any other through the threat or use of force.

To serve, as provided for in Article 4 of the Washington Treaty, as an essential transatlantic forum for Allied **consultations** on any issues that affect their vital interests, including possible developments posing risks for members' security, and for appropriate coordination of their efforts in fields of common concern.

To **deter and defend** against any threat of aggression against any NATO member state as provided for in Articles 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty.

And in order to enhance the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area:

To stand ready, case-by-case and by consensus, in conformity with Article 7 of the Washington Treaty, to contribute to effective conflict prevention and to engage actively in **crisis management**, including crisis response operations.

To promote wide-ranging **partnership**, cooperation, and dialogue with other countries in the Euro-Atlantic area, with the aim of increasing transparency, mutual confidence and the capacity for joint action with the Alliance.

In the wake of the September 11 attacks on the United States, the priority has been given to aspects such as better sharing of intelligence relating to the threat from terrorism, strengthening cooperation and partnership with other countries outside the Alliance and with other organisations across the board but above all in addressing the threat from terrorism, reinforcing the role of NATO's Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Centre in contributing to military preparedness to counter WMD threats and to the ability to operate in a WMD environment, adapting forces structures, and improving military capabilities in other relevant areas.

Facing the changing security environment

The historic decision taken by NATO to invoke Article 5 of the Washington Treaty and extend its assistance to the United States following 11 September 2001 marked the beginning of a new impetus in NATO's transformation process that was to touch on virtually every aspect of Alliance activity.

In addition to combating terrorism, a variety of other factors have reinforced the need for adaptation of Alliance structures and policies. These include the increased threat posed by weapons of mass destruction and the need for new operational capabilities in critical areas. The demands of NATO's enlargement have also had an impact, as have the developing role of partnerships with Russia, Ukraine and partner countries, the importance of the Mediterranean Dialogue and the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, and the strategic partnership with the European Union. NATO's leading role in the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan and its continuing role in the Balkans have also led the Organisation to adapt itself to the requirements of these operations, of its missions in Iraq and Sudan, and of its relief efforts in Pakistan.

Many of the changes needed to carry forward the transformation process were introduced at NATO's Prague Summit on 21–22 November 2002 and

were pursued at its Istanbul Summit on 28–29 June 2004. Five major areas have been affected: membership of the Alliance, the reform of NATO's civilian and military structures, the acceptance of new roles, the development of new capabilities and the promotion of new relationships.

The accession of new members

The accession of the first three Eastern European countries in 1999 coincided with the Alliance's 50th anniversary, which was marked at the Washington Summit in April of that year. This was followed in 2004 by NATO's largest wave of enlargement since its creation, when seven new member countries were admitted. It was at the Istanbul Summit that the leaders of the 26 member countries gathered for the first time since the Alliance's fifth round of enlargement. Allied leaders reaffirmed that NATO's door would remain open to European democracies willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, in accordance with Article 10 of the Washington Treaty.

Reforming NATO's civilian and military structures

The enlargement process had repercussions on the physical working space needed at the political headquarters in Brussels, and the construction of new, larger premises was agreed in 1999. In addition, a number of internal reforms were adopted in 2002 to adapt the International Staff and the International Military Staff to the new missions and priorities of the Alliance.

In parallel, NATO's military command structure was totally reorganised, reflecting a fundamental shift in Alliance thinking. The command structure had previously been divided into two main geographic areas, with one strategic command covering Europe and the other the North Atlantic area. These commands have been replaced by one operational command – Allied Command Operations (ACO) – and a functional command – Allied Command Transformation (ACT). ACO is a strategic command for all NATO operations whereas ACT is responsible for the continuing transformation of NATO's military capabilities and for promoting interoperability. Although the command structure had already changed considerably since the end of the Cold War, this reform provided a structure with the capacity to focus systematically on facilitating the transformation of military capabilities on a continuous basis as new needs are identified. In effect, its role is to help to ensure that the Alliance has the capabilities it needs to carry out its tasks and that the forces needed to meet new commitments are available to NATO quickly and reliably.

The increased scope of NATO's military operations

The scope of the military operations undertaken by NATO has increased significantly since its initial involvement in restoring stability to Bosnia and Herzegovina in the early 1990s. Since then, NATO has committed itself to several peacekeeping operations in and beyond its traditional area of responsibility and has enhanced its efforts in confronting the growing threat posed by terrorism.

Helping to stabilise the Balkans

The nature of NATO's engagement in the former Yugoslavia is changing, although its commitment to long-term stability throughout southeastern Europe remains as strong as ever. The aim is to restore a secure environment in the region and work with its partners to integrate southeastern Europe into Euro-Atlantic structures. This calls for building enduring multi-ethnic democracies, rooting out organised crime and corruption and establishing the rule of law, regional cooperation, and full compliance with international obligations, including the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

At the Prague Summit in November 2002, the Alliance confirmed its intention to maintain a presence in the region and its readiness to assist the countries through individual assistance programmes. Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia and Montenegro have manifested their desire to take part in NATO's Partnership for Peace programme, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* has joined NATO's Member Action Plan, together with Albania and Croatia, to prepare for future potential membership.

By the turn of the century NATO had committed itself to operations in the Euro-Atlantic area. However, at a meeting in Reykjavik, Iceland on 14–15 May 2002, NATO crossed the Rubicon by stating that it was prepared to engage in operations beyond its traditional area of responsibility. This decision opened the way to new challenges and opportunities for the Alliance, which later committed itself in Afghanistan, Iraq, Sudan and Pakistan.

Leading the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan

In the immediate aftermath of the terrorist attacks against New York and Washington, DC, the United States launched Operation Enduring Freedom, a counter-terrorist operation in Afghanistan, which was complemented two months later by the UN-mandated International Security Assistance Force (ISAF). The ultimate aim of ISAF is to help lead Afghanistan out of nearly four decades of authoritarian rule, foreign occupation and civil war, which had made

Afghan territory a suitable base for the training of terrorists. Initially, individual countries assumed command of the force on a rotational basis, with technical support from NATO. However, NATO took over full responsibility for its leadership, resolving the issue of continuity, in August 2003. In autumn 2003, the UN Security Council adopted a new resolution that authorised the expansion of ISAF's operations to areas outside Kabul through Provincial Reconstruction Teams (PRTs).

NATO is progressively taking over a growing number of PRTs in different parts of Afghanistan, and although the UN mandate clearly stipulates that the ISAF mission is to assist the Government of Afghanistan in providing a safe and secure environment conducive to free and fair elections, the spread of the rule of law, and the reconstruction of the country NATO's role in Afghanistan can also be considered as part of NATO's efforts to combat terrorism. There are ongoing debates to examine to what extent greater synergy can be achieved between Operation Enduring Freedom and ISAF, especially since a number of NATO countries provide forces and equipment to both.

Establishing a training mission in Iraq

In Iraq, NATO has committed itself to providing various forms of support. On 8 November 2002, the UN Security Council issued Resolution 1441 to offer Iraq, suspected of possessing weapons of mass destruction, a final chance to comply with its disarmament obligations that had been repeatedly stated in previous Security Council resolutions. In a special declaration issued at the Prague Summit on 21–22 November, NATO leaders also pledged support for the implementation of this resolution. However, Iraq's leader, Saddam Hussein, was still not complying and therefore raised suspicions among Council members, prompting some to support immediate military action and others to insist that the weapon inspectors be given more time to conduct their work. The division in international opinion was also reflected at NATO where, in the meantime, the Turkish government requested consultations within the framework of Article 4 of the North Atlantic Treaty in the event of a threat from Iraq. After intense discussion, defensive measures were implemented to assist Turkey under Operation Display Deterrence.

The United States led Operation Iraqi Freedom in March 2003 and ousted the regime of Saddam Hussein. Poland agreed to assume the lead of a multinational division within the international stabilisation force deployed in Iraq and, on 2 June 2003, the North Atlantic Council agreed to a request from Poland to provide support for this operation in a number of fields.

A year later, NATO leaders agreed to assist the Interim Government of Iraq with the training of its security forces and established a NATO Training

Implementation Mission. Distinct from operational missions involving combat forces, NATO's training mission works closely with the Iraqi authorities as well as with the United States-led Multinational Force in Iraq. Security and protection for the mission itself is provided in part by the Multinational Force and in part by NATO. Other measures have been adopted since that time, such as the establishment of a NATO-supported Iraqi Training, Education and Doctrine Centre that focuses on leadership training for Iraqi security staff, and NATO assistance in the coordination of training being provided bilaterally by different member countries both in and outside Iraq.

Providing logistical support to the African Union in Sudan

More recently, in April 2005, the Chairperson of the Commission of the African Union, Mr Alpha Oumar Konaré, wrote to the NATO Secretary General requesting NATO assistance in the expansion of the African Union's peace-keeping mission in the western region of Darfur, Sudan, in an attempt to halt the continuing violence in the region. The Alliance formally announced its support with airlift and training on 9 June, at a meeting of NATO defence ministers in Brussels, and started its first airlift operations on 1 July. In addition, in October 2005, following a request from the Pakistani government, NATO started air bridges to deliver aid to the earthquake-stricken regions of Pakistan. Later, on a temporary basis, NATO sent forces that included engineers, multinational medical units and deployable headquarters.

Fighting terrorism

Allied governments, in their individual and collective efforts to confront the growing threat posed by international terrorism directly, have also launched initiatives aimed at curtailing terrorist activity in the Balkan region that are implemented by NATO forces on the ground, as well as operations such as Operation Active Endeavour in the Mediterranean and Operation Eagle Assist.

Operation Active Endeavour is a maritime operation led by NATO's naval forces to detect and deter terrorist activity in the Mediterranean. The operation was launched in October 2001 and, in view of its success and efficiency, was extended on two occasions, first to cover the Straits of Gibraltar in March 2003 and then to cover the entire Mediterranean in March 2004. The initial operation was limited to the eastern Mediterranean.

Operation Eagle Assist was one of the measures requested by the United States in the aftermath of 9/11. Aircraft from NATO's Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) patrolled American airspace for a period of seven

months from mid-October 2001 to mid-May 2002. Approximately 830 crew members from 13 NATO countries flew nearly 4300 hours and over 360 operational sorties.

NATO Airborne Warning and Control aircraft have been used on several occasions to defend against the possibility of further terrorist attacks involving the use of so-called renegade aircraft, and in a more routine capacity when major NATO and EU events have called for extra protection. In July 2004, security protection was extended, at the request of the respective governments, to the European Football Championships in Portugal and the Olympic Games in Greece.

Modernising NATO's military capabilities

The widened scope of NATO military operations has radically transformed the military requirements of the Alliance. The large defence forces of the past needed to be replaced by forces geared toward relatively small-scale crisis response operations dependent upon flexibility and mobility and on the ability to deploy at significant distances from their normal operating bases.

At the Prague Summit, the member governments launched a modernisation process designed to ensure that NATO can effectively deal with the security challenges of the 21st century. A package of measures to enhance the Alliance's military operational capabilities was agreed. It included a new capabilities initiative called the Prague Capabilities Commitment, the creation of a NATO Response Force, and the streamlining of the Alliance's military command structure. These are the three key military transformation initiatives that are essential to adapting NATO's military capabilities.

In addition, NATO heads of state and government called for increased efforts in the areas of intelligence sharing and crisis response arrangements, as well as greater cooperation with Partner countries through the Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism and in the field of terrorism consequence management assistance, including the implementation of a civil emergency planning (CEP) action plan for civil preparedness against possible attacks involving chemical, biological or radiological (CBR) agents. Five nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) weapons defence initiatives were endorsed: a prototype deployable NBC analytical laboratory, a prototype NBC event response team, a virtual Centre of Excellence for NBC Weapons Defence, a NATO biological and chemical defence stockpile, and a disease surveillance system. Other initiatives included the establishment of a multinational CBRN battalion, defence against cyber attacks, and missile defence, with the launch of a new NATO Missile Defence Feasibility Study (MDFS) to examine options for protecting Alliance territory, forces and population centres against missile threats.

Implementation of the Prague Capabilities Commitment was pursued at the Istanbul Summit in June 2004, with the launching of a number of multinational projects aimed at enhancing military capabilities in critical areas such as strategic sealift and airlift capabilities, air-to-air refuelling and the Alliance ground surveillance system. "Usability" targets were endorsed, involving commitments by member countries to maintain at all times the ability to deploy and sustain larger proportions of their forces on Alliance operations. Changes to NATO's defence planning and force generation processes were announced, designed to link political agreement to launch an operation to the provision of the forces needed to carry it out. However, important challenges remained, including the development of improved measures to combat threats posed by terrorism, failed states and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction by state and non-state actors.

NATO leaders agreed to develop high-tech capabilities to protect both civilians and military forces from terrorist attacks. These capabilities include defence against weapons of mass destruction, protection of wide-body aircraft against shoulder-launched missiles, protection of helicopters from ground threats, protection of harbours and vessels, defence against improvised explosive devices, and improved mine detection. In addition, agreement was reached to improve intelligence sharing and to carry out a review of current intelligence structures at NATO. The mandate given to the Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit, created after the terrorist attacks against the United States of 11 September 2001, was made permanent and extended to include analysis of terrorist threats as a whole in addition to those more specifically aimed at NATO. Furthermore, NATO governments agreed to enhance the Organisation's ability to assist any member country in dealing with terrorist threats or with the consequences of terrorist attacks. NATO assets and capabilities such as AWACS aircraft, the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre and the Multinational Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defence Battalion can be made available to member countries requesting such assistance.

Strengthening and widening partnerships

With the need for greater solidarity in today's security environment, especially in combating terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, NATO's Partnership policies have been steadily extended with a view to building closer and more effective relationships with a wide variety of countries and international institutions. This includes Partner countries in the Euro-Atlantic area, countries in the wider Mediterranean region, "contact countries" such as Japan, Australia, Pakistan and China, and international organisations such as the European Union, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation

in Europe and the United Nations. These policies have put the spotlight on the major contribution to international security that strengthened cooperation can offer.

NATO-Russia relations

The development of a result-oriented NATO-Russia partnership geared toward finding common approaches to common security challenges is also considered an essential element of NATO's transformation agenda. The creation of the NATO-Russia Council in May 2002 marked the beginning of a more pragmatic relationship focused on activities such as defence against terrorism, defence reform, non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, military cooperation and training, civil emergency planning, theatre missile defence, and preparing for possible new joint peacekeeping operations.

NATO-Ukraine relations

With regard to Ukraine, NATO Allies have been strongly encouraging the country to pursue much-needed reforms and to implement urgent measures that would be essential for the country to realise its long-term goal of full integration into Euro-Atlantic security structures. The Orange Revolution in November 2004 triggered hopes of accelerating this process and, in response to the country's aspirations to NATO membership, foreign ministers launched an Intensified Dialogue with Ukraine in April 2005. However, they stressed once again the need for consistent and measurable progress in democratic reform and reiterated that the pace of progress remains in Ukraine's hands.

Relations with Partner countries

When seven former Partner countries became members of NATO in March 2004, the balance between member and Partner countries cooperating within the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace changed significantly. Moreover, the remaining Partner countries are in different regions and have more diverse security requirements. Some remain candidate countries for future NATO membership while others have demonstrated their desire to develop specific programmes of cooperation with NATO without seeking future membership. The quality of these partnerships has been upgraded and their scope broadened. At the same time, the Alliance has increased its focus on the Caucasus and Central Asia and is taking practical steps to develop closer cooperation with Partner countries in these regions, including the appointment of a special NATO representative for the two regions and the assignment of a liaison officer to each area.

The Mediterranean Dialogue

Since its creation in 1994, the Mediterranean Dialogue has contributed to confidence-building and cooperation between NATO and the seven participating countries – Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia. The political and practical dimensions of this programme have been progressively upgraded to encourage effective interaction on security issues of common concern, including terrorism, therefore moving the relationship from dialogue to partnership.

The Istanbul Cooperation Initiative

At Istanbul in June 2004, Alliance leaders also launched the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative. This is intended to reach out to the broader region of the Middle East by promoting practical cooperation with interested countries, starting with the countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council. The focus of the initiative is on offering advice, in accordance with each country's specific needs, on issues such as defence reform, defence budgeting, defence planning and civil-military relations. The initiative also addresses issues such as the promotion of military-to-military cooperation, fighting terrorism through information sharing and maritime cooperation, and addressing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.

Working with other international organisations

At the institutional level, international organisations including the United Nations, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) are recognising the need to meet threats such as terrorism square on, with all the resources available, and to coordinate this effort rather than to rely on the resources of any single organisation.

NATO-EU relations have evolved in leaps and bounds in a very short space of time. On 16 December 2002, the European Union and NATO adopted a joint declaration on the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP), which provided a formal basis for cooperation in the areas of crisis management and conflict prevention. On 13 December 2002, the member countries of the North Atlantic Council declared that they were now in a position to give the EU access to the collective assets and capabilities of NATO for operations in which the Alliance as a whole was not engaged militarily and announced a series of related measures pertaining to this decision. These decisions paved the way for the two organisations to work out the detailed modalities for the transfer of responsibility to the European Union for the NATO-led military operations in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* in 2003 and, from December 2004, in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Conclusion

As an intergovernmental organisation with shared values, a common determination to defend them and measures being developed to make the capabilities needed to do so available whenever and wherever necessary, NATO is able to focus on today's security challenges. The operations it is conducting in the Balkans and in Afghanistan and to which it is contributing in Iraq and Darfur, combined with the growing strength of its bilateral and multilateral partnerships with non-NATO countries and other organisations, demonstrate its continuing effectiveness.

Daunting challenges remain, however. As he took up his responsibilities as NATO's new secretary general in January 2004, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer outlined where the emphasis must lie in addressing them: successful implementation of the Alliance's current operational roles, particularly in Kosovo and in Afghanistan, responsiveness to any decision by member countries to increase the Alliance's role in Iraq, the continuing implementation of the transformation process and the accomplishment of a pragmatic, realistic and trusting transatlantic relationship.

PART II

POLICY AND DECISION-MAKING

- | | |
|------------------|--|
| CHAPTER 1 | The principal policy and decision-making institutions |
| CHAPTER 2 | Crisis management |
| CHAPTER 3 | The defence planning dimension |
| CHAPTER 4 | Common-funded resources, budgets and financial management |
| CHAPTER 5 | Nuclear policy |
| CHAPTER 6 | The economic dimension |

CHAPTER 1

THE PRINCIPAL POLICY AND DECISION-MAKING INSTITUTIONS

The principle of consensus decision-making is applied throughout the Alliance, reflecting the fact that it is the member countries that decide and each one of them is involved in the decision-making process. This principle is applied at every level of the Organisation.

The principal policy and decision-making institutions of the Alliance are the North Atlantic Council, the Defence Planning Committee and the Nuclear Planning Group. Each of these plays a vital role in the consultative and decision-making processes that are the bedrock of the cooperation, joint planning and shared security between member countries that NATO represents.

The decisions taken by each of these bodies have the same status and represent the agreed policy of the member countries, irrespective of the level at which they are taken. Subordinate to these senior bodies are specialised committees also consisting of officials representing their countries. This committee structure provides the basic mechanism that gives the Alliance its consultation and decision-making capability, ensuring that each member country can be represented at every level and in all fields of NATO activity.

Consensus decision-making

NATO decisions are taken on the basis of consensus, after discussion and consultation among member countries. A decision reached by consensus is an agreement reached by common consent and supported by each member country. This implies that when a NATO decision is taken, it is the expression of the collective will of the sovereign states that are members of the Alliance. It is this decision-making process that gives NATO both its strength and its credibility.

When there is disagreement, discussions take place until a decision is reached, and in some circumstances this may be to recognise that agreement is not possible. In general, however, mutually acceptable solutions are normally found. The process is rapid since members consult on a continuous basis and therefore frequently know and understand each other's positions in advance. Consultation is a vital part of the decision-making process. It facilitates communication between members whose prime goal is to ensure that decisions taken collectively are consistent with their national interests.

The North Atlantic Council

The North Atlantic Council (NAC) has effective political authority and powers of decision, and consists of permanent representatives of all member countries meeting together at least once a week. The Council also meets at higher levels involving foreign ministers, defence ministers or heads of state and government, but it has the same authority and powers of decision-making, and its decisions have the same status and validity, at whatever level it meets. The Council has an important public profile and issues declarations and communiqués explaining the Alliance's policies and decisions to the general public and to governments of countries which are not members of NATO.

The Council is the only body within the Alliance which derives its authority explicitly from the North Atlantic Treaty. The Council itself was given responsibility under the Treaty for setting up subsidiary bodies. Many committees and planning groups have since been created to support the work of the Council or to assume responsibility in specific fields such as defence planning, nuclear planning and military matters.

The Council thus provides a unique forum for wide-ranging consultation between member governments on all issues affecting their security and is the most important decision-making body in NATO. All member countries of NATO have an equal right to express their views round the Council table. Decisions are the expression of the collective will of member governments arrived at by common consent. All member governments are party to the policies formulated in the Council or under its authority and share in the consensus on which decisions are based.

When the Council meets at the level of ambassadors or permanent representatives of the member countries, it is often referred to as the "Permanent Council". Twice a year, and sometimes more frequently, it meets at ministerial level, either in formal or informal session, when each country is represented by its minister of foreign affairs. Meetings of the Council also take place in defence ministers' sessions. Summit meetings attended by heads of state or government are held whenever particularly important issues have to be addressed or at seminal moments in the evolution of Allied security policy.

While the Council normally meets at least once a week, it can be convened at short notice whenever necessary. Its meetings are chaired by the Secretary General of NATO or, in his absence, by his Deputy. The longest serving permanent representative on the Council assumes the title of Dean of the Council. Primarily a ceremonial function, the Dean may be called upon to play a more specific presiding role, for example in convening meetings and chairing discussions at the time of the selection of a new secretary general.

At ministerial meetings of foreign ministers, one country's foreign minister assumes the role of honorary president. The position rotates annually among the member countries in the order of the English alphabet. An order of precedence in the Permanent Council is established on the basis of length of service, but at meetings of the Council at any level, permanent representatives sit round the table in order of nationality, in English alphabetical order. The same procedure is followed throughout the NATO committee structure.

Items discussed and decisions taken at meetings of the Council cover all aspects of the Organisation's activities and are frequently based on reports and recommendations prepared by subordinate committees at the Council's request. Equally, subjects may be raised by any one of the national representatives or by the Secretary General. Permanent representatives act on instructions from their capitals, informing and explaining the views and policy decisions of their governments to their colleagues round the table. Conversely they report back to their national authorities on the views expressed and positions taken by other governments, informing them of new developments and keeping them abreast of movement towards consensus on important issues or areas where national positions diverge.

When decisions have to be taken, action is agreed upon on the basis of unanimity and common accord. There is no voting or decision by majority. Each member country represented at the Council table or on any of its subordinate committees retains complete sovereignty and responsibility for its own decisions.

The work of the Council is prepared by subordinate Committees with responsibility for specific areas of policy. Much of this work involves the Senior Political Committee (SPC), consisting of deputy permanent representatives, sometimes reinforced by appropriate national experts, depending on the subject. In such cases it is known as the SPC(R). The Senior Political Committee has particular responsibility for preparing most statements or communiqués to be issued by the Council and meets in advance of ministerial meetings to draft such texts for Council approval. Other aspects of political work may be handled by the regular Political Committee, which consists of political counsellors or advisers from national delegations. Similarly, the work of the Defence Planning Committee and the Nuclear Planning Group (NPG) is prepared by the Defence Review Committee and the NPG Staff Group respectively, and by other senior committees.

When the Council meets at the level of defence ministers or is dealing with defence matters and questions relating to defence strategy, other senior committees, such as the Executive Working Group, may be involved as the principal advisory bodies. If financial matters are on the Council's agenda, the Senior Resource Board, or the Civil or Military Budget Committees, or the

Infrastructure Committee, depending on which body is appropriate, will be responsible to the Council for preparing its work. Depending on the topic under discussion, the respective senior committee with responsibility for the subject area assumes the leading role in preparing Council meetings and following up on Council decisions.

The work of the Council is supported by the relevant divisions and offices of the International Staff, and in particular by the Council Secretariat, which coordinates Council activities and ensures that Council mandates are executed and its decisions recorded and disseminated.

The Defence Planning Committee

The Defence Planning Committee (DPC) is normally composed of permanent representatives but meets at the level of defence ministers at least twice a year, and deals with most defence matters and subjects related to collective defence planning. With the exception of France, all the member countries are represented in this forum. The Defence Planning Committee provides guidance to NATO's military authorities and, within its scope of activity, has the same functions and attributes and the same authority as the Council on matters within its area of responsibility.

The work of the Defence Planning Committee is prepared by a number of subordinate committees with specific responsibilities and in particular by the Defence Review Committee, which oversees the force planning process within NATO and examines other issues relating to the integrated military structure. Like the Council, the Defence Planning Committee looks to the senior committee with the relevant specific responsibility for the preparatory and follow-up work arising from its decisions.

The Nuclear Planning Group

The Defence Ministers of member countries which take part in NATO's Defence Planning Committee meet at regular intervals in the Nuclear Planning Group (NPG), where they discuss specific policy issues associated with nuclear forces. These discussions cover a broad range of nuclear policy matters including the safety, security and survivability of nuclear weapons, communications and information systems, deployment issues and wider questions of common concern such as nuclear arms control and nuclear proliferation. The Alliance's nuclear policy is kept under review and decisions are taken jointly to modify or adapt it in the light of new developments and to update and adjust planning and consultation procedures.

The work of the Nuclear Planning Group is prepared by an NPG Staff Group composed of members of the national delegations of the countries participating in the NPG, members of the International Military Staff and representatives of the Strategic Commanders. The Staff Group carries out detailed work on behalf of the NPG Permanent Representatives. It meets once a week and at other times as necessary.

The High Level Group (HLG) is a senior advisory body to the NPG on nuclear policy and planning issues. The High Level Group is also charged with overseeing nuclear weapons safety, security and survivability matters. The Group is chaired by the United States and is composed of national policy-makers and experts from capitals as well as members of NATO's International Staffs and representatives of the Strategic Commanders. It meets several times a year to discuss aspects of NATO's nuclear policy, planning and force posture, and matters concerning the safety, security and survivability of nuclear weapons.

The Military Committee

The Military Committee is the senior military authority in NATO under the overall political authority of the Council, the Defence Planning Committee or the Nuclear Planning Group. It is an integral part of the policy and decision-making apparatus of the Alliance and provides an essential link between the political decision-making process within the North Atlantic Council, Defence Planning Committee and Nuclear Planning Group and the integrated command structures of NATO charged respectively with the conduct of military operations and the further military transformation of the Alliance.

The Military Committee is also responsible for overseeing the development of NATO's military policy and doctrine and for providing guidance to the NATO Strategic Commanders. The Strategic Commanders are responsible to the Military Committee for the overall direction and conduct of all Alliance military matters within their fields of responsibility. The Military Committee is supported in its activities by the International Military Staff.

The consultative process

Policy formulation and implementation, in an Alliance of independent sovereign countries, depends on all member governments being fully informed of each other's overall policies and intentions as well as the underlying considerations which give rise to them. This calls for regular political consultation, whenever possible during the policy-making stage of deliberations before national decisions have been taken.

Political consultation in NATO began as a systematic exercise when the Council first met in September 1949, shortly after the North Atlantic Treaty came into force. Since that time it has been strengthened and adapted to suit new developments. The principal forum for political consultation remains the Council. Its meetings take place with a minimum of formality; discussion is frank and direct. The Secretary General, by virtue of his chairmanship, plays an essential part in its deliberations and acts as its principal representative and spokesman both in contacts with individual governments and in public affairs.

Consultation also takes place on a regular basis in other fora, all of which derive their authority from the Council. The Political Committee at senior and other levels, the Policy Coordination Group, the Atlantic Policy Advisory Group and other special committees all have a direct role to play in facilitating political consultation between member governments. Like the Council, they are assisted by an International Staff responsible to the Secretary General of NATO.

Political consultation among the members of the Alliance is not limited to events taking place within the Euro-Atlantic area. Events elsewhere that have potential implications for the Alliance regularly feature on the agenda of the Council and its subordinate committees. The consultative machinery of NATO is readily available and extensively used by the members in such circumstances, in order to identify at an early stage areas where, in the interests of security and stability, coordinated action may be taken.

Neither is the need for consultation limited to political subjects. Wide-ranging consultation takes place in many other fields. The process is continuous and takes place on an informal as well as a formal basis with a minimum of delay or inconvenience, as a result of the collocation of national delegations to NATO within the same headquarters. Where necessary, it enables intensive work to be carried out at short notice on matters of particular importance or urgency with the full participation of representatives from all the governments concerned.

Consultation within the Alliance takes many forms. In its most basic form it simply involves the exchange of information and opinions. At another level, it covers the communication of actions or decisions which governments have already taken or may be about to take and which have a direct or indirect bearing on the interests of their Allies. It may also involve providing advance warning of actions or decisions to be taken by governments in the future, in order to provide an opportunity for them to be endorsed or commented upon by others. It can encompass discussion with the aim of reaching a consensus on policies to be adopted or actions to be taken in parallel. And ultimately it is designed

to enable member countries to arrive at mutually acceptable agreements on collective decisions or on action by the Alliance as a whole.

By making their joint decision-making process dependent on consensus and common consent, the members of the Alliance safeguard the role of each country's individual experience and outlook while at the same time availing themselves of the machinery and procedures which allow them jointly to act rapidly and decisively if circumstances require them to do so. The practice of exchanging information and consulting together on a daily basis ensures that governments can come together at short notice whenever necessary, often with prior knowledge of their respective preoccupations, in order to agree on common policies. If need be, efforts to reconcile differences between them will be made in order that joint actions may be backed by the full force of decisions to which all the member governments subscribe. Once taken, such decisions represent the common determination of all the countries involved to implement them in full. Decisions which may be politically difficult, or which face competing demands on resources, thus acquire added force and credibility.

All NATO member countries participate fully in the political level of cooperation within the Alliance and are equally committed to the terms of the North Atlantic Treaty, not least to the reciprocal undertaking made in Article 5 which symbolises the indivisibility of their security – namely to consider an attack against one or more of them as an attack upon them all.

The manner in which the Alliance has evolved ensures that variations in the requirements and policies of member countries can be taken into account in their positions within the Alliance. This flexibility manifests itself in a number of different ways. In some cases, differences may be largely procedural and are accommodated without difficulty. Iceland, for example, has no military forces and is therefore represented in NATO military forums by a civilian if it so wishes. In other cases the distinctions may be of a more substantive nature. France, a founding member of the Alliance in 1949, withdrew from the Alliance's integrated military structure in 1966 while remaining a full member of its political structures.

Distinctions between NATO member countries may also exist as a result of their geographical, political, military or constitutional situations. The participation of Norway and Denmark in NATO's military dispositions, for example, must comply with national legislation which does not allow foreign forces or nuclear weapons to be stationed on their national territory in peacetime. In another context, military commands within the integrated military structure may involve only the forces of those countries directly concerned or equipped to participate in the specific function for which the command has been created.

Consultations with Partner countries, other non-member countries and contact countries

Cooperation with non-member countries of NATO is an integral part of the Alliance's security policy and plays a fundamental role in its day-to-day work. Through its pursuit of cooperation and different forms of partnership with non-member countries, NATO not only increases security and stability for its Partner countries but also reinforces its own security. Partnership and cooperation are therefore part of a two-way process benefiting both Partner countries and member countries. It provides the opportunity for each of them to discuss security issues and cooperate in different fields, helping to overcome divisions and potential areas of disagreement that could lead to instability and conflict.

Regular consultations on relevant political issues take place with Partner countries in the context of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, with Russia through the NATO-Russia Council, with Ukraine through the NATO-Ukraine Commission, and with participants in NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue through the Mediterranean Cooperation Group. NATO has also offered a framework for cooperation with countries of the broader Middle East, through the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, and maintains a consultative forum for cooperation with countries in the Balkans, through the South-East Europe Initiative.

The principles which guide consultations in these forums are modelled on those which have long formed the basis for consultations within the Alliance itself and are conducted with the same openness and spirit of cooperation. The role of each of these institutions and the manner in which Partner and other non-member countries participate in the decision-making process with respect to NATO-led operations or actions to which they contribute are described in more detail in Part VII. Finally, there are provisions for NATO consultations with any active participant in the Partnership for Peace, if that Partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence or security.

The process of cooperation at the national level is reinforced by cooperation between NATO and a number of other multinational organisations with a critical role to play in security-related matters. NATO does not therefore work in isolation. In addition to the tasks in which it plays the leading role, it acts to support and complement the work of other organisations in laying the foundation for a safer, more stable and more peaceful international environment in which economies can prosper and individuals flourish. In particular, NATO has undertaken military operations to support the principles and resolutions of the United Nations. It is working closely with its European member countries in developing an effective strategic partnership between the Alliance and the European Union. And the Alliance works closely in different contexts with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the Council of

Europe and other international organisations and non-governmental organisations. These various relationships are described in Part IX.

Although NATO has no formal institutional links with individual countries outside the framework of the bilateral and multilateral structures described above, the Alliance's role in the security of today's world leads many other countries to seek up-to-date information about NATO policies and activities, to remain in touch and to consider participating in specific projects. The various operational roles undertaken by the Alliance have also served to increase interaction with countries contributing to such efforts.

In such cases, in accordance with guidance issued by the North Atlantic Council, cooperation is considered on a case-by-case basis. Decisions are taken in the light of mutual benefits, potential costs, the priority given to cooperation with Partner countries and the extent to which the values that the Alliance represents are shared.

Contacts and exchanges take place with a number of countries, referred to as "contact countries", that have indicated their wish to establish dialogue with the Alliance. For a number of years, NATO has participated in a regular exchange of views at all levels with Japan. More recently, the Alliance has also responded positively to China's interest in informal contacts. Regular contacts at all levels with other countries like New Zealand and Australia have also been developed. In some cases these dialogues may be complemented by participation in specific NATO activities or joint participation in events.

The NATO-led operations in the Balkans, in the Mediterranean and in Afghanistan as well as the training mission in Iraq agreed upon in June 2004 provide concrete examples of practical cooperation between the Alliance and countries that are neither members of it nor linked to it through formal partnerships. Countries that have contributed forces to these operations include Argentina, Australia, Chile, New Zealand and the United Arab Emirates.

CHAPTER 2

CRISIS MANAGEMENT

The Alliance's Strategic Concept of 1999 identifies crisis management as one of NATO's fundamental security tasks. It commits the Alliance to stand ready to contribute to effective conflict prevention and to engage actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations. This requirement is fulfilled through a combination of effective consultation procedures, crisis management arrangements, military capabilities, and civil emergency planning preparations.

From the earliest years of its existence, NATO's basic task was to develop a defence planning process combined with the military capabilities needed to ensure that the Alliance had the capacity to deal with collective defence operations under Article 5 of the Treaty. However, it is only during its more recent history that NATO has taken decisions that have resulted in non-Article 5 operations outside the territory of member countries, designed to prevent a conflict from spreading and from threatening to destabilise other countries in the region, including NATO member or Partner countries. Simultaneously, the Alliance has undertaken a range of measures to develop its capacity to respond to non-Article 5 crisis situations.

Developments since the early 1990s

An increasingly important part of NATO's role in the years since the end of the Cold War has therefore been the unique contribution it has been able to make to efforts by the wider international community to prevent conflict from occurring and, when it does occur, to restore and preserve peace. In June 1992, at a meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Oslo, NATO offered to support, on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with its own procedures, peacekeeping and other operations under the responsibility of the Conference for Security and Co-operation in Europe (which became the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in 1995). A few months later, the same commitment was made with respect to peacekeeping operations under the authority of the United Nations. The Alliance stood ready to respond positively to initiatives that the UN Secretary General might take in seeking NATO assistance in implementing UN Security Council resolutions.

Between 1992 and 1995 NATO undertook a number of monitoring and enforcement operations in support of successive UN Security Council Resolutions relating to the continuing crisis and deteriorating situation in the

former Yugoslavia. However, the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina, created in December 1995 to implement the military aspects of the Dayton Peace Agreement that ended the Bosnian conflict, was the first major manifestation of this policy. Since that time the Alliance has undertaken further peace-support operations and crisis management tasks in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* and Afghanistan, in cooperation with the United Nations, the OSCE and the European Union. In August 2003 it took over the leadership of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. In August 2004, a NATO Training Mission for Iraq was established to assist the Iraqi government in training and building up its own national security forces. In May 2005, NATO decided to assist the African Union in Sudan. These operations are described in more detail in Part IV.

Varying forms of crises and crisis response

Crisis management can involve both military and non-military measures to respond to a crisis situation threatening national or international security. A crisis may be essentially political in nature, or military, or humanitarian, and may be caused by political disputes or armed conflict, technological incidents or natural disasters. Crisis management consists of the different means of dealing with these varying forms of crises.

In practice, the national or international response to a crisis, or to an evolving situation that threatens to become a crisis, depends on the nature, scale and seriousness of the situation. In some cases, it may be possible to anticipate and prevent a crisis through diplomacy or other measures. At other times more robust measures may be necessary, including military action. Moreover, depending on the nature of the crisis, different types of crisis management operation may be contemplated by national authorities.

Within NATO, there are now two broad categories of crisis management operations that member countries may consider, namely operations calling for collective defence, and other crisis response operations in which collective defence is not involved.

Collective defence operations are based on the invocation of Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty and are referred to as “Article 5 operations”. They carry the implication that the decision has been taken collectively by NATO members to consider an attack or act of aggression against one or more members as an attack against all. NATO has invoked Article 5 once in its history, in September 2001, following the terrorist attacks against the United States.

Other crisis response operations include all military operations that the Alliance may decide to conduct in a non-Article 5 situation. They may be designed to support the peace process in a conflict area and, in those circumstances, are referred to as peace support operations. However, they include a range of other possibilities including conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peace enforcement measures, peace-making, peace-building, preventive deployment and humanitarian operations. NATO's involvement in the Balkans and Afghanistan are examples of crisis management operations in this category. Other illustrations include NATO's supporting role for Polish troops participating in the International Stabilisation Force in Iraq and the acceptance of responsibility for assisting the Iraqi government with the training of its national security forces by launching the NATO Training Mission for Iraq referred to above.

Natural, technological or humanitarian disasters may also result in intervention that comes within the category of crisis response operations and involves operations to assist member and partner countries that are victims of major incidents. NATO provided assistance to Pakistan following the catastrophic earthquake in October 2005 and, on different occasions, has also lent assistance to Ukraine, which has frequently been devastated by floods. Other examples are given in later chapters.

Cooperation with other organisations and with non-NATO countries

NATO decides whether to engage in a crisis management operation on a case-by-case basis. Such decisions, as with all other Alliance decisions, are based on a consensus among the member countries. In many of the operational situations in which it has taken on responsibilities, cooperation and partnership with other organisations has been an important factor. Effective cooperation with the United Nations and with UN agencies on the ground, cooperation with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), NATO's growing strategic partnership with the European Union in which support has been made available for EU-led operations using NATO assets and capabilities – all these have played a significant role in meeting the specific needs of different forms of crisis. Equally significant has been the Alliance's expanding cooperation in crisis management situations with non-NATO countries that are partners in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) or in the Alliance's Mediterranean Dialogue.

Policy evolution

Readiness to respond to a crisis threatening the security of its member countries by invoking Article 5 of the Treaty and by implementing the mutual guarantees called for under Article 5 has been a fundamental obligation of NATO member countries from the outset. As such it plays an integral part in NATO's defence planning arrangements, which are designed to deter any possible threat and to stand ready, should deterrence fail, to take the action decided upon by the member countries at the political level to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. Throughout the Cold War years it was widely assumed that the only circumstances in which Article 5 would have to be invoked would be a crisis threatening the security of the European Allies. On the only occasion Article 5 has been invoked, it was in order to enable the allies of the United States to provide assistance in the wake of the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001.

The need for the Alliance to consider undertaking military operations in response to non-Article 5 situations emerged during the early years following the end of the Cold War, the disintegration of the Warsaw Pact and the collapse of the Soviet Union. In a number of areas both within and on the borders of the former Soviet Union and in the Balkans, past tensions resurfaced and violent conflicts broke out among ethnic groups, whose rights in many cases had been suppressed for half a century. Nor did the struggle for independence in many of the newly emerging states take place without tensions and the potential for conflict.

When major ethnic conflict broke out in the former Yugoslavia in 1992 and repeated international efforts failed to resolve the crisis, NATO member governments took a series of unprecedented decisions to use the Alliance's military capabilities in an operational role. Other non-Article 5 crisis management operations were to follow (see Part V).

Disaster relief operations

Crisis management is a broad concept that goes beyond military operations and may include issues such as the protection of populations threatened by or falling victim to natural or man-made disasters. NATO began developing civil protection measures for the eventuality of nuclear conflict as early as the 1950s and was able to take advantage of capabilities in this field to mitigate the effects of disasters caused by major flooding, earthquakes, incidents involving major industrial or technological disasters, and humanitarian crises.

In 1953, the first disaster assistance scheme was implemented following devastating flooding in northern Europe, and in 1958 NATO established

detailed procedures for the coordination of assistance between member countries in case of disaster. These procedures remained in place and provided the basis for civil emergency planning work in subsequent years. They were comprehensively reviewed in 1995 when they became applicable to Partner countries in addition to NATO member countries.

In 1998, a Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Co-ordination Centre (EADRCC) was established, on the basis of a Russian proposal, to coordinate aid provided by different member and Partner countries to a disaster-stricken area in any one of them. A Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit was also established based on non-permanent civil and military elements volunteered by member or Partner countries for deployment to a disaster area. Soon after its creation, the EADRCC was called upon to help to coordinate humanitarian assistance for Kosovo refugees in support of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Civil emergency planning measures have also enabled intervention in numerous civil emergencies in cases of flooding in Albania, Czech Republic, Hungary, Romania, Ukraine and the United States; earthquakes in Turkey and Pakistan; fires in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* and in Portugal; and extreme weather conditions knocking out the power supply in Ukraine and Moldova. NATO also conducts civil emergency planning exercises on a regular basis. Further details of the arrangements and structures relevant to these aspects of crisis management are given in Part X.

Decision-making on crisis management

In responding to a situation calling for crisis management arrangements, decisions are taken by the governments of NATO member countries collectively in the framework of the North Atlantic Council. They may include political and military measures as well as measures to deal with civil emergencies, depending on the nature of the crisis. All decisions on the planning, deployment or use of military forces are taken only with the political authorisation of the member countries. Such decisions may result in the use of different mechanisms to deal with the crises such as exchanging intelligence, information and other data, comparing different perceptions and approaches, and other measures aimed at harmonising views among the member countries. In reaching and implementing its decisions, the Council may be supported by specialised committees such as the Political Committee, the Policy Coordination Group, the Military Committee and the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee. It will also make full use of and draw on the communications and information systems available to it, including the NATO Situation Centre, which collects and disseminates political, economic and military intelligence and information on a permanent and continuous basis, every single day of the year.

In any crisis, NATO may take the lead or play a supporting role in the context of a crisis management activity undertaken under the responsibility of the United Nations, the OSCE, the European Union, or by one or more NATO member countries. In either case, the focus of NATO's involvement is on making a significant and distinct contribution to successful conflict management and resolution.

The crisis management process

The Alliance must be prepared to conduct the full range of Article 5 and non-Article 5 missions in circumstances that in many cases will be difficult to predict since, to some extent, every crisis is unique. Nonetheless, the process by which the Alliance addresses and seeks to manage and resolve a crisis can be planned with reasonable confidence. The crisis management process is designed to facilitate political consultation and decision-making at a sufficiently early stage in an emerging crisis to give the appropriate NATO committees time to coordinate their work and submit timely advice to the Council. It also allows the Supreme Allied Commander Europe, as the Strategic Commander responsible for Allied Command Operations, to undertake preparatory planning measures in a reasonable timeframe. These activities may in turn contribute early on to the advice provided to the Council by NATO's military authorities.

In an emerging crisis calling for possible crisis response operations, the crisis management process consists of five successive phases ranging from initial indications and warning of an impending crisis, assessment of the situation and its actual or potential implications for Alliance security, development of recommended response options, and planning and execution of the Council's decisions.

The effectiveness of the crisis response system and of NATO's overall crisis management process may be determined to a great extent by the effectiveness and efficiency of the structures and procedures of the NATO Headquarters Crisis Management Organisation, which have to be responsive, flexible and adaptable. They must also facilitate the seamless and smooth inter-operation of the other main elements of the crisis management process, namely the NATO Crisis Response System (NCRS), the NATO Intelligence and Warning System (NIWS), NATO's operational planning system, and NATO Civil Emergency Planning crisis management arrangements. The NATO Situation Centre supports the process with communications and other essential facilities.

In the light of decisions taken at the Washington Summit meeting in 1999 to transform NATO structures and capabilities, the crisis management tools in place were considered to be no longer sufficiently well adapted to the risks and

challenges that the Alliance might face. Accordingly, in August 2001, the North Atlantic Council approved policy guidelines with a view to developing a single, fully integrated NATO Crisis Response System (NCRS).

The terrorist attacks on the United States in September 2001 brought new urgency to this task and a new dimension to the NATO's crisis management framework, which had hitherto focused primarily on requirements for collective defence. In June 2002, the Council also provided political guidance for the development of a Military Concept for Defence Against Terrorism. An important result of this decision has been the introduction of measures to strengthen civil emergency planning for Article 5 and non-Article 5 contingencies, as well as the management of the consequences of civil emergencies or disasters resulting from the use of chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear (CBRN) agents.

In view of new risks, as well as the need for the Alliance to be able to address more complex and demanding crisis management requirements, including the possibility of NATO support for non-NATO operations involving one or more member countries, further far-reaching decisions have been taken with regard to NATO's overall defence posture. These have resulted in a new force posture and a new command structure, transformation of staff structures, new measures relating to defence against terrorism, the establishment of the NATO Response Force, improvements in capabilities, the development of the strategic partnership with the European Union, enhanced cooperation with Partner countries, and reinforcement of the Alliance's Mediterranean Dialogue.

The NATO Crisis Response System under development takes full account of, and complements these new NATO concepts, capabilities and arrangements. It aims to provide the Alliance with a comprehensive set of options and measures to manage and respond to crises appropriately, taking full advantage of the tools and capabilities being introduced as a result of decisions taken by NATO heads of state and government at successive summit meetings.

Exercises to test and develop crisis management procedures are held at regular intervals in conjunction with national capitals and NATO Strategic Commanders. Such exercises and the arrangements, procedures and facilities on which the crisis management process depends are coordinated by the Council Operations and Exercise Committee (COEC).

Crisis management activities involving NATO's Partner countries are also coordinated by the COEC and are among the agreed fields of activity in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Work Plan and in Individual Partnership Programmes. They include briefings and consultations, expert visits, crisis management courses, Partner country participation in an annual NATO-wide

crisis management exercise, and the provision of generic crisis management documents to interested Partner countries.

The coordination of crisis management responses to disasters or emergencies in the Euro-Atlantic area takes place in the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC). The Centre's role is to facilitate the coordination of responses to civil emergencies or disasters, including the management of consequences resulting from terrorist attacks. The Centre, which can be augmented if necessary, is able to operate on a 24/7 basis if circumstances require.

CHAPTER 3

THE DEFENCE PLANNING DIMENSION

In the present political and strategic environment in Europe, the success of the Alliance's role in preserving peace and preventing war depends, even more than in the past, on the effectiveness of preventive diplomacy and on the successful management of crises affecting security. The political, economic, social and environmental elements of security and stability are thus taking on increasing importance.

Nonetheless, the defence dimension of the Alliance is the concrete expression of the Alliance's overall deterrent role with regard to the defence of its member countries and thereby contributes to the maintenance of stability in Europe. The maintenance of an adequate military capability and clear preparedness to act collectively in the common defence remain central to the Alliance's security objectives. Ultimately this capability, combined with political solidarity, is designed to prevent any attempt at coercion or intimidation, and to ensure that military aggression directed at the Alliance can never be perceived as an option with any prospect of success, thus guaranteeing the security and territorial integrity of member states and protecting Europe as a whole from the consequences which would ensue from any threat to the Alliance.

At the same time, defence planning is the basis for all NATO's crisis management and military operations. Its scope has been extended to enable NATO to react to a much wider range of contingencies than in the past and Alliance forces have been radically reorganised in order to enable the full range of defence policy and plans, from conventional deterrence to conflict resolution, peace support, humanitarian intervention and other operational tasks to be fulfilled.

The framework for NATO's defence planning process is provided by the underlying principles which are the basis for collective security as a whole: political solidarity among member countries, the promotion of collaboration and strong ties between them in all fields where this serves their common and individual interests, the sharing of roles and responsibilities and recognition of mutual commitments, and a joint undertaking to maintain adequate military forces to support Alliance strategy and policy.

In determining the size and nature of their contribution to collective defence, member countries of NATO retain full sovereignty and independence of action. Nevertheless, the nature of NATO's defence structure requires that in reaching their individual decisions, member countries take into account the overall needs of the Alliance. They therefore follow agreed defence planning

procedures which provide the methodology and machinery for determining the forces needed for the implementation of Alliance policies, for coordinating national defence plans and for establishing force planning goals which are in the interests of the Alliance as a whole.¹ The planning process takes many factors into account, including changing political circumstances, assessments provided by NATO's strategic military commanders of the forces required to fulfil their tasks, technological developments, the importance of an equitable division of roles, risks and responsibilities within the Alliance, and the individual economic and financial capabilities of member countries. The process thus ensures that all relevant considerations are jointly examined to enable the best use to be made of collective national resources which are available for NATO roles.

Close coordination between international civil and military staffs, NATO's military authorities, and governments is maintained through an annual exchange of information on national plans. This exchange of information enables each country's intentions to be compared with NATO's overall requirements and, if necessary, to be reconsidered in the light of new ministerial political directives, modernisation requirements and changes in the roles and responsibilities of the forces themselves. All these aspects are kept under continual review and are scrutinised at each stage of the defence planning cycle.

Review of the defence planning process

Following a review ordered by defence ministers in 2003, heads of state and government at the 2004 Istanbul Summit welcomed changes to make the Alliance's planning processes more responsive to current and future operational requirements. The agreed changes support the further transformation of Alliance military capabilities through a coherent and streamlined process designed to ensure that NATO continues to develop the forces and capabilities needed to conduct the full range of Alliance missions. This includes providing support for operations which might be led by the European Union in the context of the European Security and Defence Identity and its strategic partnership with NATO. Also in that context, the process enables all European Allies to benefit from NATO support in the context of their operational planning for the conduct of EU-led operations.

Since 1991, the starting point for defence planning has been the Alliance's Strategic Concept, which sets out in broad terms Alliance objectives and the means for achieving them. The original Strategic Concept has been superseded by the Alliance's new Strategic Concept approved by NATO heads of

¹ France does not take part in NATO's force planning arrangements.

state at their Washington Summit meeting in April 1999. The review of defence planning conducted by the Defence Review Committee during 2003 and 2004, which resulted in changes designed to facilitate the transformation of NATO's military capabilities, also takes the Strategic Concept as its starting point, together with the development of the Alliance's new tasks and challenges and the evolution of the security environment as a whole.

While defence planning in the broadest sense embraces a wide spectrum of planning disciplines ranging from force and armaments planning to aspects such as logistics, standardisation, nuclear planning, communications, civil emergency planning, air defence (see Part X), and resource planning (see Part II), the area of defence planning examined in the course of the above review encompasses NATO's force planning procedures and their relationship with these disciplines. The role of defence planning in this context is to provide a framework which permits national and multinational defence planning arrangements to be harmonised in order to meet the Alliance's agreed requirements in the most effective way. The aim is to ensure the availability of national forces and capabilities required for the full range of Alliance missions by setting targets for implementation and assessing the degree to which these targets are being met.

The conclusions of the review recommended the retention of the basic principles of the defence planning process as it has evolved, including its three-pillar structure. This is based, firstly, on overall political guidance, secondly on the adoption of agreed planning targets to fulfil the objectives established in the guidance, and lastly on a systematic review process to monitor, and where necessary adjust or correct, the implementation of the targets. However, changes have been introduced that affect the duration of the planning cycle and the periodicity of the steps it involves. Changes in the procedures for the development of political guidance and the levels at which it is drawn up have also been made, introducing a distinction between the Comprehensive Political Guidance agreed upon at a high level and the more detailed guidance routinely elaborated as part of the normal procedures of the defence planning process within NATO under the authority of the North Atlantic Council or the Defence Planning Committee.

Political guidance will include consideration of a concept known as NATO's "level of ambition". This refers to the agreed assessment by the member governments of the number, scale and nature of operations that NATO should be able to conduct. With regard to force planning, in addition to that assessment, political guidance also encompasses the guidance agreed by defence ministers meeting in the Defence Planning Committee and supplementary guidance that may be agreed by the Defence Planning Committee meeting in permanent session at the level of ambassadors.

Two further specific areas covered by the review and leading to changes in the defence planning process should also be mentioned. Firstly, the review allows for the incorporation, within the planning procedures, of measures to enhance cooperation between NATO and the European Union in the field of defence planning and the improvement of capabilities. This is designed to enable the question of the availability of forces for EU-led operations to be addressed in a more comprehensive manner. And secondly, the review recognises the need for better coordination and harmonisation of all defence planning disciplines across the board and includes provision for further work to be done in appropriate areas to bring this about.

In accordance with the review's recommendations, the guidance required as the first step in the process is issued by defence ministers every four years, with the possibility of a biennial update if necessary, in a document known as "Ministerial Guidance". This gives guidance on defence planning in general and force planning in particular, reflecting political, economic, technological and military factors which could affect the development of forces and capabilities, and their strategic implications. It sets out the priorities and areas of concern to be addressed by the NATO Military Authorities in drawing up their force goals in the first instance, and secondly by countries in their own planning. It deals with planning for forces and capabilities required both for collective defence and for contingencies falling outside the scope of Article 5 of the Washington Treaty.² It may also provide guidance on cooperation with other organisations and, since 1997, has included political guidance defining the likely scope of European-led operations.

Planning targets and force goals

Specific planning targets for the armed forces of each member country are developed on the basis of ministerial guidance. These targets, for which the starting point is the identification of military requirements by the NATO Strategic Commands, incorporate NATO force goals developed from draft force proposals put forward by Allied Command Transformation and designed to enable Allied Command Operations to accomplish the full range of operational missions that may be assigned to it by the North Atlantic Council. The draft proposals are subsequently discussed with individual nations and if necessary amended, prior to being examined collectively by the NATO Military Committee.

2 Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty deals primarily with deterrence against the threat or use of force against members of the Alliance and embodies the principle that an attack against any one of them is considered as an attack against all. Alliance activities falling outside the scope of Article 5 are referred to collectively as "non-Article 5 operations".

That examination takes into account the military validity and technical feasibility of the proposals and, based on the Military Committee's conclusions, results in draft force goals that are then submitted to the Defence Planning Committee for its approval and formal adoption as NATO force goals. The force goals may be complemented in some cases by reinvestment goals, which are drawn up in response to requests by member governments. These combine, on the one hand, the identification of force elements that are no longer needed to meet Alliance requirements and can be eliminated and, on the other hand, the identification of other priority capabilities which may be met by the resources thus freed.

The goals generally cover a four-year period but in certain cases look further into the future. The procedures also make provision for the goals to be updated when circumstances require, normally at the mid-point of the planning cycle.

The defence review

The third leg of the force planning cycle is the defence review process that takes place every second year and is conducted during a period of a little over twelve months. It consists of the individual and collective scrutiny and assessment of the force plans and corresponding financial planning of individual member countries, measured against the yardstick of the agreed NATO force goals for a ten-year planning period.

The defence review serves two purposes. It allows an assessment to be made of the degree to which individual countries are meeting their targets in terms of NATO's force goals, output targets and national usability targets. It also enables an assessment of the extent to which combined Alliance military forces and capabilities are able to meet the political guidelines issued for the current planning cycle. These assessments represent both a measurement and a corrective mechanism, allowing shortcomings to be highlighted as well as areas where increased multinational cooperation may offer advantages. More generally, the assessments provide an evaluation of the extent to which the burden of contributing to Alliance capabilities and military operations is equitably distributed among the member countries.

The conduct of the defence review itself draws on well-established mechanisms beginning with the issuing of a Defence Planning Questionnaire and the analysis of responses to it, resulting in draft Country Chapters based on inputs from NATO's international defence planning staff and from the two Strategic Commands. Following a trilateral meeting with each member country, normally taking place in the respective capitals, revised Country Chapters are subjected to a multilateral examination at the level of the Defence Review

Committee. This aims in particular at reconciling possible differences between national and NATO force goals or plans. When this examination has been completed, the Country Chapters are transformed into individual national annexes to a general report to be submitted to the Defence Planning Committee at its spring ministerial meeting.

This process is repeated for each member country participating in NATO's integrated military structure, over a period of several months, culminating in the preparation of a General Report. The latter also includes a report by the Military Committee on the military suitability of the emerging NATO Force Plan and on the degree of military risk associated with it. Finally, the General Report contains a section coordinated with relevant bodies of the European Union, and based on the contributions of relevant European member countries, setting out the extent to which the emerging plan can be expected to meet EU force and capability requirements.

The overall force planning process may contain one further element in the form of an Overall Summary Appraisal of Defence Planning which may be presented at any time by the NATO Secretary General, giving his view of the current and future state of Alliance defence and of its force plans. The appraisal may serve to highlight points relating to specific national plans, identify issues that may need to be discussed by defence ministers, and help to establish links between different spheres of defence planning that might not otherwise be considered in relation to each other.

Many of the above elements of NATO's defence and force planning procedures are increasingly being used within the Partnership for Peace structure as a means of enhancing interoperability between the military structures of NATO and its Partner countries, assisting the process of defence reform within Partner countries and facilitating the participation of Partner countries in NATO-led operations.

CHAPTER 4

COMMON-FUNDED RESOURCES, BUDGETS AND FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

NATO is an intergovernmental organisation to which member countries allocate the resources needed to enable it to function on a day-to-day basis and to provide the facilities required for consultation, decision-making and the subsequent implementation of agreed policies and activities. It is supported by a military structure which provides for the common defence of the member countries, cooperation with NATO's Partner countries and implementation of Alliance policies in peacekeeping and other fields. Since NATO has only a limited number of permanent headquarters and small standing forces, the greater part of each member country's contribution to NATO, in terms of resources, comes indirectly through its expenditure on its own national armed forces and on its efforts to make them interoperable with those of other members so that they can participate in multinational operations. Member countries also incur the deployment costs involved whenever they volunteer forces to participate in NATO-led operations.

Therefore, with few exceptions, NATO funding does not cover the procurement of military forces or of physical military assets such as ships, submarines, aircraft, tanks, artillery or weapon systems. An important exception is the NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Force, a fleet of radar-bearing aircraft jointly procured, owned, maintained and operated by member countries and placed under the operational command and control of a NATO Force Commander responsible to the NATO Strategic Commanders. NATO also finances investments directed towards collective requirements, such as air defence, command and control systems or Alliance-wide communications systems which cannot be designated as being within the responsibility of any single member country to provide. Such investments are subject to maintenance, renewal and ultimately replacement in accordance with changing requirements and technological developments. The expenditures this requires also represent a significant portion of NATO funding.

Member countries make direct contributions to budgets managed directly by NATO, in accordance with an agreed cost-sharing formula broadly calculated in relation to their ability to pay. These contributions represent a small percentage of each member's overall defence budget and, as a general rule, finance the expenditures of those parts of the NATO structure in which they participate. These contributions, made within the framework of NATO, often follow the principle of common funding.

Projects can also be jointly funded, which means that the participating countries can identify the requirements, the priorities and the funding arrangements, but NATO has visibility and provides political and financial oversight. Joint funding arrangements typically lead to the setting-up of a management organisation and an implementation agency in areas such as aircraft and helicopter production, air defence and logistics. Additionally, NATO member countries can cooperate within the framework of NATO on an ad hoc basis for a range of other, more limited, activities. This cooperation can take the form of trust fund arrangements, contributions in kind, ad hoc cost sharing arrangements and donations.

Common funding

As explained above, the large majority of resources are national. NATO resource planning aims to provide the Alliance with the capabilities it needs, but focuses on the elements that are joined in common funding, that is to say where member pool resources within a NATO framework. When a need for expenditure has been identified, discussions take place among the potential contributing countries to determine whether the principle of common funding should be applied – in other words whether the requirement serves the interests of all the contributing countries and therefore should be borne collectively.

The common funding structure is diverse and decentralised. Certain multinational cooperative activities relating to research, development, production and logistic support do not involve all and, in some instances, may only involve a small number of member countries. These activities, most of which are managed by NATO Production and Logistics Organisations, are subject to the general financial and audit regulations of NATO but otherwise operate in virtual autonomy under charters granted by the North Atlantic Council.

The criteria for common funding are held under constant review and changes may be introduced as a result of new contingencies - for example, the need to develop clear definitions of the parts of NATO's crisis response costs which should be imputed to international budgets and those which should be financed by national budgets. Other changes may result from organisational or technological developments or simply from the need to control costs in order to meet requirements within specific funding limitations. Despite these challenges, the principle of common funding on the basis of consensus remains fundamental to the workings of the Alliance.

Common funding arrangements principally include the NATO Civil and Military Budgets, as well as the NATO Security Investment Programme (NSIP). These are the only funds where NATO authorities identify the requirements and set the priorities in line with overarching Alliance objectives and priorities.

The Civil Budget

The Civil Budget is formulated on an objective-based framework, which establishes clear links between NATO's Strategic Objectives and the resources required to achieve them. It provides funds for personnel expenses, operating costs, and capital and programme expenditure required to achieve four front-line objectives and three support objectives.

The frontline objectives are:

- providing effective policy, planning and resourcing in support of NATO operations in the Euro-Atlantic region and beyond;
- conducting necessary policy and planning work to promote and support improved Alliance capabilities;
- supporting consultation and cooperative activities with partners to strengthen security and respond to new security challenges and threats to the Euro-Atlantic region;
- building awareness of, and support for, NATO, its operations, and its role in promoting security through public diplomacy.

The support objectives consist in:

- providing professional and support services to the North Atlantic Council, subordinate committees and the International Staff;
- operating and maintaining the NATO HQ facility and site;
- ensuring NATO-wide security policy and providing a safe and secure environment for all HQ staff and operations.

The Civil Budget is funded primarily by the foreign ministries of each member country, supervised by the Civil Budget Committee and implemented by NATO's International Staff.

The Military Budget

The Military Budget covers the operating and maintenance costs of the international military structure. This includes, for instance, the Military Committee, the International Military Staff, military agencies, the two strategic commands and associated command, control and information systems, research and development agencies and the NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Force. The military budget also covers the operating costs of the command structures for crisis response operations and missions undertaken by NATO.

It is funded primarily by the ministries of defence of each member country, supervised by the Military Budget Committee and implemented by the individual budget holders.

The NATO Security Investment Programme

NATO member countries also contribute to the NATO Security Investment Programme (NSIP). This covers major construction and command and control system investments needed to support the roles of the NATO strategic commands, but which are beyond the national defence requirements of individual member countries. Both the Military Budget and the NSIP, are guided by the “over and above” rule: “Common funding will focus on the provision of requirements which are over and above those which could reasonably be expected to be made available from national resources”. The NSIP includes, for example, requirements for crisis response operations and military installations and capabilities such as communications and information systems, air command and control systems, satellite communications, military headquarters, airfields, fuel pipelines and storage, harbours, and navigational aids.

The NSIP is financed by the ministries of defence of each member country and is supervised by the Infrastructure Committee. Projects are implemented either by individual host countries or by different NATO agencies and strategic commands, according to their area of expertise.

Resource management

Since the mid 1990s, under pressures to optimise the allocation of military common-funded resources, member countries have reinforced NATO’s management structure by promoting the development of capability packages and by establishing the Senior Resource Board (SRB) which has responsibility for overall resource management of NATO’s military resources (i.e. excluding resources covered by the Civil Budget).

The capability packages identify the assets available to and required by NATO military commanders to fulfil specified tasks. They are a prime means of assessing common-funded supplements (in terms of both capital investment and recurrent operating and maintenance costs) as well as the civilian and military manpower required to accomplish the task. These packages are reviewed by the Senior Resource Board composed of national representatives, representatives of the Military Committee and the NATO Strategic Commanders and the Chairmen of the Military Budget, Infrastructure and NATO Defence Manpower Committees. The Board endorses the capability packages from the point of view of their resource implications prior to their approval by the North Atlantic Council or Defence Planning Committee as applicable. It also annually recommends for approval by the North Atlantic Council a comprehensive Medium Term Resource Plan which sets financial ceilings for the following year and planning figures for the four subsequent years.

Within these parameters the Military Budget and Infrastructure and Defence Manpower Committees oversee the preparation and execution of their respective budgets and plans. The Board further produces an Annual Report which allows the North Atlantic Council to monitor the adequacy of resource allocations in relation to requirements and to review the military common-funded resource implications for NATO's common-funded budgets of new Alliance policies.

Financial management

Financial management within NATO is structured to ensure that the ultimate control of expenditure rests with the member countries supporting the cost of a defined activity, and is subject to consensus among them.

Control may be exercised, at all levels of decision-making, either in terms of general limitations (eg., allocation of fixed resources for operating costs), or by specific restrictions (eg., temporary immobilisation of credits or the imposition of specific economy measure). These controls may be stipulated in the terms in which approval of the budget is given or exercised by contributing countries through exceptional interventions in the course of the execution of the budget. The financial managers, such as the Secretary General, NATO Strategic Commanders and Subordinate Commanders and other designated Heads of NATO bodies, have relative discretion to propose and execute their budgets.

No single body exercises direct managerial control over all four of the principal elements of the Organisation's financial structure: the International Staff (financed by the Civil Budget); the international military structure (financed by the Military Budget); the Security Investment Programme; and specialised Production and Logistics Organisations. The latter fall into two groups: those which are financed under arrangements applying to the international military structure; and those which operate under charters granted by the North Atlantic Council, with their own Boards of Directors and finance committees and distinct sources of financing within national treasuries.

Financial management of the organisational budgets

The financial management of the Civil and Military Budgets differ from that of the Security Investment Programme. Financial regulations provide basic unifying principles around which the overall financial structure is articulated. They are approved by the North Atlantic Council, and are complemented by rules and procedures adapting them to specific NATO bodies and programmes.

The budget is annual, coinciding with the calendar year. It is prepared under the authority of the Head of the respective NATO body, reviewed and recommended for approval on the basis of consensus by a finance committee composed of representatives of contributing member countries, and approved for execution by the North Atlantic Council. Failure to achieve consensus before the start of the financial year entails non-approval of the budget and the financing of operations, under the supervision of the finance committee, through provisional allocations limited to the level of the budget approved for the preceding year. This regime may last for six months, after which the Council is required to decide either to approve the budget or to authorise continuation of interim financing.

When the budget has been approved, the Head of the NATO body has discretion to execute it through the commitment and expenditure of funds for the purposes authorised. This discretion is limited by different levels of constraint prescribed by the Financial Regulations regarding such matters as recourse to competitive bidding for contracts for the supply of goods and services, or transfers of credits to correct over or under-estimates of the funding required. Discretionary authority to execute a budget may be further limited by particular obligations to seek prior approval for commitments and expenditure. These may occasionally be imposed by the finance committee in the interests of ensuring strict application of new policies or of monitoring the implementation of complex initiatives such as organisational restructuring.

Financial management of the NATO Security Investment Programme

Implementation of the NATO Security Investment Programme has its starting point in the capability packages. Once these have been approved, authorisation of individual projects can commence under the responsibility of the Infrastructure Committee. The Host Nation (either the country on whose territory the project is to be implemented, a NATO agency or a strategic command) prepares an authorisation request. Once the Committee has agreed to the project, the Host Nation can proceed with its final design, contract award and implementation. Unless otherwise agreed by the Infrastructure Committee, the bidding process is conducted among firms from those countries contributing to the project.

The financial management system which applies to the NSIP is based on an international financial clearing process. Host nations report on the expenditure foreseen on authorised projects within their responsibility. Following agreement of the forecasts by the Infrastructure Committee, the International Staff calculates the amounts to be paid by each country and to be received by each

host nation. Further calculations determine the payment amounts, currencies and which nation or NATO agency will receive the funds – these are computed on a quarterly basis. Once a project has been completed, it is subject to a Joint Final Acceptance Inspection to ensure that the work undertaken is in accordance with the scope of work authorised. As soon as this report is accepted by the Infrastructure Committee, it is added to the NATO inventory.

There are several levels of financial reporting. Twice a year the International Staff prepares for each Host Nation Semi-Annual Financial Reports on projects under implementation. Quarterly, the pre-paysheet and paysheet are published. These reports refer to the transfer of funds between host nations. An NSIP Expenditure Profile is prepared every spring, which covers the NSIP expenditure levels for the next 10 years. The NSIP Financial Statements are prepared in the spring of each year. They portray the financial situation of the NSIP as at 31 December of each year and the summary of activity during the year. These statements serve as the baseline for Infrastructure Committee discussion on the state of the NSIP.

Financial control

With respect to the Military Budget and the Civil Budget, the head of the respective NATO body is ultimately responsible for the correct preparation and execution of the budget, the administrative support for this task is largely entrusted to his Financial Controller. The appointment of this official is the prerogative of the North Atlantic Council, although the latter may delegate this task to the relevant finance committee. Each Financial Controller has final recourse to the finance committee in the case of persistent disagreement with the Head of the respective NATO body regarding an intended transaction. The responsibility for the management of the NSIP finances rests with the Controller for Infrastructure. Through a professional staff, he exercises financial control and implementation oversight.

The Financial Controller is charged with ensuring that all aspects of execution of the budget conform to expenditure authorisations, to any special controls imposed by the finance committee and to the Financial Regulations and their associated implementing rules and procedures. He may also, in response to internal auditing, install such additional controls and procedures as he deems necessary for maintaining accountability.

A major task of the NATO strategic commands' Financial Controllers (i.e., the Financial Controllers of the Supreme Allied Command Europe and the Supreme Allied Command Transformation. See Part III for additional information on these commands) is to ensure that the funds required to finance execution of the budget are periodically called up from contributing member countries

in accordance with their agreed cost shares and in amounts calculated to avoid the accumulation of excessive cash holdings in the international treasury. The outcome of all these activities is reflected in annual financial statements prepared and presented for verification to the International Board of Auditors.

An independent International Board of Auditors for NATO is responsible for auditing the accounts of the different NATO bodies and the efficiency and effectiveness of their operations from a financial perspective as well as for auditing expenditure under the NATO Security Investment Programme. The Board's mandate includes not only financial but performance audits, therefore extending its role beyond safeguarding accountability to the review of management practices in general. The Board is composed of officials normally drawn from the national audit bodies of member countries appointed by Council and responsible for their work only to the Council. The principal task of the Board is to provide the North Atlantic Council and member governments with the assurance that common funds are properly used for the settlement of authorised expenditure and that expenditure is within the physical and financial authorisations granted.

CHAPTER 5

NUCLEAR POLICY

NATO's nuclear strategy and force posture are inseparable elements of the Alliance's overall strategy of war prevention. They fulfil a fundamentally political role in preserving peace and contributing to stability in the Euro-Atlantic region. However, under the momentous security improvements which have been achieved since the end of the Cold War, the Alliance has been able to reduce its reliance on nuclear forces radically. NATO's nuclear powers – France, the United Kingdom and the United States – took unilateral steps to cancel planned modernisation programmes for their nuclear forces. Moreover, the Alliance's strategy, while remaining one of war prevention, is no longer dominated by the possibility of escalation involving nuclear weapons and its nuclear forces no longer target any country. Among the steps taken to adapt to the new security environment, the changes to the nuclear elements of its strategy and force posture were among the first and most incisive measures.

NATO's nuclear forces contribute to European peace and stability by underscoring the irrationality of a major war in the Euro-Atlantic region. They make the risks of aggression against NATO incalculable and unacceptable in a way that conventional forces alone cannot. They also create uncertainty for any country that might contemplate seeking political or military advantage through the threat or use of nuclear, biological or chemical (NBC) weapons against the Alliance. By promoting European stability, helping to discourage threats relating to the use of weapons of mass destruction, and contributing to deterrence against such use, NATO's nuclear posture serves the interests not only of the NATO Allies but also of its Partner countries and of Europe as a whole.

NATO's reduced reliance on nuclear forces has been manifested in major reductions in the forces themselves. In 1991 NATO decided to reduce the number of weapons which had been maintained for its sub-strategic³ forces in Europe by over 85 per cent compared to Cold War levels. In addition to the reductions of sub-strategic forces, the strategic forces available to the NATO Allies have also been dramatically reduced.

3 The terms "strategic" and "sub-strategic" have slightly different meanings in different countries. Strategic nuclear weapons are normally defined as weapons of "intercontinental" range (over 5500 kilometres), but in some contexts these may also include intermediate-range ballistic missiles of lower ranges. The term "sub-strategic" nuclear weapons has been used in NATO documents since 1989 with reference to intermediate and short-range nuclear weapons and now refers primarily to air-delivered weapons for NATO's dual-capable aircraft and to a small number of United Kingdom Trident warheads in a sub-strategic role (other sub-strategic nuclear weapons having been withdrawn from Europe and subsequently eliminated).

The only land-based nuclear weapons which NATO retains in Europe are gravity bombs for dual-capable aircraft. These weapons have also been substantially reduced in number and are stored in a smaller number of locations in highly secure conditions. The readiness levels of dual-capable aircraft associated with them have been progressively reduced, and increased emphasis has been placed on their conventional roles. None of these nuclear weapons are targeted against any country.

The NATO Allies have judged that the Alliance's requirements can be met, for the foreseeable future, by this "sub-strategic" force posture. NATO has also declared that enlarging the Alliance will not require a change in its current nuclear posture. NATO countries have no intention, no plan and no reason to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members, nor any need to change any aspect of NATO's nuclear posture or nuclear policy, and they do not foresee any future need to do so.

The collective security provided by NATO's nuclear posture is shared among all members of the Alliance, providing reassurance to any member that might otherwise feel vulnerable. The presence of US nuclear forces based in Europe and committed to NATO provides an essential political and military link between the European and North American members of the Alliance. At the same time, the participation of non-nuclear countries in the Alliance nuclear posture demonstrates Alliance solidarity, the common commitment of its member countries to maintaining their security and the widespread sharing among them of burdens and risks.

Political oversight of policies dictating NATO's nuclear posture is also shared among member countries. NATO's Nuclear Planning Group provides a forum in which the defence ministers of nuclear and non-nuclear Allies (except France, which does not participate) take part in the development of the Alliance's nuclear policy and in decisions on NATO's nuclear posture.

CHAPTER 6

THE ECONOMIC DIMENSION

The basis for economic cooperation within the Alliance is Article 2 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which states that member countries “will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them”.

NATO’s core business is security and defence, so its work in the economic field is focused on specific economic issues relating to security and defence where it can offer added value. It has a comprehensive approach to security, defined in the 1999 Strategic Concept which, in addition to the indispensable defence dimension of the Alliance, recognises the importance of economic factors as well as political, social and environmental aspects. Accordingly, the Organisation reinforces collaboration between its members whenever economic issues of special interest to the Alliance are involved. This applies particularly to issues which have direct security and defence implications. The Alliance acts as a forum in which different and interrelated aspects of political, military and economic questions can be examined.

The NATO Economic Committee is the only Alliance forum concerned exclusively with consultations on economic developments with a direct bearing on security policy. It meets in different formations and is supported by the Defence and Security Economics Directorate of the Political Affairs and Security Policy Division of NATO’s International Staff.

In the context of the Alliance’s overall security interests and in line with its evolving priorities, the work of the Committee covers a wide range of issues and regularly involves the preparation of analyses and assessments relating to NATO’s political and security agenda. Close cooperation is maintained with a network of experts from capitals, enabling the Directorate to serve as a unique forum for sharing information and expertise on defence and security economic issues related to countries and regions of concern to NATO and to areas where NATO is playing an operational role. The economic and financial dimensions of terrorism have become a firm part of this agenda. Based on contributions provided by member countries, agreed assessments of economic intelligence matters are regularly produced for the benefit of the North Atlantic Council, Allied capitals and military bodies.

The Defence and Security Economics Directorate is also involved in monitoring both general economic and defence economic aspects of the Membership Action Plan (see Part VI) such as the affordability and sustainability of defence spending.

Another significant facet of NATO's economic dimension is its cooperative activities with Partner and other countries with which the Alliance has developed cooperative relations, including security and defence economic work carried out in the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the NATO-Russia Council, the NATO-Ukraine Commission, and NATO's relations with South East Europe Initiative, Mediterranean Dialogue and Istanbul Cooperation Initiative countries (see Part VII). This includes economic aspects of defence budgeting and resource management in defence spending, defence conversion matters (for example relating to retraining of military personnel and conversion of military sites and defence industries), economic aspects of the international fight against terrorism and other relevant economic security issues.

Cooperation in the context of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council takes place through conferences, workshops and experts meetings. Joint cooperation schemes have also been developed in association with external institutions such as the George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies. These mechanisms have enabled the experience of NATO countries to be made available to Partner countries in a number of fields, recent examples of which have included economic dimensions of defence institution-building, economic and financial aspects of terrorism, economic aspects of security and defence in the Southern Caucasus, and new techniques for managing defence resources in Allied and Partner countries. The Directorate also monitors defence and security economic issues included in Individual Partnership Action Plans.

Cooperation with Russia in the framework of the NATO-Russia Council's Ad Hoc Working Group on Defence Reform is focused in the first instance on expert-level exchanges on a wide spectrum of topics ranging from macro-economic, financial, budgetary and social aspects of defence reform to the restructuring of defence industries. Secondly, a Memorandum of Agreement was signed with the Russian Ministry of Defence in June 2001 on the opening of a NATO-Russia Information, Consultation and Training Centre for the resettlement of military personnel due for discharge or discharged from the Russian Federation armed forces. This Centre, which operates in the six Russian military districts, is financially supported by NATO and organises training courses, "train the trainer" courses and meetings of experts on current topics. The Centre also runs a comprehensive website including a wide range of practical information for released military personnel. The Centre's work is a very concrete and practical example of cooperation between NATO and the Russian Ministry of Defence.

Specific activities in the area of economic cooperation are also conducted within the framework of the NATO-Ukraine Annual Target Plans. They include meetings of the Joint Working Group on Economic Security, courses on

economic aspects of the defence budgetary process, exchanges on the restructuring of defence industries and social issues relating to defence reform. There are also regular consultations on general economic policy and on structural and macro-economic trends in Ukraine. Since 1999, NATO has financed retraining courses in various cities of Ukraine, which have facilitated training in foreign languages and in management techniques for some one hundred former Ukrainian military officers each year. This programme has produced tangible benefits, greatly facilitating the reintegration process for released military personnel.

Comprehensive programmes on the retraining of released military personnel and military base conversion in southeastern Europe are also monitored by the Defence and Security Economics Directorate. NATO has taken the lead on these issues in the framework of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe. Through teams of experts from Allied and Partner countries led by the Directorate, NATO has provided advice to a series of countries for the development of appropriate reconversion programmes adapted to their needs. The teams make available expertise, technical assistance and recommendations, based on general experience and taking into account the specific situation facing the countries concerned. NATO's work in this field contributes substantively to the difficult process of defence reform and conversion in the region. Defence conversion schemes worked out with NATO's assistance have demonstrated their worth as blueprints for project implementation.

PART III

NATO'S CIVILIAN AND MILITARY STRUCTURES

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| CHAPTER 7 | Civilian organisation and structures |
| CHAPTER 8 | The International Staff's key functions |
| CHAPTER 9 | Military organisation and structures |
| CHAPTER 10 | The International Military Staff's key functions |
| CHAPTER 11 | Specialised organisations and agencies |
| CHAPTER 12 | Key to the principal NATO committees and policy bodies |

CHAPTER 7

CIVILIAN ORGANISATION AND STRUCTURES¹

NATO Headquarters, in Brussels, Belgium, is the political headquarters of the Alliance. It is home to national delegations of member countries and to liaison offices or diplomatic missions of Partner countries. The work of these delegations and missions is supported by the International Staff and the International Military Staff, which are also located within NATO Headquarters.

When the decisions taken by member countries have military implications, NATO has the military infrastructure and know-how in place to respond to demands. The Military Committee recommends measures considered necessary for the common defence of the Euro-Atlantic area and provides guidance to NATO's two strategic commanders (the Supreme Allied Commander Operations based in Mons, Belgium, and the Supreme Allied Commander Transformation in Norfolk, Virginia, United States). The Military Committee, located at NATO Headquarters, is supported by the International Military Staff, which plays a similar role to that of the International Staff for the North Atlantic Council.

There are approximately 4200 people working at NATO Headquarters on a full-time basis. Of these, some 2100 are members of the national delegations of member countries and staffs of national military representatives to NATO. There are approximately 1200 civilian members of the International Staff (including agencies and other NATO bodies) and just over 500 members of the International Military Staff. There are also just under 400 members of Partner missions to NATO. Civilian staff employed by NATO worldwide, including the staff of NATO agencies located outside Brussels and civilians serving on the staff of the military commands throughout NATO, number approximately 5200.

National delegations

The national delegation of each member country has the status of an embassy and is headed by an ambassador (also referred to as a permanent representative), who acts on instructions from his/her capital and who reports back to the national authorities. The staff of the delegation comprises civil

¹ The following chapters describe the civil and military organisation of NATO, as well as the principal structures. Due to ongoing reforms of the International Staff and the International Military Staff, more detailed and up-to-date information, including organigrams, can be found on the NATO website (www.nato.int).

servants from the ministries of foreign affairs and other relevant ministries seconded to NATO to represent their respective countries.

The liaison offices of Partner countries are diplomatic missions headed by an ambassador or a head of mission who is responsible for communications between the national capital and NATO.

The Secretary General

The Secretary General has three main roles: first and foremost, he is the chairman of the North Atlantic Council, the Defence Planning Committee and the Nuclear Planning Group as well as the chairman of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the NATO-Russia Council, the NATO-Ukraine Commission and the Mediterranean Cooperation Group. Secondly, he is the principal spokesman of the Alliance and represents the Alliance in public on behalf of the member countries, reflecting their common positions on political issues. Thirdly, he is the senior executive officer of the NATO International Staff, responsible for making appointments to the staff and overseeing its work.

The Secretary General is nominated by member governments for an initial period of four years. Usually an international statesman with ministerial experience in the government of one of the member countries, he acts as a decision facilitator, leading and guiding the process of consensus-building and decision-making throughout the Alliance. He may propose items for discussion and has the authority to use his good offices in cases of dispute between member countries.

His role allows him to exert considerable influence on the decision-making process while respecting the fundamental principle that the authority for taking decisions is invested only in the member governments themselves. His influence is therefore exercised principally by encouraging and stimulating the member governments to take initiatives and, where necessary, to reconcile their positions in the interests of the Alliance as a whole.

As the Organisation's senior representative, the Secretary General speaks on its behalf not only in public but also in its external relations with other organisations, with non-member country governments and with the international media.

The Secretary General is assisted by a Deputy Secretary General who replaces the Secretary General in his absence. The Deputy Secretary General is the chairman of a number of senior committees, *ad hoc* groups and working groups.

The International Staff

The International Staff is an advisory and administrative body that supports the work of the national delegations at NATO Headquarters at different committee levels. It follows up on the decisions of NATO committees and supports the process of consensus-building and decision-making. It is made up of personnel from the member countries of the Alliance recruited directly by NATO or seconded by their governments.

CHAPTER 8

THE INTERNATIONAL STAFF'S KEY FUNCTIONS

In view of the changing security environment, NATO leaders are constantly reviewing the structure of the Organisation's International Staff in order to reflect the Alliance's new missions and priorities. As a consequence, restructuring has become a permanent feature of the Organisation.

That explains why this handbook offers explanations on the functions that need to be fulfilled by the International Staff, as opposed to a detailed description of the responsibilities of the various structures, divisions and independent offices which constitute the International Staff. Updated organigrammes and explanations can be found on the NATO website, together with updated versions of the structure of the International Military Staff and the military command structures.

Firstly, it is important to underline that the primary role of the International Staff is to provide advice, guidance and administrative support to the national delegations at NATO Headquarters. Secondly, from a purely organisational point of view, it must be noted that all divisions are headed by an Assistant Secretary General, who is supported by one or two Deputy Assistant Secretary Generals, and the independent offices are headed by directors.

The Secretary General, who heads the International Staff (IS) but is also from an administrative point of view a member of the IS, has a Private Office that includes a director and staff, the Deputy Secretary General, the Office of the Legal Adviser and a Policy Planning Unit.

Providing political advice and policy guidance

The political aspects of NATO's fundamental security tasks need to be managed on a daily basis. They embrace a wide range of issues at the top of the Alliance's political agenda, which include regional, economic and security affairs, relations with other international organisations and relations with Partner countries.

A number of high-level bodies need to be informed on these political matters and advised on current and future policy issues. The North Atlantic Council, for instance, and other NATO committees can request information, while other sections of the International Staff and the International Military Staff need to be advised on current and future policy issues. The Secretary General also requests input relevant to NATO's political agenda such as

background notes, up-to-date reports, and speeches. In addition, for meetings involving NATO and Partner countries, as well as for the political contacts with the respective national authorities, political preparation is also necessary to support the political consultation process. This is also provided by the staff responsible for political matters.

In sum, the aim is to provide political guidance for the implementation of the policy areas listed above. In relation to the enlargement process, for instance, advice, support and assistance to member countries, invited countries and relevant NATO bodies in handling the process of accession of new member countries is provided. The same applies, for instance, to the continuity of the Membership Action Plan, the development of the NATO-EU strategic partnership and the expansion of cooperation with Partner countries. Other matters addressed include the provision of political country area expertise and support for operational matters in the crisis management field; the coordination of political and economic aspects of cooperation in relation to NATO's role in the fight against terrorism; and the coordination of political aspects involved in the enhancement of the readiness and effectiveness of Allied forces for operations aimed at responding to the use of weapons of mass destruction. Contributions are also made to the public relations activities of the Alliance designed to inform external audiences in member and Partner countries as well as elsewhere about NATO's tasks, policies and objectives.

Developing and implementing the defence policy and planning dimension

Developing and implementing the defence policy aspects of NATO's fundamental security tasks includes defence planning, nuclear policy and defence against weapons of mass destruction. The defence dimension also comprises operational issues, but these are explained in the following sub-heading for greater clarity.

Just as the Secretary General, member countries and Partner countries need political advice, they also need support in developing and implementing the defence policy and planning dimension of Alliance and partnership activities. This includes the Alliance's response to terrorism; the defence perspective of NATO's cooperation with the European Union (including the Berlin Plus arrangements), the United Nations and other international organisations; and politico-military aspects of NATO's transformation agenda and capabilities initiatives, including NATO's command structure and force structure (and in particular the implementation of the NATO Response Force), the Prague Capabilities Commitment and policy guidance for capabilities development. It also comprises support on the Planning and Review Process for Partner

countries, as well as other defence aspects of cooperation with countries within the Partnership for Peace, the Mediterranean Dialogue and other countries as required.

The development and implementation of logistics policy and planning initiatives within NATO and between NATO Headquarters, external NATO bodies, NATO's Strategic Commands and the member countries also comes under defence policy and planning, as well as the review of NATO's nuclear policy guidance and force posture, promoting public understanding of the nuclear elements of NATO strategy, and the training and exercising of nuclear consultation procedures.

In addition, the Weapons of Mass Destruction Centre (WMDC), located at NATO Headquarters, is responsible for supporting the sharing of information and intelligence in this field.

Managing NATO's operational commitments and crisis response capabilities

Overseeing the operational capability required to meet NATO's deterrence, defence and crisis management tasks is essential for the success of NATO missions. Responsibilities include NATO's crisis management and peacekeeping activities and civil emergency planning and exercises, which encompass NATO's operational commitments.

The International Staff supports and advises the senior committees involved in the above areas and prepares and follows up their discussions and decisions. This includes the Policy Coordination Group, the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee, and the Council Operations and Exercises Committee. It also contributes to the implementation of the NATO-Russia Work Programme, the NATO-Ukraine Action Plan and the Mediterranean Dialogue Work Programme in each of these specific areas of responsibility.

The information and communications processes and technological aspects of crisis management mechanisms, joint exercises and civil emergency planning are also managed in liaison with other NATO bodies and other international organisations.

In the operations sphere, there are Operational Task Forces to oversee the role of NATO-led forces in different crisis areas. Direction is provided for the future elaboration of the Alliance's crisis management procedures and arrangements, and the Situation Centre ensures continuous and secure links between NATO Headquarters and NATO capitals, Strategic Commands, other military structures and other organisations.

In the civil emergency planning field, the International Staff supports the work of specialised civil emergency planning boards and committees responsible for drawing up arrangements relating to the use of civil resources in support of NATO operations and the protection of the civilian population. It also maintains contacts and consultation with the United Nations, the World Health Organisation, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, as well as the appropriate bodies in the framework of joint NATO-EU activities relating to civil emergencies.

The Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) coordinates disaster assistance for EAPC countries and is responsible for maintaining and updating EADRCC organisation and procedures for responding to emergencies.

Developing assets and capabilities

Another area of responsibility of the International Staff is the development of and investment in assets and capabilities aimed at enhancing the Alliance's defence capacity, including armaments planning, air defence and security investment.

Policy, technical, financial and procedural expertise relating to armaments, air defence, airspace management and security investment is provided, and work is undertaken for the development of military capabilities and overseeing investment in NATO common-funded assets to ensure that forces assigned to the Alliance are properly equipped, interoperable and able to undertake the full range of military missions. Work is also conducted in developing cooperation with partner countries in the context of the Partnership for Peace, the Mediterranean Dialogue and the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, as well as the special relationships with Russia and Ukraine.

The work is divided into three main areas: armaments, air defence and airspace management, and security investment. Armaments provides support for the work of the Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD) and its subordinate structures, focusing on the collaborative development and acquisition of military equipment. It comprises, for instance, units for land, air and naval armaments, as well as a dedicated Counter-Terrorism Technology Unit.

In the area of air defence and airspace management, policy and technical expertise is provided, as is support for two senior NATO committees: the NATO Air Defence Committee, which harmonises national air defence policies and programmes, and the NATO Air Traffic Management Committee, which develops harmonised civil-military policy guidance and requirements on the use of airspace in support of Alliance tasks and missions.

With regard to security investment, the key objective is to ensure the timely provision of common-funded capital investments in support of NATO's operational requirements. Funding for these capabilities is provided through the NATO Security Investment Programme (NSIP). Support is also given to the following committees: the Senior Resource Board (SRB), Military Budget Committee, the Infrastructure Committee, the NATO Consultation, Command and Control (C3) Board, and the Missile Defence Project Group.

The area of assets and capabilities also encompasses the International Staff support element for the NATO Headquarters Consultation, Command and Control Staff (NHQC3S), the Office of the Chairman of the Senior Resource Board and a Resource Policy Coordination Section.

Communicating with the wider public

The Organisation has an obligation to inform the wider public in member and Partner countries about NATO's activities and policies. It does this through a variety of communication activities including contacts with the media, the NATO website, print and electronic publications, and seminars and conferences.

These efforts contribute to raising public awareness and knowledge of the issues with which NATO is concerned, and help to promote constructive debate about NATO policies and objectives.

The staff working in press and public relations constitute one of NATO's principal public interfaces with external audiences worldwide. They provide support for the NATO Secretary General in his role as principal spokesman for the Alliance and arrange briefings and interviews with journalists, press conferences, press tours, media monitoring, audio-visual media support and exhibits. Cooperation programmes in NATO member and Partner countries are organised and visits, seminars and conferences involving opinion leaders, parliamentarians, civic society groupings and experts in different fields are held in different countries. Grants and other forms of support for special projects are made available, and print and electronic publications are distributed on request. Publications work in print and electronic formats covers a broad range of NATO-related topics, is often produced in a variety of NATO and Partner country languages, and is disseminated worldwide.

NATO's website provides access to up-to-date information on NATO policies and activities including public statements, background information, and official documents, as well as video interviews, audio files, real-time coverage of major NATO-related events and the resources of the NATO media library.

Staff also work closely with the Public Information Adviser to the Chairman of the Military Committee and assist in coordinating public diplomacy activities

in other parts of the International Staff and entities within the NATO structure. Public relation's activities are described in more detail in Part X.

Cooperating with the science community

Since the attacks on the United States of 11 September 2001 and the increased focus of NATO policies on new challenges and threats, including terrorism, NATO's science programme has directed increasing support to collaborative research projects related to defence against terrorism and other threats to security. The programme serves to strengthen cooperation between NATO and Partner countries through different forms of support mechanisms including collaborative grants in priority areas, currently defined as defence against terrorism, countering other threats to security, and Partner-country priorities. Collaboration is between research scientists in NATO member countries and those in eligible Partner or Mediterranean Dialogue countries. Computer networking support for Partner countries, particularly in Central Asia and the Caucasus, is also an important element of the activities undertaken by the programme.

The programme also deals with two other research areas: human and societal dynamics and security-related civil science. Studies and workshops are organised, bringing together experts from different government agencies in NATO member countries, Partner countries and Mediterranean Dialogue countries in order to concentrate inter-governmental action on pressing areas of environmental security. These areas include the environmental impact of military activities, regional studies including cross-border activities, the prevention of conflicts arising in relation to scarcity of resources, emerging risks to the environment and society with the potential to cause economic cultural or political instability, and non-traditional threats to security. Examples of areas of study in the latter sphere include food chain security, risk response strategies and security of waterways, ports and harbours.

Managing staff, finances and security standards

The effective management of the International Staff and the actual running of the Headquarters require support and conference services, information, human and financial management, as well as the support of security services.

One of the main functions is to handle all human resources management and development matters for the International Staff including administration, recruitment, contracts, training and development, performance management, personnel support, health and social matters, civilian personnel policies and compensation and benefits. An underlying principle applied throughout is the improvement of the gender balance and diversity of the staff working at NATO Headquarters.

It is also the responsibility of the International Staff working in Headquarters management to oversee the NATO Staff Centre, which comprises catering, sport and recreational facilities, and to stay in regular contact with NATO Staff Association representatives. The support services provided by Headquarters management include conference services (interpretation and translation), and an information and systems management service. These support services also include building services and teams responsible for the interior and exterior utilities, maintenance and transport.

NATO's civil budget is operated on an objective-based budgeting (OBB) system. In conjunction with the Civil Budget Committee, staff are responsible for managing the annual budget preparation and approval cycle based on political guidance issued by the North Atlantic Council. They also monitor and manage the procurement cycle from contracting and purchasing to reception, inventories and distribution.

The Financial Controller is appointed by the North Atlantic Council and is responsible for the call-up of funds from the member countries and for the control of expenditures in accordance with NATO's financial regulations, within the framework of relevant budgets, namely the civil budget, the budget for the new NATO headquarters and the pension budget. Audits of the management process are carried out in order to identify the principal management risks and keep them under control.

There is an independent International Board of Auditors for NATO, composed of government officials from the auditing bodies of member countries appointed by and responsible to the North Atlantic Council for auditing the financial accounts of the various NATO bodies under their respective budgets. Its principal task is to provide the Council and member governments with the assurance that common funds are properly used for the settlement of authorised expenditure and that expenditure is within the physical and financial authorisations granted.

Organisational, procedural and administrative support is also provided to all official meetings at ambassadorial, ministerial and summit level, and to special events at NATO Headquarters and abroad. The same staff works closely with the Private Office of the Secretary General, who has overall responsibility for the running of the Organisation.

In addition, there is an independent office in the International Staff that is responsible for ensuring the coordination and implementation of security standards throughout NATO. It carries out periodic surveys of security systems and is responsible for security at NATO Headquarters in Brussels. Moreover, it is responsible for the overall coordination of security for NATO among member countries, Partner countries and Mediterranean Dialogue countries and NATO

civil and military bodies, for the correct implementation of NATO security policy throughout the Alliance, and for the evaluation and implementation of counter-measures against terrorist and intelligence threats.

The office has three main functions: policy oversight, security intelligence and protective security.

With regard to policy oversight, inspections and surveys mandated by the North Atlantic Council in NATO member countries, NATO civil and military bodies and in Partner and Mediterranean Dialogue countries are carried out, and the proper protection of NATO information is certified. Security policy, directives, guidance and supporting documents are developed and revised for consideration by the NATO Security Committee and, where required, by the North Atlantic Council. Security agreements with non-NATO countries and international organisations receiving NATO classified material in support of cooperation activities approved by the North Atlantic Council are negotiated. Moreover, security accreditation of communication and information systems in NATO civil bodies is undertaken and advice given on information security aspects related to NATO multinational communication and information systems. The application of security risk management procedures also needs to be ensured in NATO civil bodies, as does the coordination of the NATO elements of an associated security risk assessment methodology.

Security intelligence deals with counter-intelligence policy and oversight throughout NATO, providing threat-related information to the North Atlantic Council and the other principal decision-making bodies in NATO as well as to the NATO Military Committee, through a Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit. Staff working in this area coordinate the work of and provide the secretariat for the NATO Special Committee. They also support and, in limited cases, conduct special inquiries and espionage investigations, manage all matters relating to personnel security at NATO Headquarters and in NATO civil and military bodies, and manage the Secretary General's Close Protection Unit.

Protective security encompasses a number of elements: coordinating protective security programmes and operations, including physical, personnel and information security measures at NATO Headquarters, providing advice on protective security measures for the new NATO headquarters buildings, coordinating the security aspects of NATO ministerial and other high-level meetings at NATO Headquarters and in NATO member and Partner countries, and under NATO's Cyber Defence Programme, managing and operating the NATO Computer Incident Response Capability Coordination Centre (NCIRC CC), responsible for the coordination throughout NATO of information security awareness and responses to computer security incidents such as computer virus outbreaks and network attacks.

CHAPTER 9

MILITARY ORGANISATION AND STRUCTURES

Earlier chapters have described the NATO Headquarters in Brussels, which is the political headquarters of the Alliance where the permanent representatives, at ambassadorial level, meet in the North Atlantic Council under the chairmanship of the Secretary General to discuss and approve NATO policy. This chapter describes the military components of the Organisation, which are the Military Committee (NATO's senior military authority), the two Strategic Commanders and the military command structure. The work of the Military Committee is supported by the International Military Staff, as explained in the following chapter.

The Military Committee

The Military Committee (MC) is the senior military authority in NATO under the overall political authority of the North Atlantic Council and, as appropriate, of the Defence Planning Committee and the Nuclear Planning Group. It meets under the chairmanship of an elected chairman (CMC) and is the primary source of military advice to the North Atlantic Council, Defence Planning Committee and Nuclear Planning Group. Its members are senior military officers who serve as national military representatives (MILREPs) in permanent session, representing their chiefs of defence (CHODs). A civilian official represents Iceland, which has no military forces. The Military Committee also meets regularly at a higher level, namely at the level of chiefs of defence, when the two NATO Strategic Commanders are invited to attend.

On a day-to-day basis, the military representatives work in a national capacity, representing the best interests of their countries while remaining open to negotiation and discussion so that consensus can be reached. This often involves reaching agreement on acceptable compromises, when this is in the interests of the Alliance as a whole and serves to advance its overall objectives and policy goals. The military representatives therefore have adequate authority to enable the Military Committee to discharge its collective tasks and to reach prompt decisions.

The Committee is responsible for recommending to NATO's political authorities those measures considered necessary for the common defence of the NATO area and for the implementation of operational decisions taken by the North Atlantic Council. Its principal role is to provide direction and advice on military policy and strategy. It provides guidance on military matters to the

NATO Strategic Commanders, whose representatives attend its meetings, and is responsible for the overall conduct of the military affairs of the Alliance under the authority of the Council, as well as for the efficient operation of Military Committee agencies.

The Committee assists in developing overall strategic concepts for the Alliance and prepares an annual long-term assessment of the strength and capabilities of countries and areas posing a risk to NATO's interests. In times of crisis, tension or war, and in relation to military operations undertaken by the Alliance (such as those in Kosovo and Afghanistan), its role is to advise the Council or the Defence Planning Committee of the military situation and its implications, and to make recommendations on the use of military force, the implementation of contingency plans and the development of appropriate rules of engagement.

The Military Committee normally meets every Thursday, following the regular Wednesday meeting of the Council, so that it can follow up promptly on Council decisions. In practice, meetings are convened whenever necessary, and both the Council and the Military Committee normally meet much more often. As a result of the Alliance's role in Kosovo and Afghanistan and its supporting role in relation to Iraq and Sudan, there is a heightened need for the Council and Military Committee to meet more frequently to discuss operational matters. Indeed, as a result of the internal and external transformation of Alliance structures, the intensification of partnership and cooperation with other countries, the creation of new institutions to oversee these developments, and in particular the emergence of new threats and the development of the Alliance's role in combating terrorism, the frequency of meetings of all the decision-making bodies of the Alliance has greatly increased in recent years.

The Military Committee in Chiefs of Staff Session normally meets three times a year. Two of these Military Committee meetings are held in Brussels and one is hosted by NATO member countries, on a rotational basis.

In the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) and Partnership for Peace (PfP), the Military Committee meets regularly with EAPC/PfP countries at the level of national military representatives (once a month) and at the level of chiefs of defence (twice a year) to discuss military cooperation issues. The Military Committee also meets in different formats in the framework of the NATO-Russia Council and the NATO-Ukraine Commission.

Since January 2001, the Military Committee of NATO has met regularly with the Military Committee of the European Union on issues of common interest relating to security, defence and crisis management. The first meeting of the Military Committee in Chiefs of Staff session with the participation of the chiefs of defence of the Mediterranean Dialogue countries was held in November 2004.

The Chairman of the Military Committee

The Chairman of the Military Committee is nominated by the chiefs of defence and appointed for a three-year term of office. He acts in an international capacity and his authority stems from the Military Committee, to which he is responsible in the performance of his duties. He normally chairs all meetings of the Military Committee. In his absence, the Deputy Chairman of the Military Committee (DCMC) takes the chair.

The Chairman of the Military Committee is both its spokesman and representative. He directs its day-to-day business and acts on behalf of the Committee in issuing the necessary directives and guidance to the Director of the International Military Staff. He represents the Military Committee at high-level meetings, such as those of the North Atlantic Council, the Defence Planning Committee and the Nuclear Planning Group, providing advice on military matters when required.

By virtue of his appointment, the Chairman of the Committee also has an important public role and is the senior military spokesman for the Alliance in contacts with the press and media. He undertakes official visits and representational duties on behalf of the Committee, both in NATO countries and in countries with which NATO is developing closer contacts in the framework of the Partnership for Peace programme, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the NATO-Russia Council, the NATO-Ukraine Commission, and the Mediterranean Dialogue. The Chairman is also the ex-officio chairman of the NATO Defense College Academic Advisory Board. The role of the Defense College is described in Part X.

NATO's Strategic Commanders

The Strategic Commanders – the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) and the Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT) – are responsible to the Military Committee for the overall direction and conduct of all Alliance military matters within their areas of responsibility. They also provide advice to the Military Committee on their command responsibilities. They normally attend the Military Committee meeting in Chiefs of Staff Session but may be called upon to brief the Military Committee in Permanent Session when required. For day-to-day business, each has a representative at NATO Headquarters of general or flag officer rank who assists them by maintaining close links with both the political and military staffs within the Headquarters and ensuring that the flow of information and communications in both directions works efficiently. These representatives attend meetings of the Military Committee in Permanent Session and provide advice on Military Committee business relating to their respective Commands.

The Military Command Structure

The Military Command Structure of NATO, as distinct from the NATO Force Structure, is the mechanism which enables NATO's military authorities to command and control the forces assigned to them for joint operations involving more than one service branch – army, navy, air force. It is based on a hierarchical structure of Strategic Commands and Subordinate Commands.

The NATO Force Structure consists of the organisational arrangements that bring together the forces placed at the Alliance's disposal by the member nations, temporarily or permanently, along with their associated command and control structures, either as part of NATO's multinational forces or as additional national contributions to NATO. These forces are available for NATO operations in accordance with predetermined readiness criteria.

Changes to the NATO Force Structure introduced over recent years have placed the emphasis on smaller, more mobile forces that can be used flexibly for a range of military tasks, as opposed to the large, heavily armed concentrations of forces in permanent fixed headquarters that were a feature of Cold War force structures. While the latter were equipped and trained for major defence operations against an invading army, the majority of forces that comprise NATO's present-day force structure are designed to be moved rapidly to the area of crisis or conflict where they are required and to have the capability to fulfil their role away from their home bases.

The above changes to the force structure have brought about a parallel need for changes to the NATO Command Structure. These have concentrated on reductions in the number of commands within the structure and on rationalisation of the system of command and control linking the different elements which together make up NATO's military capabilities. These changes are designed to permit NATO's Strategic Commanders to exercise more effective command and control of the forces assigned to them, drawing on the full range of military capabilities needed to undertake the kind of operations that may be assigned to them in today's vastly different security environment.

The present-day NATO Command Structure reflects changing strategic circumstances attributable to a number of factors including the accession of new member countries, NATO's evolving strategic partnership with the European Union, its cooperation with Partner countries and relations with other non-NATO countries, new security challenges including the evolving threat of terrorism, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The command structure is designed to cope with the likely tasks, risks and potential threats facing the Alliance across the board and to meet them when and where it may be required by the North Atlantic Council to do so.

At the centre of the command structure are two strategic commands. Of these, one is focused on planning and executing all the operations that the North Atlantic Council has agreed to undertake. The other is concerned with the transformation of NATO's military capabilities to meet changing requirements and enable the military forces made available to the Alliance to carry out the full range of military tasks entrusted to them. The transformation process is a continuous one. It calls for the proactive development and integration of innovative concepts, doctrines and capabilities designed to improve the effectiveness and interoperability of the forces that NATO and Partner countries may make available for NATO-led military operations.

There are also a number of subordinate military headquarters and other components of the command structure located in different NATO member countries.

With the separation of strategic command responsibilities along operational and functional lines, all the operational responsibilities formerly shared by Allied Command Europe and Allied Command Atlantic are now vested in a single European-based Strategic Command called Allied Command Operations (ACO), in Mons, Belgium, under the responsibility of the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR). The appointed officer is "dual-hatted" and serves simultaneously as the Commander of the United States European Command.

In a similar manner, the second strategic-level command, known as Allied Command Transformation (ACT), is based in the United States and comes under the responsibility of the Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT), who serves simultaneously as the Commander of the United States Joint Forces Command. This helps to maintain a strong transatlantic link and at the same time ensures access for NATO's forces to the transformational process being undertaken by the United States in relation to its national military forces.

Both NATO's Strategic Commanders carry out roles and missions assigned to them by the North Atlantic Council or in some circumstances by NATO's Defence Planning Committee, under the direction of the Military Committee. Their responsibilities and tasks are based on the objectives outlined in the Alliance's Strategic Concept and in relevant Military Committee documents. In broad terms they are as follows:

The Supreme Allied Commander, Europe (SACEUR)

The Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) for Allied Command Operations (ACO) is task with contributing to the peace, security and territorial integrity of Alliance member countries by assessing risks and threats, conducting military planning, and identifying and requesting the forces needed to undertake the full range of Alliance missions, as and when agreed upon by the North Atlantic Council and wherever they might be required.

SACEUR contributes to the Alliance's crisis management arrangements and provides for the effective defence of the territory of NATO countries and of their forces. If aggression occurs, or if the North Atlantic Council believes that aggression is imminent, SACEUR executes all the military measures within the authority and capabilities of his Command needed to demonstrate Allied solidarity and preparedness to maintain the integrity of Alliance territory, to safeguard the freedom of the seas and lines of communication and trade, and to preserve the security of NATO member countries or restore it if it has been infringed.

Allied Command Operations also contributes to the process of ensuring that the forces that make up the NATO Force Structure are provided both now and in the future with effective combined or joint military headquarters able to call on the military capabilities needed to perform their tasks. It does so in consultation with Allied Command Transformation by synchronising operational activities and elements of the command structure that have an operational role in the Alliance's transformation efforts.

Other tasks that come under the responsibility of the Supreme Allied Commander Europe include:

- contributing to stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area by developing and participating in military-to-military contacts and other cooperation activities and exercises undertaken in the framework of the Partnership for Peace (PfP) and of activities undertaken to enhance NATO's relationships with Russia, Ukraine and Mediterranean Dialogue countries;
- conducting analysis at the strategic level to identify capability shortfalls and to assign priorities to them;
- managing the resources allocated by NATO for operations and exercises, and accomplishing the operational missions and tasks assigned by the North Atlantic Council; and
- in conjunction with Allied Command Transformation, developing and conducting training programmes and exercises in combined and joint procedures for the military headquarters and forces of NATO and Partner countries.

The Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT)

Allied Command Transformation (ACT) comes under the authority of the Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT), whose responsibilities can be summarised as follows:

- contributing to the preservation of peace and security and of the territorial integrity of Alliance member countries by assuming the lead role at the strategic command level in the transformation of NATO's military structures, forces, capabilities and doctrines in order to improve the military effectiveness of the Alliance;
- conducting operational analysis at the strategic level, in cooperation with ACO, in order to identify and prioritise the type and scale of future capability and interoperability requirements and to channel the results into NATO's overall defence planning process;
- integrating and synchronising NATO's transformation efforts, in cooperation with ACO, with the operational activities and other elements of the command structure in order to contribute to the process of ensuring that NATO forces are provided both now and in the future with effective combined or joint military headquarters able to call on the military capabilities needed to perform their tasks;
- exploring concepts and promoting doctrine development,
- conducting experiments and supporting the research and acquisition processes involved in the development of new technologies; in fulfilling this function, interacting with appropriate NATO agencies and project management boards in order to identify opportunities for improved interoperability and standardisation and to deliver qualitatively transformed capabilities for the benefit of the Alliance;
- managing commonly funded resources allocated for NATO's transformation programmes in order to provide timely, cost-effective solutions for operational requirements;
- conducting training and education programmes in order to provide the Alliance with leaders, specialists and headquarters staffs trained to common NATO standards and capable of operating effectively in a combined and joint force military environment;
- establishing and maintaining procedures designed to ensure the continuous adaptation of the organisations, concepts, resources and education programmes required to promote NATO's transformation efforts;
- supporting the exercise requirements of Allied Command Operations throughout their planning, execution and assessment phases.

Shared roles and responsibilities

While the new command structure provides for close cooperation between the two strategic commands, there is a clear division of their respective responsibilities in order to avoid unnecessary overlap and duplication of effort. Each command therefore has well-identified lead and supporting roles. In specific areas where a strategic command has the lead role, it is responsible for providing the formal input to the Military Committee but receives assistance from the other strategic command as required. Conversely, where the strategic command is in the supporting role, it is responsible for channelling command-level and staff-level advice to the strategic command in the leading role.

While both strategic commands have responsibilities in NATO's defence planning process, for the purposes of ensuring a streamlined and coherent process, the lead role is undertaken by Allied Command Transformation for military aspects such as reviewing defence requirements, force planning, armaments and logistics planning, and command and control planning, as well as for the Partnership for Peace (PfP) Planning and Review Process. Allied Command Operations has the lead on military aspects of civil emergency planning and nuclear planning and for suitability and risk assessments in force planning.

Command and control of forces, including operational planning, is the preserve of SACEUR. Where joint and combined concepts and doctrine are concerned, on the other hand, including PfP military concepts, the responsibility lies with SACT, drawing on lessons learned from operations and exercises as a basis for introducing changes relating to concepts, doctrine and capabilities. These then form the basis of strategic directives and procedures for operations developed by Allied Command Operations.

Each of the strategic commands has individual management structures and budgets and individual responsibilities relating to them, including strategic management, financial planning and resource management.

The management of capability packages is another responsibility shared by both Strategic Commands. SACT focuses on the development of capabilities to improve joint and combined effectiveness for the full range of Alliance missions. SACEUR is responsible for the development of capabilities required for the conduct of operations.

In the intelligence field, Allied Command Operations provides intelligence support for operational planning and operations, while Allied Command Transformation concentrates on the long-term analysis of trends and development of intelligence concepts and capabilities. Similarly, in the sphere of communications and information systems, the division of responsibility enables ACO to focus on operational planning and identifying shortfalls, while ACT concentrates on future concepts, capabilities and structures.

With regard to exercises, training, evaluation and experimentation, SACT has the leading role for NATO and PfP joint individual education and training and associated policy. The design, conduct and assessment of experiments to assist in the development and testing of emerging concepts, doctrine and technology form part of this task. Close coordination with SACEUR and the member countries takes place with regard to scheduling and access to forces for training, exercises and experimentation undertaken for the purposes of fulfilling transformation objectives.

NATO and PfP collective training of assigned forces and subordinate elements of the operational command structure are the responsibility of SACEUR supported by ACT, which provides exercise design, planning and evaluation assistance.

Allied Command Transformation has the leading role in scientific research and development, although Allied Command Operations conducts its own operational analysis and provides technical support for the command structure and for operations.

The operational structure

All NATO operations draw on deployable or static elements and capabilities available to the integrated command structure and force structure, tailored to the requirements and challenges of the specific operation. This applies whether they are operations undertaken by the Alliance in response to a threat to one or more of the member countries in accordance with Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty (known as Article 5 operations), or peace support or other military operations decided upon by the North Atlantic Council (non-Article 5 operations).

The command and control structure functions at three levels, namely the strategic, operational and component levels.

At the strategic level, Allied Joint Forces are employed within a political-military framework endorsed by the Military Committee and approved by the North Atlantic Council, designed to fulfil the strategic objectives of the Alliance. Overall command of any operation, at the strategic level, is assumed by SACEUR, who exercises this responsibility from the headquarters of Allied Command Operations at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE) in Mons, Belgium. SACEUR is responsible for the preparation and conduct of all Alliance military operations, in accordance with the division of responsibilities between the strategic commands outlined above. He issues strategic military direction to the subordinate commanders and coordinates the multinational support, reinforcement and designation of the different elements and components of the command structure.

In circumstances where political decisions have been taken based on the framework agreement reached between NATO and the European Union regarding NATO support for EU-led military operations, SACEUR may also be required to provide a headquarters capability for such operations, open to the participation of all Allies.

Similarly, the involvement of Partner countries in command arrangements is set out in an agreed Political-Military Framework for NATO-led PfP operations.

At the operational level, the planning and conduct of operations, based on the strategic military guidance received, is in the hands of the designated operational-level commander who exercises his responsibilities through a joint permanent or deployable operational headquarters.

The Alliance has three operational-level standing joint headquarters: two Joint Force Command (JFC) Headquarters based in Brunssum, the Netherlands, and Naples, Italy, and a third, more limited Joint Headquarters based in Lisbon, Portugal. Differing arrangements are in place to ensure that, if necessary, at least two operations can be conducted concurrently, that they can be sustained for the period of time required and that their varying components can be relieved. Operational command and control of the NATO Response Force rotates between the three Joint Headquarters.

The two Joint Force Commands have subordinate land, maritime and air Component Commands. The third Joint Headquarters has no permanent operational command responsibilities and is primarily responsible for providing support for Combined Joint Task Force operations.

At the Component Command level, a number of Component Command Headquarters provide service-specific expertise for Joint Force commanders at the operational level, as well as advice on joint operational planning and execution. There are two Component Command-level land headquarters in Germany and Spain respectively, namely CC-Land Headquarters, Heidelberg, and CC-Land Headquarters, Madrid. There are also two static Component Command air headquarters in Ramstein, Germany and in Izmir, Turkey, and two static Component Command-Maritime headquarters in Northwood, England and in Naples, Italy. Each of the Component Command headquarters is supported by other specialised entities and subordinate elements, depending on the nature and scale of the operations involved, and can be augmented if necessary by additional elements and personnel at appropriate levels of readiness and training.

In addition to the above structure of Component Commands, an Allied Submarine Command Headquarters located in Norfolk, Virginia, subordinate to SACEUR but funded nationally by the United States, has the lead responsibility for the overall coordination of Alliance submarine matters in conjunction with the Component Command-Maritime Headquarters in Northwood and in Naples.

The transformational process and structure

The transformation of NATO's military capabilities comprises closely linked functions working together to address the critical task of introducing the improvements in capabilities needed to ensure that the Alliance can meet the challenges of the current and future security environment. These functions include, for example, assessing the future operating environment, identifying future strategic-level joint concepts, developing, integrating and testing new operational concepts, doctrines, organisational structures, capabilities and technologies, and contributing to the implementation of improvements.

The organisation of Allied Command Transformation is designed to enable the various processes involved in bringing about improvements to be undertaken within a coherent, integrated transformation framework. The work involves several distinct but related functions, including strategic concepts, policy and requirements identification; capability planning and implementation; joint and combined concept development, experimentation, assessment and doctrine; future capabilities research and technology; and training and education.

The headquarters of SACT, in Norfolk, Virginia, maintains close links to the United States Joint Forces Command and is the focal point for overseeing the entire transformation process and coordinating the above functions. It does so by means of a network of centres and entities within NATO's military structure located in Europe and North America, contributing to different aspects of the transformation process. Some of these centres or entities support more than one function or process.

In organisational terms, in addition to its headquarters in Norfolk, Allied Command Transformation has an ACT Staff Element based at NATO Headquarters in Brussels to support SACT's representative to the Military Committee, plus an ACT Staff Element co-located with SHAPE, thereby ensuring liaison and coordination with Allied Command Operations, the International Staff, the International Military Staff, national military representatives and other NATO bodies and agencies responsible for defence and resource planning and implementation issues.

Within the ACT structure there is also a Europe-based Joint Warfare Centre (JWC) located in Stavanger, Norway, which promotes and conducts NATO's joint and combined experimentation, analysis, and doctrine development processes to maximise transformational synergy and to improve NATO's capabilities and interoperability. The Centre contributes to developmental work on new technologies, modelling and simulation and conducts training and development programmes for new concepts and doctrine.

The ACT structure includes a Joint Analysis and Lessons Learned Centre located in Monsanto, Portugal, which feeds the results of joint analysis work and lessons learned back into the transformation network.

Through its Joint Force Training Centre located in Bydgoszcz, Poland, the JWC provides training programmes to assist both strategic commands and contributes to joint force training evaluation undertaken by Allied Command Operations. It maintains formal links with other NATO agencies and bodies and with national and multinational training centres and facilities.

The Undersea Research Centre at La Spezia, Italy, conducts research and integrates national efforts that support NATO's undersea operational and transformational requirements. A NATO Maritime Interdiction Operational Training Centre is in the process of being set up in Souda Bay, Greece.

There are also a number of educational facilities within the NATO military structure, including the NATO Defense College in Rome, Italy, the NATO School in Oberammergau, Germany, and the NATO CIS School in Latina, Italy, which coordinate their activities with Allied Command Transformation.

A number of Centres of Excellence, funded nationally or multinationally, provide opportunities for improving interoperability and capabilities, testing and developing doctrine, and validating new concepts through experimentation. Cooperation between the Centres of Excellence and the Strategic Commanders is established on the basis of specific memoranda of understanding drawn up between the participating nations and the appropriate Strategic Command.

Military forces

In general, NATO does not have independent military forces, other than those contributed by the member countries to military operations. Therefore, when the North Atlantic Council decides to launch an operation, forces have to be made available by member countries through a force generation process. This may include forces of non-NATO member countries, such as Partnership for Peace (PfP) and Mediterranean Dialogue countries. Once these forces have completed their mission, they are reintegrated into their national military structures.

Working together requires a compatibility of equipment and a sufficient level of interoperability, for example to enable forces to be refuelled or resupplied by another country. The forces of NATO and Partner countries also train together, participate in courses on standardised operational procedures and language, conduct military simulations and take part in other multinational exercises, all of which serve to enhance their ability to undertake combined (multinational) operations.

There are nevertheless a number of common defence capabilities, most significantly a fleet of Airborne Warning and Control Systems (AWACS) aircraft, which provide air surveillance, early warning, and command and control.

Following the terrorist attacks on the United States in 2001, AWACS aircraft were sent to patrol United States territory. At the request of Turkey in 2003, they were sent to guard Turkish territory against the possibility of an attack arising from the Iraqi conflict. They also frequently contribute to the security of major events, such as the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens.

Besides AWACS aircraft, the NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control capability includes a number of multinational support and training aircraft, an integrated radar system and shared infrastructure installations. Such forces are manned by multinational staff provided by the member countries for these specific roles in the framework of the Alliance's integrated force structure.

Civil-military cooperation

In the present-day security environment, close co-operation between civil and military bodies has become an increasingly important factor in the successful conduct of military operations, especially in post-conflict peace-support operations such as those undertaken by the Alliance in the Balkans and in Afghanistan. Civil-military cooperation encompasses the vital coordination needed between NATO operational commands and civilian organisations, including local authorities and the local population in any given area of operations, as well as international, national and non-governmental organisations and agencies.

Initially a multinational project sponsored by six NATO countries (Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway and Poland), the Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) Group North formally received its status as an international military headquarters of NATO on 15 January 2003.

Its role is to provide both NATO commanders and civilian institutions with the necessary expertise to create the conditions necessary to bridge the civil-military gap in military operations, particularly in the post-conflict peace-support operations when cooperation between all those involved is an essential factor in helping local authorities to rebuild social structures and restore normal living conditions for the local population. Civil-military cooperation may also be an important aspect of humanitarian, disaster relief or other civil emergency operations undertaken by national or international military forces.

Located in Budel, the Netherlands, CIMIC Group North is functionally attached to Joint Force Command Headquarters Brunssum and is establishing working and training relationships with this headquarters. However, its role is to offer support to all NATO operations. Its main priority has been to establish an effective operational capability, focusing initially on training and education for CIMIC personnel. A similar initiative has been developed by Italy, Hungary and Greece to create a CIMIC Group South that will be attached to Joint Force Command Headquarters Naples.

Reserve forces

The importance of reserve forces is growing with the multiplication of military operations conducted by the international community in the form, for instance, of “coalitions of the willing” and UN-mandated operations led by different international organisations.

The National Reserve Forces Committee (NRFC) is a central forum of the Alliance for reservist issues and has the task of preparing conceptual proposals and developing approaches for the Military Committee (MC) and member countries in this area.

The NRFC constantly takes up current problems with regard to preventive security and sets forth the interrelations with reservist issues as comprehensively and with as much foresight as possible so as to fulfil its role as an advisory body. It also serves as a forum for the exchange of information between individual NATO countries that deal with reservist matters and for the harmonisation of reserve forces, whenever possible, in accordance with the best practice principle. Since 1996, the NRFC has focused on strengthening the operational readiness of NATO reserve forces by broadening the exchange of information and employing reserve forces jointly with active forces. A number of key areas are being examined such as mobilisation systems, the requirements for training and follow-on training of reservists, and the motivation of reservists.

The NRFC was established in 1981. At present, almost all NATO countries are members of the committee, and the International Military Staff, Allied Command Operations and Allied Command Transformation are represented in it by liaison officers (and Australia by a permanent observer). It holds plenary conferences at least twice a year.

NRFC delegations are appointed by the respective national ministries of defence, and the national heads of delegations (HoD) are mostly heads of reserve or commissioners of reserve of Allied forces.

The NRFC provides guidance to the Confédération interalliée des officiers de réserve (Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers, or CIOR), which brings together all existing reserve officer associations in NATO countries. The CIOR is a non-political, non-governmental, non-profit-making organisation dedicated to cooperation between the national reserve officers associations of NATO countries and to solidarity within the Atlantic Alliance.

The members of these associations are active as civilians in business, industrial, academic, political and other fields of professional life, in addition to their role as reserve officers. They are therefore in a position to contribute to a better understanding of security and defence issues in the population as a whole, as well as bringing civilian expertise and experience to the tasks and challenges facing reserve forces in NATO.

The CIOR was founded in 1948 by the reserve officer associations of Belgium, France and the Netherlands. Its principal objectives include working to support the policies of NATO and to assist in the achievement of the Alliance's objectives, maintaining contacts with NATO's military authorities and commands, and developing international contacts between reserve officers in order to improve mutual knowledge and understanding.

Delegates to the CIOR are elected by their national reserve officer associations. The head of each delegation is a CIOR vice-president. The CIOR International President and Secretary General are elected by an Executive Committee, the CIOR's policy body that decides which country will assume the presidency, where congresses will be held, what projects will be assumed by the various commissions and the final actions to be taken on these projects.

The CIOR meets on an annual basis in the summer, alternating the location among member countries. It also organises a winter conference for the CIOR Executive Committee and Commissions.

The Confédération interalliée des officiers médicaux de réserve (Interallied Confederation of Medical Reserve Officers, or CIOMR) is an associated member of the CIOR. It holds its sessions at the same time and place as the CIOR summer congress and winter conference but follows its own agenda for the discussion of medical matters.

The CIOMR was established in 1947 as the official organisation of medical officers within reserve forces from countries which were to become NATO members. Originally founded by Belgium, France and the Netherlands, the Organisation now includes all CIOR member countries. Its objectives include establishing close professional relations with the medical doctors and services of the reserve forces of NATO countries, studying issues of importance to medical reserve officers, including medico-military training, and promoting effective collaboration with the active forces of the Alliance.

Whenever possible the CIOR, the CIOMR and the NRFC convene at the same time and place. The three bodies also try to harmonise their respective programmes and projects.

The names and addresses of national reserve officer associations affiliated to the CIOR and further information about the CIOR and the CIOMR can be obtained from:

CIOR Liaison Office	Reserve Affairs	The Secretary General
NATO/IMS/P1P/CIOR	Advisor	CIOMR
NATO HQ	Public Inform. Office	6 Boterdorpse
1110 Brussels	7010 SHAPE	Verlaat
Belgium	Belgium	3054 XL Rotterdam
Tel: 32 2 707 529	Tel: 32 65 44 33 89	The Netherlands
		Fax: 31 10 4635307

CHAPTER 10

THE INTERNATIONAL MILITARY STAFF'S KEY FUNCTIONS

In the same way that the International Staff is the executive agency supporting the Council and its committees, so the International Military Staff (IMS), under the authority of its Director, is the executive agency supporting the Military Committee. Like the International Staff it undergoes restructuring on a regular basis, which is why its key functions rather than its structures and their roles are described below. Up-to-date structural information can be found on the NATO website (www.nato.int).

The Director of the International Military Staff (DIMS) is a general or flag officer selected by the Military Committee from candidates nominated by member countries. Under his direction, the IMS prepares assessments, studies and reports that form the basis of discussion and decisions in the Military Committee. It is also responsible for planning, assessing and recommending policy on military matters for consideration by the Military Committee, and ensuring that the policies and decisions of the Committee are implemented as directed. The IMS provides the essential link between the political decision-making bodies of the Alliance and the Strategic Commanders and maintains close liaison with the civilian International Staff.

The IMS consists of military personnel sent to take up staff appointments at NATO Headquarters, to work in an international capacity for the common interest of the Alliance rather than on behalf of their country of origin. Some posts within the IMS are filled by civilian personnel who work in administrative and support positions. As well as supporting the work of the Military Committee, preparing and following up its decisions, the IMS is also actively involved in the process of cooperation in the EAPC and PFP framework as well as the NATO-Russia Council, the NATO-Ukraine Commission and the Mediterranean Dialogue. Partner countries are represented within the International Military Staff and parts of the integrated command structure. These representations are called "Partnership for Peace Staff Elements". In times of tension, crisis and hostilities, or during NATO exercises, the IMS will implement a Crisis Management Organisation based on functional military cells.

Coordination of staff action, and control of the flow of information and communications both within the IMS and between the IMS and other parts of the NATO Headquarters, is the responsibility of the Executive Coordinator, who works within the Office of the Director of the IMS.

The Executive Coordinator and his/her staff also provide secretarial support and procedural advice to the Military Committee. A Public Information Adviser advises the Chairman of the Military Committee, the Deputy Chairman, and the Director of the IMS on public information matters, and acts as spokesperson for the Chairman and the Military Committee. This officer is also responsible for developing and monitoring military public information policy and doctrine. During NATO operations, the Public Information Adviser is the IMS representative in all committees and working groups dealing with public information matters and develops, coordinates and executes public information strategies. He/she works closely with the International Staff and the public information organisations within the Strategic Commands and the national ministries of defence.

There is also a Financial Controller, who advises key officials on all financial and fiscal matters related to the group of budgets administered by the IMS. The Financial Controller is responsible to the Military Budget Committee for the financial management of the IMS budget. He/she is also tasked with preparing, justifying, administering and supervising all budget-related matters for presentation to the Military Budget Committee, and for financial supervision of the NATO bodies with budgets administered by the IMS, namely the NATO Standardization Agency, the NATO Defense College, and the Research and Technology Agency. Finally, the financial controller is also responsible for conducting internal audits of accounts and activities with financial repercussions within his/her area of responsibility.

The Office of the Director of the IMS includes a Legal Counsel serving the Director and the IMS as a whole by providing advice on international and national legal implications of all aspects of NATO's military missions and of military advice provided by the Military Committee to the North Atlantic Council. Legal advice is given on legal aspects of operations, operations support, international laws and agreements relating to armed conflict, land, air and maritime operational plans, rules of engagement, targeting policy, the use of force, logistics and procurement matters, installations and other matters. The advice may also address NATO commitments with regard to non-NATO military and civilian entities as well as internal legal issues relating to the role of the IMS.

The Director of the International Military Staff is supported by assistant directors, each of whom is responsible for specific areas of activity.

Planning and policy

One of the functions is to develop and coordinate the contribution of the Military Committee to NATO policy and planning matters, defence policy, strategic planning, special weapons policy planning, proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, defence and force planning, the NATO Response Force (NRF) and

the Prague Capabilities Commitments (PCC). Work is divided into three main areas dealing with strategic policy and concepts, nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) policy, and defence and force planning. This includes contributing to the development of politico-military concepts, studies and assessments, NATO's defence and force planning process, the biannual defence review and long-term conceptual studies. The staff develop and represent the views of the Military Committee and of the NATO Strategic Commanders on military policy matters in different NATO bodies. They are also responsible for the conceptual development of documents related to NATO-EU relations and the NATO-EU strategic partnership, as well as the follow-up of Berlin Plus-related issues (see Part VIII).

Regional cooperation and security

Cooperation and regional security is also a focus of the International Military Staff, involving military contacts and cooperation within the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and Partnership for Peace, the NATO-Russia Council, the NATO-Ukraine Commission and the Mediterranean Dialogue. Military advice on NATO involvement in different aspects of disarmament, arms control and cooperative security issues is also developed, as is cooperation with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in the field of disarmament, arms control and cooperative security. The International Military Staff also provides personnel for the Western Consultation Office (WCO) in Vienna, established to facilitate and enhance NATO's cooperation with the OSCE.

Relations with Partner countries are integrated into the daily work of the IMS. Since 1994, a number of Partner country liaison offices and, since 1997, permanent diplomatic missions, have been opened at NATO Headquarters. Military links with Partner countries are further strengthened by Partnership for Peace Staff Elements, consisting of officers from NATO and Partner countries located within the IMS at NATO Headquarters as well as within the NATO integrated military structure. Officers from Partner countries filling such posts work alongside officers from NATO countries in an international capacity, participating in the preparation of policy discussions and the implementation of policy decisions dealing with relevant Partnership for Peace military matters.

Operations

Another important function of the International Military Staff is to support the Military Committee in the development of current operational plans and in addressing questions relating to the NATO force posture and other military management issues relating to NATO's role in international crises. This also includes the promotion and development of multinational training and exer-

cises for NATO and PfP countries and coordinating efforts relating to the development of effective NATO information operations and the associated training and exercises. Support is also provided for the NATO Air Defence Committee and for air defence matters in general. A NATO liaison officer to the United Nations ensures regular contact with the UN on behalf of the International Military Staff and the Organisation as a whole, when required.

Intelligence

Day-to-day strategic intelligence support is provided to the Secretary General, the North Atlantic Council and Defence Planning Committee, the Military Committee, and other NATO bodies. It is within the IMS that the collation and assessment of intelligence received from NATO member countries and NATO commands takes place and its dissemination within NATO Headquarters and to NATO commands, agencies, organisations and countries is centralised and coordinated.

NATO strategic intelligence estimates are produced and disseminated, intelligence policy documents and basic intelligence documents are managed and coordinated, and selected data bases and digital intelligence information services are maintained. Additional functions performed include strategic warning and crisis management roles, liaising with other NATO and national bodies performing specialised intelligence functions, informing NATO bodies of relevant developments and facilitating the formulation of military advice to NATO's political authorities.

Logistics and resources

A number of important functions are fulfilled in the area of logistics and resources: the management of Alliance resources in support of NATO military bodies, the development and updating of military policy and procedures for the management of Alliance resources, and staff support to and appropriate representation of the Military Committee on the following:

- all matters concerning the development and assessment of NATO military policy and procedures for armaments, research and technology and Military Committee-related standardisation activities;
- all matters concerning logistics, medical, civil emergency planning, the military and civilian manpower and personnel function, and NATO common-funded resources provided by the NATO Security Investment Programme and the Military Budget;

- in conjunction with staff working on regional cooperation and security, all matters concerning logistics, armaments, including research and technology, resource management and Military Committee-related standardisation activities with all the countries and organisations involved in cooperation with NATO.

Consultation, command and control (C3)

The NATO HQ Consultation, Command and Control Staff (NHQC3S) is a combined staff comprising civilian members of the International Staff and officers of the International Military Staff, serving the consultation, command and control requirements of the North Atlantic Council, the Military Committee and the NATO C3 Board (NC3B). It is administratively located within the International Military Staff structure and works under the Director, NHQC3S, who is a Vice-Chairman of the NATO C3 Board and the Military Committee representative to the Board. Members of the NHQC3S provide support for the NC3B and its sub-committees and give advice to the Military Committee on C3/communication and information system (CIS) policy standards, products, analysis and capability packages.

The NATO Situation Centre

The NATO Situation Centre (SITCEN) assists the North Atlantic Council, the Defence Planning Committee and the Military Committee in fulfilling their respective functions in the field of consultation. The SITCEN serves as the focal point within the Alliance for the receipt, exchange and dissemination of political, military and economic information, and monitors political, military and economic matters of interest to NATO and to NATO member countries on a 24-hour basis. The SITCEN is also responsible for all NATO Headquarters external communications, both secure and non-secure, ensuring contact with national capitals, Strategic Commands and other international organisations, and for providing geographic support services for the NATO Headquarters. It also provides facilities to enable the rapid expansion of consultation during periods of tension and crises, and maintains and updates relevant background information during such periods.

The Office of the Women in NATO Forces

This office provides the secretariat for, and acts as the adviser to, the Committee on Women in the NATO Forces (CWINF). It is responsible for developing a network with defence and other international agencies

concerned with the employment of military women, providing briefings on gender integration, and collecting and managing relevant information for dissemination among member and Partner countries, Mediterranean Dialogue countries and other international agencies and researchers. The office serves as NATO's focal point for all issues relating to the recruitment and employment, training and development, and quality of life of women in uniform. It also examines their impact on levels of readiness and ability to work in a multinational environment during NATO-led missions.

CHAPTER 11

SPECIALISED ORGANISATIONS AND AGENCIES

In addition to its political headquarters and military command structures, NATO also has a number of specialised agencies located in different NATO member countries. Whereas the International Staff and International Military Staff cover the day-to-day activities of the Alliance as well as activities related to its political and military agenda, the agencies have responsibilities in more technical fields and areas of specialisation that complement and form an integral part of NATO's agenda. They provide advice and undertake research, support the implementation of Alliance decisions, provide communications and information systems services, and manage cooperative programmes. One of their main roles is to facilitate the best use of the limited defence resources of member countries through the development of common projects, procedures and standards.

At the Prague Summit meeting in November 2002, the NATO Secretary General was commissioned by NATO heads of state and government to undertake a review of the roles and requirements for NATO's agencies, including their relationship with NATO structures as a whole and with the North Atlantic Council in particular. The aims of the review are to examine the effectiveness and coherence of the agency structure, opportunities for project rationalisation and improvements in reporting channels and coordination mechanisms, as well as the relationship between the agencies' roles and NATO's ongoing transformation process as a whole, including measures to bring about improvements in capabilities.

The review is being undertaken in parallel to the redirection of resources and rationalisation of the military structure agreed upon at the Prague Summit meeting, and in particular those aspects that impact upon the role of Atlantic Command Transformation, which has the leading role in relation to the development of military structures, forces, capabilities and doctrines, research and acquisition processes, interoperability and standardisation issues and training and education programmes.

There are essentially two types of agencies, namely those that act as project coordinators and those that are service providers. Several of the agencies are concerned with identifying the member countries' collective requirements and managing the production and logistics of common procurement projects on their behalf. At one end of the scale are agencies managing major projects and therefore dealing with large budgets, such as the NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Programme Management Agency

(NAPMA), the NATO Air Command and Control System Management Agency (NACMA), the NATO Battlefield Information Collection and Exploitation System (BICES) Agency and the Central Europe Pipeline Management Agency (CEPMA). Other logistics agencies are concerned with practical cooperation in all aspects of logistic support, including the purchase of logistic items and the maintenance of defence equipment. The main logistics agency in this field is the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA) based in Luxembourg. It provides cost-effective logistic support for NATO weapon systems operated by 25 of NATO's member countries and helps NATO and its Partner countries to purchase items of equipment as well as spare parts and maintenance and repair facilities at the lowest possible cost.

The agencies report through Boards of Directors or Steering Committees to the North Atlantic Council under whose authority they normally operate. Heads of agencies meet on a regular basis, hold meetings with the NATO Secretary General and receive briefings on the latest developments and thinking in defence procurement, planning and operations, personnel policy and security. They are supported by their own staffs and coordinate their efforts in order to contribute to the overall process of moving forward on issues on NATO's current agenda, for example through developing standardisation practices and common codification systems.

The programmes and activities undertaken by the agencies vary considerably and require different forms of budgeting and financial cost-sharing arrangements reflecting their specific roles and varying membership. Each agency is governed by its own specific charter, and its relationship with the country in which it is located and with the other participating countries is subject to specific memoranda of understanding.

The issues of standardisation and interoperability of forces from NATO and Partner countries remain high on NATO's agenda in view of its key role in facilitating multinational military operations. The NATO Standardization Agency works toward the implementation of common standards and the adaptation of procedures and practices necessary to achieve them.

The NATO Consultation, Command and Control Agency (NC3A), based in Brussels and The Hague, is another agency which has major responsibilities on behalf of the Alliance for the development of Allied capabilities in communications and information systems. Its role is to ensure that the command and control structures and forces of NATO and Partner countries are able to communicate together, especially during crises. The agency deals with matters such as operational research, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, air command and control, and communications and information systems. It provides central planning, systems architecture, systems integration, design, systems engineering, technical support and configuration control.

Collaborative studies in the field of scientific research are supported by the NATO Research and Technology Agency (RTA), based in Neuilly, France, on behalf of NATO's Military Committee and the Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD), which is responsible for cooperation in matters relating to defence acquisition. There are also a number of specialised NATO agencies engaged in managing procurement programmes such as the NATO Medium Extended Air Defence System Design and Development, Production and Logistics Management Agency (NAMEADSMA), the NATO EF 2000 and Tornado Development Production and Logistics Management Agency (NETMA), the NATO Helicopter Design and Development, Production and Logistics Management Agency (NAHEMA) and the NATO HAWK Management Office (NHMO).

Other agencies and organisations are active in fields such as civil emergency planning, air traffic management and air defence, electronic warfare, meteorology and military oceanography. In addition, there are a number of multinational institutions that play a key role in the field of education and training, such as the NATO Defense College in Rome, Italy, the NATO School in Oberammergau, Germany, and the NATO Communications and Information Systems School in Latina, Italy.

Additional information on the roles of specific agencies is given in relevant chapters of Part X.

Further information:

NATO Battlefield Information Collection and Exploitation System (BICES) Agency

Z Building – Blvd Léopold III
1110 Brussels, Belgium

Central Europe Pipeline Management Agency (CEPMA)

11bis rue du Général Pershing, BP 552
78005 Versailles CEDEX, France

Common Regional Initial ACCS Programme/Regional Programme Office (CRIAP/RPO)

Quartier Reine Elisabeth Bloc 5A
Rue d'Evere
1140 Brussels, Belgium

NATO ACCS Management Agency (NACMA)

Z Building – Blvd Léopold III
1110 Brussels, Belgium

NATO Helicopter Design and Development, Production and Logistics Management Agency (NAHEMA)

Le Quatuor Bâtiment A-42
Route de Galice
13090 Aix-en-Provence, France

NATO Medium Extended Air Defence System Design and Development, Production and Logistics Management Agency (NAMEADSMA)

620 Discovery Drive
Building 1 - Suite 300
Huntsville, AL 35806, USA

NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA)

8302 Capellen, Luxembourg

NATO Consultation, Command and Control Agency (NC3A)

NC3A Brussels	NC3A The Hague
Z Building – Blvd Léopold III	PO Box 174
1110 Brussels, Belgium	2501 CD The Hague, Netherlands

NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Programme Management Agency (NAPMA)

Akerstraat, 6445
CL Brunssum, Netherlands

NATO Defense College (NDC)

Via Giorgio Pelosi 1
00143 Rome, Italy

NATO Standardization Agency (NSA)

NATO Headquarters
1110 Brussels, Belgium

Research and Technology Agency (RTA)

BP 25, F-92201 Neuilly-sur-Seine CEDEX, France

NATO CIS Services Agency (NCSA)

SHAPE, B-7010, Belgium

CHAPTER 12

KEY TO THE PRINCIPAL NATO COMMITTEES AND POLICY BODIES

Key to the principal NATO committees

The principal forums for Alliance consultation and decision-making are supported by a committee structure which ensures that each member country is represented at every level in all fields of NATO activity in which it participates. Some of the committees were established in the early days of NATO's development and have contributed to the Alliance's decision-making process for many years. Others have been established more recently in the context of the Alliance's internal and external adaptation, following the end of the Cold War and the changed security environment in Europe.

The following section summarises the membership, chairmanship, role, levels, subordinate structure and principal source of staff support of the principal NATO Committees. The Secretary General is the titular chairman of a number of policy committees which are chaired or co-chaired on a permanent basis by senior officials responsible for the subject area concerned. It must be noted that the denomination of the divisions for which certain Assistant Secretary Generals or Deputy Assistant Secretary Generals are responsible can change following reforms of the International Staff, which take place on a regular basis. For updated information, please consult the NATO website (www.nato.int).

The main source of support shown under the respective committees is the division of the International Staff with the primary responsibility for the subject matter concerned. Many of the committees are also supported by the International Military Staff.

All NATO committees take decisions or formulate recommendations to higher authorities on the basis of exchanges of information and consultations leading to consensus. There is no voting or decision by majority.

NB: The NATO Military Committee is subordinate to the North Atlantic Council and Defence Planning Committee but has a special status as the senior military authority in NATO. The role of the Military Committee is described in chapter 8.

The Military Committee and most of the Committees listed below also meet regularly with representatives of Partner countries in the framework of

the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) and with representatives of Mediterranean Dialogue countries.

1. North Atlantic Council (NAC)
2. Defence Planning Committee (DPC)
3. Nuclear Planning Group (NPG)
4. Military Committee (MC)
5. Executive Working Group (EWG)
6. High Level Task Force on Conventional Arms Control (HLTF)
7. Joint Committee on Proliferation (JCP)
8. Political-Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace (PfP/SC)
9. NATO Air Defence Committee (NADC)
10. NATO Consultation, Command and Control (C3) Board (NC3B)
11. NATO Air Command and Control System (ACCS)
Management Organisation Board of Directors (NACMO BoD)
12. Senior Political Committee (SPC)
13. Atlantic Policy Advisory Group (APAG)
14. Political Committee (PC)
15. Senior Politico-Military Group on Proliferation (SGP)
16. Verification Coordinating Committee (VCC)
17. Policy Coordination Group (PCG)
18. Defence Review Committee (DRC)
19. Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD)
20. NATO Committee for Standardization (NCS)
21. Infrastructure Committee
22. Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC)
23. Senior NATO Logisticians' Conference (SNLC)
24. Science Committee (SCOM)
25. Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS)
26. Civil and Military Budget Committees (CBC/MBC)

27. Senior Resource Board (SRB)
28. Senior Defence Group on Proliferation (DGP)
29. High Level Group (NPG/HLG)
30. Economic Committee (EC)
31. Committee on Public Diplomacy (CPD)
32. Council Operations and Exercises Committee (COEC)
33. NATO Air Traffic Management Committee (NATMC)
34. Central Europe Pipeline Management Organisation Board of Directors (CEPMO BoD)
35. NATO Pipeline Committee (NPC)
36. NATO Security Committee (NSC)
37. Special Committee
38. Archives Committee

1. North Atlantic Council (NAC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Secretary General
Role	Decision-making authority of the North Atlantic Alliance. The only body formally established by the North Atlantic Treaty, invested with the authority to set up “such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary” for the purposes of implementing the Treaty
Principal levels	Permanent (permanent representatives/ambassadors); ministerial (foreign and/or defence ministers); summit (heads of state and government)
Principal subordinate committees	The Council is supported by a large number of committees covering the full range of Alliance activities
International Staff support	All divisions of the International Staff support the work of the Council directly or indirectly. The Council’s role as the body responsible for fulfilling the objectives of the Treaty has included the creation of a number of agencies and organisations which also support its work in specialised fields

2. Defence Planning Committee (DPC)

Members	Member countries participating in NATO’s integrated military structure (all member countries except France)
Chairman	Secretary General
Role	Principal decision-making authority on matters relating to collective defence planning and the integrated military structure of NATO
Levels	Permanent (permanent representatives/ambassadors); ministerial (defence ministers)
Principal subordinate committees	Defence Review Committee
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division

3. Nuclear Planning Group (NPG)

Members	All member countries except France
Chairman	Secretary General
Role	Principal decision-making authority on matters relating to Alliance nuclear policy
Levels	Defence ministers, permanent representatives
Principal subordinate committees	High-Level Group, NPG Staff Group
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division (Nuclear Policy Directorate)

4. Military Committee (MC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Chairman of the Military Committee
Role	Senior military authority in NATO under the overall authority of the North Atlantic Council and Defence Planning Committee
Levels	Chiefs of Staff/Chiefs of Defence, Permanent Military Representatives
Principal subordinate committees	Military Committee Working Groups. A number of joint civil and military bodies also report to the Military Committee as well as to the Council and Defence Planning Committee
International Staff support	International Military Staff; NATO Headquarters C3 Staff (NHQC3S)

5. Executive Working Group (EWG)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Deputy Secretary General
Acting chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning
Role	Senior advisory body to the North Atlantic Council on defence matters concerning the member countries
Levels	Defence counsellors of national delegations
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division

6. High Level Task Force on Conventional Arms Control (HLTF)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Deputy Secretary General
Acting chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy
Role	Consultative and advisory body to foreign and defence ministers on conventional arms control issues
Levels	Experts from ministries of foreign affairs and ministries of defence at the level of political directors; political advisors to NATO delegations
Principal subordinate committees	HLTF at deputies level
International Staff support	Arms Control and Coordination Section, Office of the Deputy Secretary General

7. Joint Committee on Proliferation (JCP)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Deputy Secretary General
Role	Senior advisory body providing coordinated reports to the North Atlantic Council on politico-military and defence aspects of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction
Levels	Members of the Senior Politico-Military Group on Proliferation (SGP) and the Senior Defence Group on Proliferation (DGP) meeting in joint session
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division (Weapons of Mass Destruction Centre)

8. Political-Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace (PfP/SC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Deputy Secretary General
Acting chairmen	Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy, Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning
Deputy acting chairmen	Director, Euro-Atlantic Integration and Partnership, Political Affairs and Security Policy Division; Head, Defence Cooperation Section, Defence Policy and Planning Division
Role	Principal policy-making body and advisory body to the North Atlantic Council for all aspects of the Partnership for Peace, including the PfP Planning and Review Process (PARP) for which it meets in a special format
Levels	Representatives of national delegations (two members per delegation); membership frequently changes depending on the subjects being discussed
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Political Affairs and Security Policy Division; Defence Policy and Planning Division

9. NATO Air Defence Committee (NADC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Deputy Secretary General
Role	Advises the North Atlantic Council and the EAPC on all aspects of air defence, including missile defence; promotes harmonisation of national efforts with international planning related to air command and control and air defence weapons
Levels	Senior national military or executive officers involved in management and policy relating to air defence or air command and control systems
Principal subordinate committees	Air Defence Representatives (ADREPS); Panel on Air Defence (PAD); Early Warning Inter-Staff Group (EWISG)
International Staff support	Defence Investment Division (Air Defence and Airspace Management Directorate)

10. NATO Consultation, Command and Control Board (NC3B)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Deputy Secretary General
Permanent chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Defence Investment
Co-vice-chairmen	Director, NATO Headquarters C3 Staff and an elected national co-vice-chairman
Role	Senior multinational body acting on behalf of and responsible to the North Atlantic Council and Defence Planning Committee on all matters relating to Consultation, Command and Control (C3) throughout the Organisation
Levels	The C3 Board brings together 2 senior representatives from each nation involved in management and policy of Communication and Information Systems (CIS) in support of C3, able to take into account the wide-ranging functional responsibilities of the Board; 1 representative from the Military Committee; 1 representative from each Strategic Command; 1 representative from the following NATO committees: CNAD, SCEPC/CCPC, COEC, NADC, NACMO BoD, NAPMO BoD, NSC, SRB, PMSC, NCS and RTB; the General Manager, NC3A and the Director, NATO CIS Services Agency (NCSA)
Principal subordinate committees	Group of National C3 Representatives acting as the Board in permanent session, working groups and subcommittees + 8 sub-committees with their sub-structure of regular and <i>ad hoc</i> working groups
International Staff support	NATO Headquarters C3 Staff (NHQC3S)

11. NATO Air Command and Control System (ACCS) Management Organisation Board of Directors (NACMO BoD)

Members	24 participating countries (NATO member countries excluding Iceland and Luxembourg)
Chairman	Deputy Secretary General
National chairman	(Vice Chairman of the NATO Air Defence Committee (NADC))
Role	Ensures the planning and implementation of NATO's Air Command and Control System Programme
Levels	Senior national military or executive officers involved in the management of air defence or air command and control systems
Principal subordinate committees	ACCS Advisory Committee
International Staff support	Defence Investment Division (Air Defence and Airspace Management Directorate)

12. Senior Political Committee (SPC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy
Role	Senior advisory body of the North Atlantic Council on political and specific politico-military questions. Reinforced with experts when dealing with some issues (SPC(R))
Levels	Deputy permanent representatives
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Political Affairs and Security Policy Division and other IS Divisions as required

13. Atlantic Policy Advisory Group (APAG)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy
Role	Advisory body to the North Atlantic Council, tasked with examining relevant security policy projections in the longer term
Levels	National representatives at the level of political directors, acting in an individual expert capacity. The APAG meets annually, with Partner country participation
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Political Affairs and Security Policy Division

14. Political Committee (PC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy
Role	Advisory body to the North Atlantic Council on political questions
Levels	Political advisers to national delegations, reinforced as required by experts
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Political Affairs and Security Policy Division

15. Senior Politico-Military Group on Proliferation (SGP)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy
Role	Senior advisory body on politico-military aspects of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction
Levels	Senior national officials responsible for political and security issues related to non-proliferation
Principal subordinate committees	Also meets with Senior Defence Group on Proliferation (DGP), becoming the Joint Committee on Proliferation (JCP)
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division (Weapons of Mass Destruction Centre)

16. Verification Coordinating Committee (VCC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Head, Arms Control and Coordination Section, Office of the Deputy Secretary General
Role	Principal body for decisions on matters of conventional arms control implementation and verification coordination
Levels	Plenary sessions, working groups, expert groups, seminars/workshops with experts from ministries of foreign affairs and ministries of defence, experts from verification units, secretaries of delegations
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Arms Control and Coordination Section, Office of the Deputy Secretary General

17. Policy Coordination Group (PCG)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning and Assistant Secretary General for Operations
Role	Principal forum for consultation and advisory body to the North Atlantic Council on politico-military matters (including peacekeeping operations)
Levels	Deputy permanent representatives and national military representatives
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division and Operations Division

18. Defence Review Committee (DRC)

Members	All member countries except France
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning
Role	Senior advisory committee to the Defence Planning Committee on force planning and other issues relating to the integrated military structure
Levels	Defence counsellors of national delegations
Principal subordinate committees	DRC Working Group
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division

19. Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Secretary General
Permanent chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Defence Investment
Role	Gives advice to the North Atlantic Council on all matters relating to armaments. Responsible for improving military capabilities by promoting cooperative development and cost-effective acquisition of armaments, enhancing interoperability and facilitating technological and industrial cooperation among member and Partner countries.
Levels	National armaments directors
Principal subordinate committees	National Armaments Directors' Representatives (NADREPs); NATO Army Armaments Group (NAAG); NATO Air Force Armaments Group (NAFAG); NATO Naval Armaments Group (NNAG); NATO Industrial Advisory Group (NIAG); Group of National Directors on Codification; CNAD Ammunition Safety Group (CASG); CNAD Life Cycle Management Group (LCMG), Research and Technology Board (which also reports to the Military Committee); Alliance Ground Surveillance Steering Committee (AGS SC); Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence Steering Committee (ALTBMD SC); Munitions Safety Information Analysis Centre (MSIAC)
International Staff support	Defence Investment Division (Armaments Directorate)

20. NATO Committee for Standardization (NCS)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Secretary General
Permanent co-chairmen	Assistant Secretary General for Defence Investment and Director of the International Military Staff
Role	Senior authority of the Alliance responsible for providing coordinated advice to the North Atlantic Council on overall standardisation matters
Levels	Senior officials from capitals representing coordinated national positions on standardization
Principal subordinate committees	NCS Representatives (NCSREPs); NATO Standardization Staff Group (NSSG)
International Staff support	NATO Standardization Agency (NSA)

21. Infrastructure Committee

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Defence Investment
Permanent chairman	Controller for Security Investment Programme
Role	Responsible for the implementation of the NATO Security Investment Programme, as screened and endorsed by the Senior Resource Board and approved by the North Atlantic Council or Defence Planning Committee
Levels	Infrastructure advisers of national delegations; representatives of the Military Committee, NATO Strategic Commanders and NATO agencies
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Defence Investment Division (Security Investment Directorate)

22. Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Secretary General
Permanent chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Planning/ Operations
Role	Senior policy and advisory body to the North Atlantic Council on civil emergency planning and disaster relief matters. Responsible for policy direction and coordination of Planning Boards and Committees.
Levels	Senior officials from capitals with responsibility for coordination of civil emergency activities/ representatives from national delegations
Principal subordinate committees	Planning boards and committees (Ocean Shipping, European Inland Surface Transport, Civil Aviation, Food and Agriculture, Industrial Preparedness, Civil Communications Planning, Civil Protection, Medical Planning)
International Staff support	Operations Division (Civil Emergency Planning and Exercises Directorate)

23. Senior NATO Logisticians' Conference (SNLC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Secretary General
Permanent chairmen	Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning and Deputy Chairman of the Military Committee
Role	Senior body advising the North Atlantic Council, Defence Planning Committee and Military Committee on consumer logistics matters. Joint civil/military body responsible for assessment of Alliance consumer logistics requirements and ensuring adequate logistics support of NATO forces. The SNLC has the primary responsibility, on behalf of the Council, for the coordination of issues across the whole logistics spectrum with other NATO logistics bodies.
Levels	Senior national, civil and military officials with responsibilities for consumer logistics matters in member countries
Principal subordinate committees	SNLC Logistic Staff Meeting; Movement and Transportation Group
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division (Logistics Section); IMS Logistics and Resources Division

24. Science Committee (SCOM)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Public Diplomacy
Role	Principal decision-making authority for the NATO Science Programmes
Levels	National experts in science policy appointed from government or independent bodies in member countries
Principal subordinate committees	The Science Committee appoints a variety of subcommittees, advisory panels and steering groups to carry out special tasks
International Staff support	Public Diplomacy Division

25. Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Public Diplomacy
Role	Principal decision-making authority for the NATO programme on the Challenges of Modern Society
Levels	National representatives with expertise and/or responsibilities related to environmental programmes in member countries
Principal subordinate committees	Nations appoint representatives to a subcommittee responsible for CCMS fellowships
International Staff support	Public Diplomacy Division

26. Civil and Military Budget Committees (CBC/MBC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	National chairman selected on rotational basis
Role	Responsible to the North Atlantic Council for the assessment and recommendation of the annual budgets for the International Staff, International Military Staff, Strategic Commands, and the NAEW&C Force, as well as for review of budgetary execution
Levels	Financial counsellors from national delegations
Principal subordinate committees	The Budget Committees establish working groups as required
International Staff support	Office of the Chairman of the Budget Committees Executive Management Division (Financial Control)

27. Senior Resource Board (SRB)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	National chairman selected on rotational basis
Role	Senior advisory body to the North Atlantic Council on the management of military common-funded resources
Levels	National representatives, representatives of the Military Committee, NATO Strategic Commanders, Chairmen of the Military Budget Committee, Infrastructure Committee and NATO Defence Manpower Committee
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Office of the Chairman of the SRB; Defence Investment Division

28. Senior Defence Group on Proliferation (DGP)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Co-chairmanship: one North American and one European member country
Role	Senior advisory body on defence-related aspects of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and associated delivery systems
Levels	Defence policy directors from capitals
Principal subordinate committees	DGP Steering Committee (composed of working-level experts); also meets with Senior Politico-Military Group on Proliferation (SGP), becoming the Joint Committee on Proliferation (JCP)
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division (Weapons of Mass Destruction Centre)

29. High Level Group (HLG)

Members	All member countries except France
Chairman	National chairman (United States)
Role	Advisory body to the Nuclear Planning Group (NPG). Meets several times per year to consider aspects of NATO's nuclear policy and planning and matters relating to the safety, security and survivability of nuclear weapons.
Levels	Defence Policy Directors from capitals
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division (Nuclear Policy Directorate)

30. Economic Committee (EC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Regional, Economic and Security Affairs, Political Affairs and Security Policy Division
Role	Advisory body to the North Atlantic Council on economic issues
Levels	Representatives from NATO delegations (economic counsellors); reinforced meetings attended by experts from capitals
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Political Affairs and Security Policy Division (Defence and Security Economics Directorate)

31. Committee on Public Diplomacy (CPD)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Public Diplomacy
Role	Advisory body to the North Atlantic Council on information and press issues
Levels	Representatives from NATO delegations; reinforced meetings attended by experts from capitals
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Public Diplomacy Division

32. Council Operations and Exercises Committee (COEC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Civil Emergency Planning and Exercises, Operations Division
Role	Principal forum for consultation and coordination of crisis management arrangements, procedures and facilities, including communications issues, questions relating to the NATO Situation Centre (SITCEN), and the preparation and conduct of crisis management exercises
Levels	Political and military representatives from national delegations concerned with crisis management and exercises
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division (Civil Emergency Planning and Exercises)

33. NATO Air Traffic Management Committee (NATMC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Elected (currently the Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Air Defence and Airspace Management, Defence Investment Division)
Role	Senior advisory body on matters related to airspace use and air traffic management
Levels	Senior civil and military air traffic managers from national capitals
Principal subordinate committees	Air Traffic Management Group (ATMG), Communications and Navigation and Surveillance Group (CNS), NATO/EUROCONTROL ATM Security Coordinating Group (NEASCOG)
International Staff support	Defence Investment Division (Air Defence and Airspace Management Directorate)

34. Central Europe Pipeline Management Organisation Board of Directors (CEPMO BoD)

Members	Six participating member countries (Belgium, Canada, France, Germany, the Netherlands, United States)
Chairman	National representative
Role	Senior directing body for the Central Europe Pipeline System (CEPS)
Levels	Representatives of participating countries plus representatives of the Central Europe Pipeline Management Agency (CEPMA)
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division (Logistics Section); NATO Military Authorities

35. NATO Pipeline Committee (NPC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Head, Logistics Section, Defence Policy and Planning Division
Role	Senior advisory body in NATO on consumer logistics relating to military petroleum supplies
Levels	Government experts on military petroleum matters
Principal subordinate committees	Working Group on Special Tasks, Fuels and Lubricants Working Group, Petroleum Handling Equipment Working Group
International Staff support	Defence Policy and Planning Division (Logistics Section); NATO Military Authorities

36. NATO Security Committee (NSC)

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Director, NATO Office of Security (NOS)
Role	Advisory body to the North Atlantic Council on matters relating to NATO Security Policy
Levels	National security authority representatives, national delegation security officers, and security officials of NATO civil and military bodies
Principal subordinate committees	INFOSEC Working Group
International Staff support	NATO Office of Security

37. NATO Special Committee

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Annual rotating chairmanship among member countries
Role	Advisory body to the North Atlantic Council on matters of espionage and terrorist or related threats which might affect the Alliance
Levels	Heads of Security/Intelligence Services of member countries
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	NATO Office of Security

38. Archives Committee

Members	All member countries
Chairman	Director, Information and Systems Management Services
Role	In keeping with the adaptation of NATO to the new international security environment following the end of the Cold War, and in a spirit of promoting greater transparency, the Alliance established a policy of declassification and public disclosure of NATO documents of historical importance for research purposes. The role of the Archives Committee is to continue and expand the archival programme (including provision of facilities for public access) and to manage and preserve archives held by civilian and military bodies of the Alliance.
Levels	Deputy Permanent Representatives reinforced by national archivists
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
International Staff support	Executive Management Division (Information and Systems Management Services, Archives Section; Council Secretariat).

Key to the institutions of cooperation, partnership and dialogue

The following section summarises the membership, chairmanship, status or role, levels, associated structures and principal source of staff support of the institutions of cooperation, partnership and dialogue that underpin relations between NATO and other countries. Further details relating to these institutions may be found in Part VII.

Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC)

NATO-Russia Council (NRC)

NATO-Ukraine Commission (NUC)

Mediterranean Cooperation Group (MCG)

Istanbul Cooperation Initiative Group (ICIG)

Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC)

Members	Forty-six countries (26 NATO member + 20 Partner countries)
Chairman	Secretary General
Role	Established in accordance with the EAPC Basic Document of May 1997. The overarching framework for political and security consultations and for enhanced cooperation under the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme
Levels	Ambassadorial (permanent representatives of NATO member countries and ambassadors of Partner countries); ministerial (foreign and defence ministers); summit (heads of state and government)
Principal related committees	Subordinate committees of the North Atlantic Council meeting with Partner countries participating in the EAPC/PfP
Staff support	Supported by diplomatic missions and liaison offices of EAPC countries and by NATO staffs. Many International Staff and International Military Staff divisions support the work of the EAPC directly or indirectly

NATO-Russia Council (NRC)

Members	All NATO member countries and the Russian Federation
Chairman	Secretary General
Role	Established in accordance with the NATO-Russia Founding Act of 27 May 1997 and the Declaration by Heads of State and Government of NATO Member States and the Russian Federation issued at their summit meeting in Rome on 28 May 2002. Forum for consultation, cooperation and consensus-building between NATO and Russia
Levels	Ambassadorial; ministerial (foreign and defence ministers); summit (heads of state and government)
Principal related committees	No formal substructure. However, Chiefs of Staff/Chiefs of Defence meet under the auspices of the NRC no less than twice a year. Military representatives meet monthly. The NRC is also supported by a number of expert working groups
Staff support	Supported by Russian and NATO staffs. Many NATO International Staff and International Military Staff divisions support the work of the NRC directly or indirectly

NATO-Ukraine Commission (NUC)

Members	All NATO member countries and Ukraine
Chairman	Secretary General
Role	In accordance with the NATO-Ukraine Charter of July 1997, the North Atlantic Council meets periodically with Ukraine as the NATO-Ukraine Commission, as a rule not less than twice a year, to assess the implementation of the relationship and consider its further development
Levels	Ambassadorial; ministerial (foreign and defence ministers); summit (heads of state and government)
Principal subordinate committees	A number of senior NATO committees meet regularly with Ukraine, including the Military Committee in Permanent or Chiefs of Staff session. The NUC is also supported by expert working groups such as the Joint Working Group on Defence Reform
Staff support	Supported by Ukrainian and NATO staffs. Many International Staff and International Military Staff divisions support the work of the Commission directly or indirectly

Mediterranean Cooperation Group (MCG)

Members	All NATO member countries
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy
Acting chairman	Deputy Assistant Secretary General for Regional, Economic and Security Affairs
Role	Consultative body on Mediterranean issues
Levels	Meetings are held at the level of political counsellors and, when required, with representatives of Mediterranean Dialogue countries
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
Staff support	Political Affairs and Security Policy Division

Istanbul Cooperation Initiative Group (ICIG)

Members	All member countries of the Alliance
Chairman	Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy
Acting chairman	Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regional, Economic and Security Affairs
Role	Consultative body on ICI issues
Levels	Meetings are held at the level of political counsellors
Principal subordinate committees	N/A
Staff support	Political Affairs and Security Policy Division

PART IV

THE ALLIANCE'S ROLE IN PEACEKEEPING AND PEACE-SUPPORT OPERATIONS

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| CHAPTER 13 | NATO's role in Bosnia and Herzegovina |
| CHAPTER 14 | The Kosovo conflict and the role of KFOR |
| CHAPTER 15 | NATO's role in the former Yugoslav
Republic of Macedonia* |
| CHAPTER 16 | NATO's role in Afghanistan |
| CHAPTER 17 | NATO's role in Iraq |
| CHAPTER 18 | NATO's role in Darfur |

CHAPTER 13

NATO'S ROLE IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Since the end of the Cold War, NATO has become increasingly involved in peacekeeping and peace-support operations, deploying in support of the wider interests of the international community and working closely together with other organisations to help resolve deep-rooted problems, alleviate suffering and create the conditions in which peace processes can become self-sustaining. NATO's first three peace-support operations took place in Europe – in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Kosovo and in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* – yet the need for long-term peace-building is global. NATO foreign ministers recognised this at a meeting in Reykjavik, Iceland, in May 2002 agreeing that: "To carry out the full range of its missions, NATO must be able to field forces that can move quickly to wherever they are needed, sustain operations over distance and time, and achieve their objectives." This decision effectively paved the way for NATO to deploy for the first time outside the Euro-Atlantic area, in Afghanistan in 2003. Since then, the Alliance has also become involved in both Iraq and in Darfur, Sudan.

Bosnia and Herzegovina has been the scene of many firsts for NATO, and decisions taken in response to events in that country have helped shape the Alliance's evolution and develop its peacekeeping and peace-support capabilities. The Alliance carried out an air campaign in Bosnia and Herzegovina in August and September 1995 that helped bring the Bosnian War to an end and then led a peacekeeping operation there for nine years, from December 1995 to December 2004. Although NATO handed responsibility for ensuring day-to-day security in Bosnia and Herzegovina to the European Union in December 2004, the Alliance retains a residual military headquarters in Sarajevo to focus on defence reform in Bosnia and Herzegovina and prepare the country for membership of the Partnership for Peace programme.

The political basis for the Alliance's role in peacekeeping operations was established at an Oslo meeting of NATO foreign ministers in June 1992. At that meeting, the foreign ministers announced their readiness to support peacekeeping activities under the responsibility of the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE, subsequently renamed the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, or OSCE) on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with their own procedures. This included making Alliance resources and expertise available for peacekeeping operations.

In December 1992, the Alliance stated that it was also ready to support peacekeeping operations under the authority of the UN Security Council, which has primary responsibility for international peace and security. Reviewing the peacekeeping and sanctions or embargo enforcement measures already being undertaken by NATO countries, individually and as an Alliance, to support the implementation of UN Security Council resolutions relating to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, NATO foreign ministers indicated that the Alliance was ready to respond positively to further initiatives that the UN Secretary-General might take in seeking Alliance assistance in this field.

Between 1992 and 1995, the Alliance took several key decisions which led to operations to monitor, and subsequently enforce, a UN embargo and sanctions in the Adriatic and to monitor and then to enforce the UN no-fly zone over Bosnia and Herzegovina. The Alliance also provided close air support to the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) and authorised air strikes to relieve the siege of Sarajevo and other threatened areas designated by the United Nations as safe areas.

On 30 August 1995, NATO aircraft launched a series of precision strikes against selected targets in Serb-held positions in Bosnia and Herzegovina. This heralded the start of Operation Deliberate Force, NATO's first air campaign, which lasted until 15 September. The operation shattered Bosnian Serb communications and, in conjunction with a determined diplomatic effort, helped pave the way to a genuine cease-fire; moreover, it prepared the ground for successful peace negotiations in Dayton, Ohio, United States.

Dayton Peace Accord

Under the terms of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina, commonly referred to as the Dayton Peace Accord (DPA), signed in Paris on 14 December 1995, a NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) of 60 000 troops was established for one year to oversee implementation of the military aspects of the agreement. The Force was activated on 16 December, and transfer of authority from the Commander of UN forces to the Commander of IFOR took place four days later, bringing all NATO and non-NATO forces participating in the operation under IFOR command.

By 19 January 1996, the parties to the DPA had withdrawn their forces from the zone of separation on either side of the agreed cease-fire line and by 3 February, all forces had been withdrawn from the areas to be transferred under the terms of the Agreement. The transfer of territory between the entities of Bosnia and Herzegovina was completed by 19 March and a new zone of separation was established. By the end of June, the cantonment of heavy weapons and demobilisation of forces required under the DPA had also been

completed. After more than four years of conflict and the repeated failure of international initiatives to end it, a basis for the future peace and security of Bosnia and Herzegovina had been established within less than six months.

IFOR contributed substantially to the creation of a secure environment conducive to civil and political reconstruction. It also provided support for civilian tasks, working closely with the Office of the High Representative (OHR), the International Police Task Force (IPTF), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and many other agencies, including more than 400 non-governmental organisations active in the area.

IFOR also assisted the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) in preparing, supervising and monitoring the first free elections in September 1996 and, following those elections, supported the OHR in assisting the entities of Bosnia and Herzegovina in building new common institutions. In addition, IFOR military engineers repaired and reopened roads and bridges and played a vital role in demining efforts, repairing railroads, opening up airports to civilian traffic, restoring gas, water and electricity supplies, rebuilding schools and hospitals, and restoring key telecommunication installations.

From IFOR to SFOR

In November and December 1996, a two-year consolidation plan was established under the auspices of the Peace Implementation Council, an *ad hoc* group consisting of countries and international organisations with a stake in the peace process. On the basis of this plan and of the Alliance's own study of security options, NATO foreign and defence ministers concluded that a reduced military presence was needed to provide the stability necessary for consolidating peace in the area. They agreed that NATO should organise and lead a 32 000-strong Stabilisation Force (SFOR), which was subsequently activated on 20 December 1996 – the day on which IFOR's mandate expired – with a new 18-month mandate.

In accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 1088 of 12 December 1996, SFOR became the legal successor to IFOR, its primary task being to contribute to the development of the secure environment necessary for the consolidation of peace. A further follow-on force retained the name "SFOR" and continued to operate on a similar basis, in order to deter renewed hostilities and to help create the conditions needed for the implementation of the civil aspects of the DPA. At the same time, the North Atlantic Council projected a transitional strategy involving progressive reductions of force levels as the

transfer of responsibilities to the competent common institutions, civil authorities and international bodies became feasible.

As the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina became more stable, NATO restructured and reduced the size of the Stabilisation Force. By the beginning of 2002, it had been reduced from its original 32 000 troops to approximately 19 000 drawn from 17 NATO member countries and 15 non-NATO countries, including a Russian contingent. A large number of non-NATO countries, some of which have since become members, participated in IFOR and SFOR at different times, including Albania, Argentina, Austria, Bulgaria, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Ireland, Jordan, Latvia, Lithuania, Morocco, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden and Ukraine.

SFOR was further reduced to 12 000 troops by January 2003, with the support of strategic reserve forces if required and a continuing mandate to help maintain a safe and secure environment in accordance with the DPA. Improvements in the overall security situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2003, including successful operations conducted by explosive ordnance disposal units to destroy large quantities of grenades, rifles, pistols, mines and other munitions, enabled NATO further to reduce SFOR's size to a residual deterrent force of some 7000 troops, once again backed by reinforcement possibilities, by mid-2004.

Simultaneously, the successful handover to the European Union of the NATO operation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* in 2003 opened the way for the deployment of an EU follow-on mission to succeed SFOR. Recognising the progress made in Bosnia and Herzegovina since the deployment of the NATO-led Implementation Force in 1995 as well as the subsequent positive role undertaken by the SFOR, Alliance leaders agreed to conclude the SFOR operation by the end of 2004.

On 2 December 2004, the European Union deployed a new force in Bosnia and Herzegovina, EUFOR, in Operation Althea. EUFOR benefits from ongoing NATO support in accordance with the Berlin-Plus arrangements made between the two organisations (described in Part VIII). Preparations for the transfer of responsibility for this mission were undertaken in the framework of these arrangements, drawing on NATO planning expertise and paving the way for the use by the European Union of the Alliance's collective assets and capabilities. In particular, the provisions enabled the Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe (DSACEUR) to become the Operation Althea Commander. These arrangements also enabled the transition of responsibility for the mission from NATO to the European Union to take place without interruption, which optimised the use of resources and avoided duplicating efforts.

Although NATO's role as the main provider of security in Bosnia and Herzegovina concluded with the completion of the SFOR mission, the Alliance's continuing commitment to the country manifests itself in other ways. On 2 December 2004, the Alliance established a military headquarters in the country as a residual military presence to help the national authorities as they tackle the problems of defence reform and prepare for possible future participation in the Partnership for Peace programme. The headquarters has also undertaken certain operational support tasks such as counter-terrorism; supporting the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), within the means and capabilities at the headquarters' disposal, with the detention of persons indicted for war crimes; and intelligence-sharing with the European Union.

NATO has continued to demonstrate its practical support for Bosnia and Herzegovina's efforts to join the Partnership for Peace (PfP) and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council through activities organised in the framework of a concrete NATO Security Cooperation Programme with that country. Activities in the 2004 programme included workshops on the drafting of the government's 2005 defence budget and on preparations for its 2006-2007 defence budget. Similarly, in July 2004 an additional workshop was held at the NATO School in Oberammergau to consider ways to enhance practical cooperation and the newly established defence institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to select a list of potential PfP activities in which the country might already be able to participate. In 2005 a new programme of cooperation was established, tailored to the needs of the country and designed to familiarise military and civilian personnel with the possibilities and requirements of the PfP programme.

CHAPTER 14

THE KOSOVO CONFLICT AND THE ROLE OF KFOR

NATO has been leading a peacekeeping operation in Kosovo since June 1999 in support of wider international efforts to build peace and stability in the contested province. The NATO-led Kosovo Force, or KFOR, deployed in the wake of a 78-day air campaign launched by the Alliance in March 1999 to halt and reverse the humanitarian catastrophe that was then unfolding. That campaign, which was NATO's second, followed more than a year of fighting in the province and the failure of international efforts to resolve the conflict by diplomatic means.

Simmering tension in Kosovo resulting from the 1989 imposition of direct rule from Belgrade of this predominantly Albanian province erupted in violence between Serbian military and police and Kosovar Albanians at the end of February 1998. The international community became increasingly concerned about the escalating conflict, its humanitarian consequences and the risk of it spreading to other countries, as well as Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic's disregard for diplomatic efforts aimed at peacefully resolving the crisis and the destabilising role of Kosovar Albanian militants.

On 13 October 1998, the North Atlantic Council authorised activation orders for NATO air strikes, in support of diplomatic efforts to make the Milosevic regime withdraw forces from Kosovo, cooperate in bringing an end to the violence and facilitate the return of refugees to their homes. Following further diplomatic initiatives, President Milosevic agreed to comply and the air strikes were called off. Further measures were taken in support of UN Security Council resolutions calling for an end to the conflict, including the establishment of a Kosovo Verification Mission by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and an aerial surveillance mission by NATO, as well as a NATO military task force to assist in the evacuation of members of the Verification Mission in the event of further conflict.

The situation in Kosovo flared up again at the beginning of 1999, following a number of acts of provocation on both sides and the use of excessive force by the Serbian military and police. This included the massacre of 40 unarmed civilians in the village of Racak on 15 January. Renewed international efforts to give new political impetus to finding a peaceful solution to the conflict resulted in the convening of negotiations between the parties to the conflict in London and Paris under international mediation. These negotiations failed, however, and in March 1999, Serbian military and police forces stepped up the intensity of their operations, moving extra troops and tanks into the region, in a clear

breach of agreements reached. Tens of thousands of people began to flee their homes in the face of this systematic offensive. A final unsuccessful attempt was made by US Ambassador Richard Holbrooke to persuade President Milosevic to reverse his policies. All diplomatic avenues having been exhausted, NATO launched an air campaign against the Milosevic regime on 24 March 1999.

NATO's political objectives were to bring about a verifiable stop to all military action, violence and repression; the withdrawal from Kosovo of military personnel, police and paramilitary forces; the stationing in Kosovo of an international military presence; the unconditional and safe return of all refugees and displaced persons and unhindered access to them by humanitarian aid organisations; and the establishment of a political agreement for Kosovo in conformity with international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

Following diplomatic efforts by Russia and the European Union on 3 June, a Military Technical Agreement was concluded between NATO and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on 9 June. On the following day, after confirmation that the withdrawal of Yugoslav forces from Kosovo had begun, NATO announced the suspension of the air campaign. On 10 June, UN Security Council Resolution 1244 welcomed the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia's acceptance of the principles for a political solution, including an immediate end to violence and a rapid withdrawal of its military, police and paramilitary forces and the deployment of an effective international civil and security presence, with substantial NATO participation.

The NATO-led Kosovo Force

The first elements of KFOR entered Kosovo on 12 June 1999. By 20 June, the withdrawal of Serbian forces was complete. KFOR tasks have included assistance with the return or relocation of displaced persons and refugees; reconstruction and demining; medical assistance; security and public order; security of ethnic minorities; protection of patrimonial sites; border security; interdiction of cross-border weapons smuggling; implementation of a Kosovo-wide weapons, ammunition and explosives amnesty programme; weapons destruction; and support for the establishment of civilian institutions, law and order, the judicial and penal system, the electoral process and other aspects of the political, economic and social life of the province.

KFOR was initially composed of some 50 000 personnel from NATO member countries, Partner countries and non-NATO countries under unified command and control. By the beginning of 2002, KFOR had been reduced to around 39 000 troops. Improvements in the security environment enabled NATO to reduce KFOR troop levels to around 26 000 by June 2003 and to 17 500 by the end of that year. A setback in progress towards a stable, multi-ethnic

and democratic Kosovo occurred in March 2004, when renewed violence broke out between Albanians and Serbs and KFOR troops were attacked. NATO contingency plans for such an eventuality enabled the rapid deployment of some 2500 additional troops to reinforce the existing KFOR strength.

Pending resolution of Kosovo's status, the Alliance's commitment manifested through KFOR is unlikely to undergo significant reductions. In the meantime, measures permitting the return of refugees, economic reform and other standards have been defined by the United Nations as the necessary conditions for normalisation. At the Istanbul Summit, NATO heads of state and government condemned the renewed ethnic violence that had erupted in March 2004 and reaffirmed NATO's commitment to a secure, stable and multi-ethnic Kosovo, on the basis of full implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 1244. They also reiterated their support for the agreed "Standards before Status" policy and the associated Standards Review Mechanism.

Ahead of the comprehensive review of the Standards Implementation Process scheduled for the end of 2005, NATO defence ministers agreed at their meeting in Brussels in December 2004 to maintain a robust KFOR profile during the year 2005. In the meantime, in August 2005, the North Atlantic Council decided to restructure KFOR, replacing the four existing multinational brigades with five task forces. This reform will be introduced gradually and will allow greater flexibility with, for instance, the removal of restrictions on the cross-boundary movement of units based in different sectors of Kosovo. The move from brigade to task force will also place more emphasis on intelligence-led operations, with task forces working closely with both the local police and the local population to gather information.

Support for neighbouring countries

As a result of the conflict in Kosovo, the countries of the region faced major humanitarian, political and economic problems. At the height of the Kosovo crisis, more than 230 000 refugees had arrived in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,* more than 430 000 in Albania and some 64 000 in Montenegro. Approximately 21 500 had reached Bosnia and Herzegovina and more than 61 000 had been evacuated to other countries. Within Kosovo itself, an estimated 580 000 people had been rendered homeless. To help ease the humanitarian situation on the ground, NATO forces flew in many thousands of tons of food and equipment. By the end of May 1999, over 4666 tons of food and water, 4325 tons of other goods, 2624 tons of tents and nearly 1600 tons of medical supplies had been transported to the area.

In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,* NATO troops built refugee camps, refugee reception centres and emergency feeding stations and moved hundreds of tons of humanitarian aid to those in need. In Albania, NATO deployed substantial forces to provide similar forms of assistance and helped the UNHCR with the coordination of humanitarian aid flights to enable the evacuation of refugees to safety in other countries, including many NATO countries. These flights were supplemented by aircraft supplied by NATO member countries. The Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) established at NATO in June 1998 also played an important role in the coordination of support to UNHCR relief operations.

A NATO PfP Cell was set up in Tirana from 1998 to December 2002 to assist the government with PfP programmes and procedures. In June 2002, NATO nominated a Senior Military Representative to Albania, with headquarters in Tirana. The role of the Senior Military Representative is to advise Tirana on military aspects of security sector reform, including the restructuring of the Albanian armed forces, and on military aspects of the Membership Action Plan and PfP Planning and Review Process, in both of which Albania is a participant. NATO Headquarters Tirana includes a NATO Advisory Team which assists the Senior Military Representative in the implementation of these tasks. A further task assigned to NATO Headquarters Tirana has been to provide support for NATO-led operations in the region. A significant contribution to NATO operations is also made by Albania itself, through the authorisation of surveillance and reconnaissance flights over its territory as well as cooperation on border security issues between Albanian border police and military units and KFOR.

CHAPTER 15

NATO'S ROLE IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA*

NATO became involved in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* at the request of the Skopje authorities to help defuse an escalating conflict between the government and ethnic Albanian rebels to head off what might have degenerated into a full-scale war.

In June 2001, President Boris Trajkovski of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* asked for NATO assistance to help demilitarise the National Liberation Army (NLA) and disarm ethnic Albanian groups operating on the territory of his country. In response, the North Atlantic Council took a double-track approach: it condemned the attacks and adopted measures in support of the government's action against extremist activities, while urging the government to moderate its military action and adopt constitutional reforms to increase the participation of ethnic Albanians in society and politics.

A political dialogue between both parties was engaged, leading to a peace plan and a cease-fire. The signing of the Ohrid Framework Agreement on 13 August 2001 opened the way for the entry of NATO troops into the country on 27 August 2001 and for the introduction of internal reforms. The 30-day mission, code-named Operation Essential Harvest, was to collect and destroy all weapons voluntarily handed in by NLA personnel. The operation involved some 3500 NATO troops and their logistical support. Approximately 3875 weapons and 397 600 other items, including mines and explosives, were collected. Later in the year, the 15 constitutional amendments in the peace agreement were passed by the Parliament.

In September 2001, President Trajkovski requested a follow-on force to provide protection for international monitors from the European Union and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe overseeing implementation of the peace plan for the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*. Known as Operation Amber Fox, the follow-on mission involved some 700 troops provided by NATO member countries, under German leadership, reinforcing some 300 troops already based in the country. It started on 27 September 2001 with a three-month mandate to contribute to the protection of international monitors overseeing the implementation of the peace plan and was subsequently extended.

In response to a request from President Trajkovski, NATO agreed to continue supporting the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* with a new mission starting on 16 December 2002, known as Operation Allied Harmony.

The North Atlantic Council recognised that while Operation Amber Fox could now be concluded, a follow-on international military presence in the country was still required to minimise the risk of destabilisation. The mission consisted of operational elements to provide support for the international monitors and advisory elements to assist the government in assuming responsibility for security throughout the country.

The NATO-led Operation Allied Harmony continued until 31 March 2003, when responsibility for the mission was handed to the European Union. NATO has subsequently maintained both a civilian and a military presence in the country to assist and advise the national authorities on developing security sector reforms and on the country's participation in the Membership Action Plan (MAP).

NATO Headquarters Skopje, established for this purpose, consists of some 120 combined military and civilian personnel. It is a non-tactical headquarters under the command of a NATO Senior Military Representative. In the light of the damage and wear and tear on roads and bridges caused by increased military traffic and the use of the road network as military supply routes, NATO is also contributing to reconstruction and other civil engineering projects in the country. NATO Headquarters Skopje plays an important role in the coordination of these efforts, which are being undertaken in conjunction with the civil engineering department of Skopje University.

CHAPTER 16

NATO'S ROLE IN AFGHANISTAN

NATO has been leading international peacekeeping efforts in Afghanistan since August 2003, thereby helping to establish the conditions in which the country can enjoy a representative government and self-sustaining peace and security. This groundbreaking operation is NATO's first beyond the Euro-Atlantic area. Initially restricted to providing security in and around Kabul, the Alliance is now expanding the mission to cover other parts of the country via so-called Provincial Reconstruction Teams. Specifically, NATO is seeking to assist the government of Afghanistan in maintaining security within its area of operations, to support the government in expanding its authority over the whole country, and to help provide a safe and secure environment conducive to free and fair elections, the spread of the rule of law, and the process of reconstruction.

In the wake of the ouster of al Qaida and the Taliban, Afghan leaders met in Bonn, Germany, in December 2001 with international backing to begin the process of rebuilding the country. A new government structure was created in the form of an Afghan Transitional Authority, and an International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) was created under United Nations Security Council Resolutions 1386, 1413 and 1444 to enable the Transitional Authority itself and the UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan to operate in the area of the capital, Kabul, and its surroundings with reasonable security. A detailed Military Technical Agreement between the ISAF Commander and the Afghan Transitional Authority provided further guidance for ISAF operations.

ISAF was initially led by the United Kingdom and then by Turkey. Germany and the Netherlands jointly took over leadership of ISAF in February 2003 and in doing so requested NATO support. In August 2003, the Alliance itself took responsibility for ISAF in such a way that the problem of identifying new countries willing and able to take over the leadership of the mission every six months was overcome.

The international composition of ISAF has varied but, since its establishment, has included forces or contributions from all 26 NATO Allies and from Albania, Azerbaijan, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Ireland, New Zealand, Sweden, Switzerland and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,* in addition to elements provided by Afghanistan itself.

ISAF's political direction is provided by the North Atlantic Council in consultation with non-NATO troop-contributing countries. NATO's Allied Command Operations (based at Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe located in Mons, Belgium), has responsibility for the operation's headquarters; Allied

Joint Force Command Brunssum, in the Netherlands, acts as the operational-level headquarters.

Initially, the core of the ISAF headquarters in Kabul was formed from the Joint Command Centre in Heidelberg, Germany, which provided the first NATO ISAF Force Commander. Subsequently, command passed to Canada, then to the Eurocorps under French command, then to Turkey and then Italy. Together with its civilian support elements, the overall strength of ISAF amounts to approximately 8 000 personnel. A rotation plan has been developed that provides for the longer-term support of the ISAF's mission headquarters at least until February 2008.

In January 2004, NATO appointed former Turkish Foreign Minister Hikmet Cetin as its Senior Civilian Representative in Afghanistan, with responsibility for advancing political and military aspects of the Alliance's engagement in Afghanistan. The Senior Civilian Representative works under the guidance of the North Atlantic Council and in close co-ordination with the ISAF Commander and the UN Assistance Mission in Afghanistan, as well as with the Afghan authorities and other international bodies present in the country.

ISAF expansion

In October 2003, UNSC Resolution 1510 opened the way for a wider role for ISAF to support the government of Afghanistan in regions of the country beyond the confines of the capital. In December 2003, the North Atlantic Council authorised NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Europe to initiate the expansion process.

Provincial Reconstruction Teams, or PRTs, form the cornerstone of this process. They are teams composed of international civilian and military personnel structured as civil-military partnerships, the military elements of which are integrated into the ISAF chain of command. Their primary role is to help the government of Afghanistan extend its authority further afield and to facilitate the development of security in the regions. This includes establishing relationships with local authorities, enhancing security in their specific areas of operation, supporting security sector reform activities and using the means and capabilities available to them to help facilitate the reconstruction effort in the provinces.

The PRT concept is a new one which is proving to be an efficient and effective means of helping to create a secure environment and enabling lead countries, international organisations and non-governmental organisations to fulfil their own roles in assisting the government of Afghanistan to rebuild the country.

In December 2003, ISAF took over command of the German-led PRT in Kunduz as the pilot project and first step in the expansion process. By the end

of 2004, ISAF had taken command of the military components of five PRTs in the north of Afghanistan, located in Baghlan, Faizabad, Kunduz, Maymaneh and Mazar-e-Sharif. NATO also took responsibility for four PRTs in the west of the country – in Herat, Farah, Chagcharan and Qal'eh-Now – in mid-2005, bringing the total of NATO-led PRTs to nine, covering approximately 50 per cent of Afghanistan's territory. NATO has also decided to take over additional PRTs in the south and east of Afghanistan, which may necessitate greater synergy with the US-led Operation Enduring Freedom.

The composition and geographical reach of PRTs are determined by the NATO military authorities and the lead countries, in close consultation with the UN Assistance Mission to Afghanistan and the Afghan authorities and based on the specific situation in the provinces in which they operate. The specific objectives of individual PRTs take into account such factors as the local security situation, the status of reconstruction, and the presence of other international agencies.

Other components of ISAF

In addition to the PRTs, there are three other main components of ISAF. These are:

- The ISAF headquarters, which commands the Kabul Multinational Brigade and conducts operational tasks in its area of responsibility, liaising with and assisting in the work of the United Nations, the Afghan authorities, governmental and non-governmental organisations and the US-led coalition forces in Afghanistan (Operation Enduring Freedom).
- The Kabul Multinational Brigade, which is ISAF's tactical headquarters and is responsible for the planning and conduct of patrolling and civil-military cooperation operations on a day-to-day basis; and
- Kabul Afghan International Airport, which is operated by the Afghan Ministry of Civil Aviation and Tourism with the assistance of ISAF. NATO has an additional role in relation to the rehabilitation of Kabul airport, together with representatives of the other national and international bodies concerned.

ISAF also supported the conduct of the Constitutional Loya Jirga, or grand council, of some 500 Afghan leaders, which was held from December 2003 to early January 2004, and assisted the Afghan authorities in providing security for Kabul throughout the process. The ratification of the new constitution agreed by the Loya Jirga laid the foundation for the creation of democratic institutions and opened the way for free and fair national elections. In response

to a request from Afghan President Hamid Karzai, ISAF also provided support during the presidential election period in autumn 2004 and the autumn 2005 parliamentary and local elections.

While primary responsibility for the conduct of the presidential elections rested with the Afghan government assisted by the UNAMA, additional forces were made available, including a Spanish Quick Reaction Force deployed to Marzar-e-Sharif and an Italian in-theatre reserve force located in Kabul. Additional Dutch and UK aircraft and helicopter support was also provided, and a US battalion was on hand for rapid deployment to the area if required. Close coordination took place throughout with other national and international agencies on the spot, including the United Nations, the European Union and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The Bonn Agreement of December 2001 defines the institutional reforms required to lay the foundation for stability, peace and prosperity in five distinct spheres, namely counter narcotics; judicial reform; disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration; training of the Afghan National Army; and training of police forces. Lead donor countries from the G8 countries are assisting the Afghan authorities in carrying out security sector reform programmes in these spheres. Japan is the lead country overseeing the demobilisation, disarmament and reintegration process. The United States is leading international efforts to train the Afghan National Army. Germany has taken the lead in training the Afghan National Police. Italy is the lead country for judicial reform. The United Kingdom is leading international efforts to help combat the production of and trade in narcotics.

Within the framework of NATO-Russia cooperation, a joint pilot training project is also being developed to help build capacity in the region to more effectively tackle the trafficking in Afghan narcotics.

While the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration process is not part of ISAF's mandate, its implementation impacts significantly on ISAF operations, particularly in and around Kabul. In March 2004, a ceremony outside Kabul marked the successful cantonment in safe storage sites of heavy weapons such as tanks, artillery pieces, surface-to-surface missiles and rocket-launching systems held by different militias in the capital. Initiated by the Afghan Ministry of Defence, the cantonment operates under a dual-key system and prevents the removal of these weapons without the agreement of both the Ministry and the ISAF Commander. A similar initiative implemented in the Panjsher Valley and the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration process applied to armed groups in the country combine to form an integrated programme designed to bring the large number of weapons circulating in Afghanistan under control.

CHAPTER 17

NATO'S ROLE IN IRAQ

Since the end of the 2003 US-led campaign against Iraq and the ouster of the regime of Saddam Hussein, NATO has become involved in various ways in helping with Iraq's transition. The Alliance is training Iraqi personnel both inside and outside Iraq and supporting the development of security institutions to help the country build effective armed forces and provide for its own security. NATO is also coordinating equipment donations to Iraq and providing support to Poland to help it command a sector in Iraq.

In May 2003, the North Atlantic Council agreed to provide Poland with assistance in the form of intelligence, logistics, movement coordination, force generation and secure communications. The decision was taken on a similar basis to the decision that had been taken to provide comparable forms of assistance to the Netherlands and Germany when they jointly assumed leadership of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. It came into effect immediately.

A Force Review Conference took place at Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE) with the participation of Poland, other NATO member countries and Partner countries in June 2003 to discuss force requirements and conclude arrangements for implementation. The conference forms part of the normal military planning process for any NATO operation and gives contributing countries the opportunity to discuss details, provide offers and finalise the force generation process. In September 2003, Poland assumed command of the Multinational Division (MND) Central South as part of the stabilisation force in Iraq. This role was reinforced by NATO as a whole as well as by bilateral contributions (including forces and other forms of support) by a number of individual NATO and Partner countries.

Statements issued on behalf of the North Atlantic Council at the end of 2003 and at the beginning of 2004 emphasised that, without prejudice to subsequent decisions that might be taken in relation to the security situation in Iraq, the immediate operational priority for the Alliance remained the successful implementation of the role it had undertaken, from August 2003, in assuming command of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF). Ensuring effective implementation of this task would be a prerequisite for any subsequent decision relating to an enhanced Alliance role in relation to Iraq. However, the Alliance's role in relation to stabilisation efforts in Iraq would be kept under continuous review.

Sovereignty was formally transferred to an Interim Iraqi Government on 28 June 2004, the opening day of the NATO Istanbul Summit. In response to a request from the Iraqi Interim Government and following the unanimous adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 1546 asking international and regional organisations to assist the Multinational Force in Iraq, NATO leaders agreed to assist the Interim Government with the training of its security forces and tasked the North Atlantic Council to develop ways to implement this decision. Following discussions with the Interim Government, including visits to NATO by the Iraqi Foreign Minister in July and the Iraqi President in September, it was also decided that NATO would provide further assistance with respect to the equipment and technical assistance for Iraq's security forces.

On 30 July 2004, the Council agreed to the establishment of a NATO Training Implementation Mission numbering some 50 military personnel to begin training selected military and civilian headquarters personnel. Unlike operational missions involving combat forces, this was a distinct NATO training mission under the political control of the North Atlantic Council, working closely with the Iraqi authorities as well as with the US-led Multinational Force in Iraq. The aim of the mission is to help the Iraqi Interim Government to develop adequate national security structures as soon as possible, to provide for the future security of the Iraqi people. Security and protection for the mission itself is provided in part by the Multinational Force and in part by NATO.

The specific tasks of the mission included establishing liaison arrangements with the Iraqi Interim Government and the Multinational Force; working with the Iraqi authorities to help them develop effective security structures, including training selected Iraqi headquarters personnel in Iraq; helping to identify Iraqi personnel for training outside Iraq; and working with the Interim Government and the Multinational Force to develop more detailed proposals for NATO training, advice and cooperation. Training and mentoring selected Iraqi personnel inside Iraq and developing a role in coordinating national offers of equipment and training began in August 2004.

The renamed NATO Training Mission is directed by an American general who is also in charge of the separate training programme led by the Multinational Force, thereby ensuring coordination while maintaining the distinct nature of the NATO programme. Overall responsibility for the programme rests with the Supreme Allied Commander, Operations, at SHAPE, who reports through the NATO Military Committee to the North Atlantic Council. SHAPE is supported by Allied Command Transformation in Norfolk, Virginia, United States, which is responsible for coordination of training efforts outside Iraq.

In September, based on the findings and recommendations of the NATO military authorities, NATO announced its intention to help create a NATO-supported Iraqi Training, Education and Doctrine Centre. Located near Baghdad,

the role of the Centre is to focus on leadership training for Iraqi security forces and provide NATO assistance for the coordination of training being offered bilaterally by different member countries, both inside and outside Iraq.

In October 2004, the North Atlantic Council approved the Concept of Operations for the enhancement of NATO's assistance to the Iraqi Interim Government with the training of its security forces and with the coordination of offers of training and equipment. The Concept of Operations provided the basis for a substantial practical enhancement of assistance within the framework of a distinct NATO mission and the development of a detailed Operations Plan which the North Atlantic Council approved in November 2004.

At the beginning of November 2004, 19 Iraqi security personnel participated in an eight-day training course at NATO's Joint Warfare Centre at Stavanger, Norway – the first such training activity to be conducted outside Iraq and in accordance with the above decisions. The participants included senior military officers and civilian staff from the Iraqi Ministries of Defence and of the Interior. The course was designed to focus on the functioning of an operational-level headquarters and served as a pilot project for follow-on training both inside and outside Iraq. Iraqi requests for further training by NATO or other organisations are coordinated by a NATO Training and Equipment Coordination Centre, which is working with a similar centre in Baghdad to coordinate the requirements of the Iraqi government for training and equipment with the support that is on offer by NATO as a whole and by individual NATO member countries.

When NATO foreign ministers met in Brussels in December 2004, they gave the formal go-ahead for the expansion of NATO's training assistance to Iraq. As a consequence, the NATO Training Mission was increased to some 300 training and support personnel, and the training and mentoring of senior Iraqi security personnel was stepped up.

CHAPTER 18

NATO'S ROLE IN DARFUR

Together with the European Union, NATO has been assisting the African Union in expanding its peacekeeping mission in Darfur, Sudan, since July 2005 in an attempt to halt continuing violence. The Alliance has been airlifting African Union peacekeepers and civilian police into the war-ravaged region and providing training in running a multinational military headquarters and managing intelligence.

In April 2005, the African Union asked NATO to consider providing logistical support to help it expand its operation in Darfur, the African Union Mission in Sudan, to halt ongoing violence. In May, the Chairperson of the Commission of the African Union, Alpha Oumar Konaré, became the first African Union official to visit NATO to provide details of the assistance sought by the African Union. In June, following further consultations with the African Union, the European Union and the United Nations, NATO formally agreed to support the African Union with airlift and training.

The NATO airlift began on 1 July and is coordinated from Europe. A special African Union Air Movement Cell at the African Union's headquarters in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, coordinates the movement of incoming troops on the ground. Both the European Union and NATO are providing staff to support the cell, but the African Union has the lead.

NATO is also providing staff capacity building workshops for African Union officers within the Deployed Integrated Task Force Headquarters in Ethiopia. The training is based on strategic-level planning and focuses on technologies and techniques to create an overall analysis and understanding of Darfur and to identify the areas where the application of African Union assets can influence and shape the operating environment to deter crises. Following a request made by the African Union on 16 September, NATO decided to extend its assistance in the area of airlift and capacity-building until end March 2006.

PART V

COMBATING NEW THREATS AND DEVELOPING NEW CAPABILITIES

- CHAPTER 19** **The Alliance's role in the fight against terrorism
and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction**
- CHAPTER 20** **New capabilities**

CHAPTER 19

THE ALLIANCE'S ROLE IN THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM AND PROLIFERATION OF WEAPONS OF MASS DESTRUCTION

The terrorist attacks on New York and Washington, DC of 11 September 2001 thrust not only the United States but the entire Alliance into the fight against terrorism. Less than 24 hours after the attacks, NATO invoked Article 5 – the collective defence clause of its founding treaty – for the very first time in its history. The political significance of this decision resides in the fact that Article 5 involves a commitment by each of the Allies to consider an attack on one or more of them in Europe or North America as an attack against them all. As a consequence, these attacks were considered an attack on all the members of the Alliance, and member and Partner countries alike firmly and repeatedly condemned the attacks and terrorism in all its forms.

The practical implications of the decision were unprecedented since it was the first time that the Alliance deployed forces and other assets in support of an Article 5 operation. At the request of the United States, the Allies agreed to take eight specific measures of support. One of these was to send NATO Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft to the United States to assist in patrolling American airspace. The operation was known as Eagle Assist and ran until mid-May 2002. Another was the launch, on 26 October 2001, of a counter-terrorist operation in the Mediterranean called Active Endeavour, which is still operating in the region.

The invocation of Article 5 and the ensuing operations to help guard US airspace and patrol the Mediterranean were followed by another significant “first” for NATO. The Alliance conducted its first peacekeeping operation outside Europe when it decided, in August 2003, to take over the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. This was later followed by other out-of-area missions.

In parallel, a major overhaul of military capabilities was ongoing with the launch of the Prague Capabilities Commitment and the decision to create a NATO Response Force (NRF). These are both explained in the following chapter.

In addition to the contribution to the fight against terrorism, existing NATO operations also took on a role in this area. NATO introduced a number of political initiatives and practical measures in many different areas to help combat terrorism. It adopted a Military Concept for Defence against Terrorism,

reinforced cooperation with Partner countries by agreeing on a Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism and introduced measures against the spread of weapons of mass destruction. An enhanced package of anti-terrorist measures was adopted and new initiatives were introduced to improve cyber-defence, civil emergency planning and civil protection. These measures were bolstered by the commitment to reinforce cooperation with other international organisations on terrorism.

Initial support to the United States

On 4 October 2001, at the request of the United States, NATO Allies agreed to take eight measures to expand the options available in the campaign against terrorism. These eight measures included the following:

- greater intelligence sharing;
- assistance to states threatened as a result of their support for coalition efforts;
- increased security for the United States, and other Allies' facilities on their territory;
- back-filling of selected Allied assets needed to support anti-terrorist operations;
- blanket overflight rights for the United States' and other Allies' aircraft for military flights related to counter-terrorism operations;
- access to ports and airfields;
- the deployment of NATO naval forces to the eastern Mediterranean;
- the deployment of elements of the NATO' Airborne Early Warning and Control Force to support counter-terrorism operations.

As previously mentioned, Operation Eagle Assist was terminated by the North Atlantic Council in May 2002 following material upgrades to the US air defence posture, enhanced cooperation between US civil and military authorities, and a US re-evaluation of homeland security requirements.

Operation Active Endeavour

Since October 2001, elements of NATO's Standing Naval Forces have conducted anti-terrorist operations in the Mediterranean. Known as Operation Active Endeavour, the operation has made use of ships, submarines and aircraft, initially to monitor merchant shipping in the eastern Mediterranean. The

mission was expanded in March 2003 to include escorting non-military ships from Alliance member countries through the Straits of Gibraltar, and again in April 2003 to include compliant boarding of suspicious vessels in accordance with the rules of international law. A year later, the operation was extended to the entire Mediterranean. Escort operations were suspended in December 2003, but the forces remain ready to resume operations when necessary.

Since the beginning of their operational role in 2001, forces assigned to the operation have hailed over 70 000 merchant vessels in the Mediterranean, conducted surveillance operations using ships, submarines and aircraft in order to provide an overview of maritime activity in the area, boarded approximately 100 vessels in accordance with the rules of international law, and escorted several hundred vessels through the Straits of Gibraltar. In addition to NATO's Standing Naval Forces, to which a number of member countries contribute, American and Portuguese maritime patrol and other aircraft, Spanish aircraft, helicopters and frigates, and Danish, Norwegian and German patrol boats have participated in these operations.

With the extension of its area of operations to the entire Mediterranean in 2003, the scope of potential multinational support for Operation Active Endeavour has also been widened to include NATO's Partner countries and Mediterranean Dialogue countries. Russian and Ukrainian offers to contribute to the operation, in the framework of NATO-Russian and NATO-Ukrainian cooperative arrangements, were also welcomed by Alliance leaders.

During their deployment in the Mediterranean, the forces involved in the operation have been called upon on several occasions to participate in emergency operations involving, for example, the evacuation of oil rig personnel threatened by high winds and heavy seas and the rescue of passengers aboard a ferry.

International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan

Military operations led by the United States in Afghanistan resulted in the ousting of the Taliban regime, its replacement by an administration committed to peace and to rebuilding the country, and the disabling of large parts of the extensive al-Qaida network in Afghanistan and elsewhere. Known as Operation Enduring Freedom, this effort has been supported by a number of NATO countries that have, for example, provided special forces teams or contributed planes and ships to work together with US special forces on surveillance, interdiction and interception operations. Offers of support have also been made by a number of other non-NATO countries, including Russia and Ukraine.

Concurrently, NATO forces have played a crucial role in the UN-mandated multinational force initially led by individual NATO countries – the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), which was transferred to unified NATO command in August 2003. The role of the force is to help stabilise the country and create the conditions for self-sustaining peace. In this respect, ISAF can be considered as part of NATO's fight against terrorism since it is helping, albeit indirectly, to put an end to terrorist activity on Afghan territory.

ISAF is a multinational force drawn from NATO and Partner countries. Initially under UK command, the force was under Turkish command from June 2002 and, from February 2003, under the joint command of Germany and the Netherlands, with NATO support in specific fields. Examples of national contributions included airlift capability provided by Belgium, a field hospital provided by the Czech Republic, a medical team contributed by Portugal and engineering and logistical support provided by Poland.

A request from Germany and the Netherlands for NATO support in preparing for this role was approved by the North Atlantic Council on 17 October 2002. NATO assistance was sought in particular in the areas of force generation, communications, and intelligence coordination and information sharing. A force generation conference attended by participants from NATO and Partner countries was held at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE) on 27 November 2002 to give the countries an opportunity to make offers of contributions and to identify and discuss critical shortfalls that might need to be filled to enhance future capacity. This was the first such conference to take place in support of countries offering to lead a non-NATO-led military operation based on a United Nations Security Council resolution.

Both Operation Enduring Freedom and ISAF continue to benefit from the efforts made by NATO over the past decade to engage its Partner countries in NATO-led operations and from the practical experience gained from Partner country participation in peacekeeping operations in the Balkans. Contributions made by Partner countries to operations aimed at rooting out terrorism and assisting the Afghan government in stabilising the country have included crucial basing and overflight rights provided by Caucasian and Central Asian countries; infantry, military police, nuclear, biological and chemical protection and transportation assets from Romania – a country that has since become a member of NATO; engineering support from Russia and from Slovakia, which became a member of NATO in 2004; and an intelligence unit deployed to ISAF headquarters by Sweden.

The evolution of NATO's role with respect to ISAF in Afghanistan is described in more detail in Part IV.

Anti-terrorist operations in the Balkans

NATO operations in the Balkans have contributed to making that region less prone to terrorist activities. Action has been taken by NATO-led forces against local terrorist groups with links to the al-Qaida network, as part of the wider campaign against terrorism, particularly through measures aimed at curtailing illegal movements of people, arms and drugs.

Military Concept for Defence against Terrorism

A Military Concept for Defence against Terrorism was approved at the November 2002 Prague Summit. It underlines the Alliance's readiness to help deter, defend, disrupt and protect against terrorist attacks or the threat of such attacks directed from abroad against Allied populations, territory, infrastructure and forces, including by acting against terrorists and those who harbour them; to provide assistance to national authorities in dealing with the consequences of terrorist attacks; to support operations by the European Union or other international organisations or coalitions involving Allies; and to deploy forces as and where required to carry out such missions.

The Partnership Action Plan on Terrorism

Together with its Partner countries, NATO has elaborated a Partnership Action Plan on Terrorism (PAP-T). Issued at the Prague Summit in November 2002, the PAP-T provides a framework for cooperation on terrorism and defines Partnership roles and the instruments for fighting terrorism and managing its consequences. Mediterranean Dialogue countries can also participate in activities under the plan.

The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (succeeded by the NATO-Russia Council in May 2002), the NATO-Ukraine Commission and countries participating in NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue all joined NATO in condemning the September 11 attacks and offering their support to the United States. NATO countries continue to make extensive use of Partnership mechanisms to consult with their Partner countries about further steps. They agree that a comprehensive effort comprising political, economic, diplomatic and military actions as well as law enforcement measures is needed to combat terrorism; in other words, a long-term, multifaceted approach involving NATO as a whole but also involving all the Allies individually, both as members of the Alliance and as members of the United Nations, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) and the European Union.

Protecting against weapons of mass destruction

At the Prague Summit in November 2002, NATO governments endorsed the implementation of five nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) defence initiatives designed to improve the Alliance's defence capabilities against weapons of mass destruction. These consist of:

- a prototype deployable NBC analytical laboratory;
- an NBC joint assessment team;
- a virtual centre of excellence for NBC weapons defence;
- a NATO biological and chemical defence stockpile; and
- a disease surveillance system.

An enhanced package of anti-terrorist measures

An enhanced package of anti-terrorist measures was agreed at the Istanbul Summit in June 2004. These measures include improved intelligence sharing through NATO's Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit and other means; improving NATO's ability to respond rapidly to national requests for assistance in response to a terrorist attack; helping to provide protection during selected major events, including the use of NATO airborne early warning aircraft; strengthening the contribution of NATO-led operations in the Mediterranean, the Balkans and Afghanistan to the fight against terrorism, increasing cooperation with Partner countries and with other international and regional organisations; and improving relevant capabilities. They also include a specialised armaments programme endorsed by the Conference of National Armaments Directors at its meeting in May 2004. This programme focuses on ten areas:

- actions to counter improvised explosive devices, such as car and roadside bombs;
- reduction of the vulnerability of wide-body civilian and military aircraft to man-portable air defence missiles;
- reduction of the vulnerability of helicopters to rocket-propelled grenades;
- protection of harbours and ships from explosive-packed speedboats and underwater divers;
- detection, protection and defeat of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear weapons;
- explosive ordnance disposal;

- precision airdrop technology for special operations forces and their equipment;
- intelligence, surveillance, target acquisition and reconnaissance of terrorists;
- technologies to counter mortar attacks;
- protection of critical infrastructure.

Cyber defence

Efforts are being made to strengthen defences against cyber attacks by providing better protection against the possible disruption of NATO and critical national infrastructure, including information and communications systems.

Civil emergency planning

Significant measures have also been taken to improve preparedness to deal with the consequences of possible terrorist attacks. A Civil Emergency Action Plan for the Improvement of Civil Preparedness against Possible Attacks against Civilian Populations with Chemical, Biological and Radiological Agents was developed in October 2001, in direct response to the events of 11 September 2001 and the subsequent anthrax attacks in the United States. Since then, the action plan has been continuously updated to reflect new threat scenarios and lessons learned.

In the framework of the action plan, NATO and Partner countries are working together to develop complementary civilian measures to address the threat. These include:

- an inventory of national capabilities that could be made available to assist a member or Partner country stricken by a terrorist attack;
- use of the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre at NATO Headquarters to coordinate the consequence management assistance offered by member and Partner countries in response to requests by the attacked country;
- international consequence management exercises for civil-military and civil protection units;
- development of guidelines and minimum standards to improve the interoperability of capabilities offered by countries providing consequence management assistance;
- improved protection of critical infrastructure.

Civil protection

In response to the emergence of growing threats to high-profile public events, the Alliance has taken specific measures to make use of its capabilities to enhance the protection of all the participants. The NATO airborne early warning capability and other forms of practical assistance have been made available on a number of occasions to provide protection during major events such as the 2004 European football championships, the Olympic Games in Athens and the Istanbul Summit meeting.

Enhanced cooperation

None of the measures described above negate the need for intensified cooperation with other international organisations able to contribute to efforts to improve defence against terrorism through information exchange and coordinated action. For example, NATO and the European Union have exchanged information on civil emergency planning and in other related fields. NATO is contributing actively to the work of the UN Counter Terrorism Committee, holds regular consultations with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, and works together with EUROCONTROL, the International Civil Aviation Organisation and the International Air Transport Association to improve civil-military coordination in air traffic management.

The pattern of measures taken over recent years to combat new threats includes national initiatives taken by NATO member countries, to which other countries, often including other Allied and Partner countries, are contributing. In May 2003, for example, the United States launched a Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), involving a global partnership of countries seeking to halt the flow of dangerous technologies to and from states and non-state actors engaged in proliferation. Eight NATO countries, as well as Australia and Japan, have taken part in this initiative from the outset, contributing expertise and experience in the detection and the deterrence of potential threats. NATO supports and pursues a wide range of political and defence initiatives to deal with proliferation. For more details on this subject, see Part X.

CHAPTER 20

NEW CAPABILITIES

NATO is putting into place a series of measures to help improve the military capabilities of its member countries. Aimed at ensuring that the Alliance can fulfil its present and future operational commitments and fight new threats such as terrorism and the spread of weapons of mass destruction, these efforts build on a comprehensive array of measures taken since the end of the Cold War to adapt the Alliance to new challenges. This is particularly important as NATO takes on new missions in faraway places like Afghanistan, which require forces that reach farther, faster, can stay in the field longer and can still undertake the most demanding operations if need be. Furthermore, these forces must be properly equipped and protected for the more dangerous missions they undertake.

In order to achieve these new objectives, the Alliance introduced three key initiatives that are the main driving force behind the transformation of the entire organisation: the Prague Capabilities Commitment to improve capabilities in critical areas such as strategic lift and air-to-ground surveillance; the streamlining of the military command structure; and the creation of the NATO Response Force.

Plans for an Alliance ground surveillance capability have moved forward and will provide situational awareness before and during NATO operations. To address the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, the Alliance is considering the possibility of missile defence for its territory, forces and population centres. It has also created a Multinational Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Defence Battalion to defend against these threats.

The Prague Capabilities Commitment

The Prague Capabilities Commitment (PCC) succeeded the Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) launched at the 1999 Washington Summit, which was designed to bring about improvements in the capabilities needed to ensure the effectiveness of future multinational operations across the full spectrum of Alliance missions, with a special focus on improving interoperability. While DCI contributed to improvements in Alliance capabilities in quite a number of important areas, it was couched in terms of general commitments by member countries as a whole and did not require them to report individually on progress

achieved. The 11 September 2001 attacks on the United States increased both the urgency and the importance of more focused capability improvements.

NATO made firm political commitments to improve capabilities in 400 specific areas which are fundamentally important to the efficient conduct of all Alliance missions. These cover the following eight fields:

- chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) defence;
- intelligence, surveillance and target acquisition;
- air-to-ground surveillance;
- command, control and communications;
- combat effectiveness, including precision-guided munitions and suppression of enemy air defence;
- strategic airlift and sealift;
- air-to-air refuelling;
- deployable combat support and combat service support units.

Defence ministers also decided that this new initiative should be based on firm country-specific commitments undertaken on the basis of national decisions and should incorporate target dates for the correction of shortfalls. In addition, such commitments should further increase multinational cooperation and role-sharing and should be realistic and achievable in economic terms, while representing a challenge to member countries. Moreover, they should achieve mutual reinforcement and full transparency with the related activities of the European Capability Action Plan initiated by the European Union.

While the focus of the new initiative was sharper and involved individual commitments by member countries to specific capability improvements, to be contributed individually or together with other Allies, it concentrated on realistic and attainable objectives. The aim was clear: to deliver the urgently needed capability improvements to enable the Alliance to carry out all its missions, wherever they might occur.

The PCC therefore represents an important effort to ensure that Alliance forces have the means necessary to conduct operations swiftly and effectively for as long as necessary. It is by this agreement that heads of state and government at the Prague Summit committed themselves to substantive capability improvements. While the principal responsibility for doing this lies with the governments of the member countries themselves, collectively the Alliance has put in place measures to track and monitor progress and take action to resolve any problems that arise. The PCC also seeks to identify ways of ensuring the mutual reinforcement of NATO's efforts and those of the European

Union. Success in implementing these challenging but realistic and achievable goals is central to the fulfilment of the wider agenda laid down in Prague.

NATO command arrangements

A further central focus of the transformation process has been the streamlining of NATO's command arrangements, the key elements of which are described in Part III. The function of the command structure is to plan and execute operations, to promote the modernisation and interoperability of Allied forces and to enhance the transatlantic link, which is at the heart of intra-Alliance cooperation. Changes to the command structure reflect these imperatives and assign a particularly important, continuous development role to Allied Command Transformation. This new command incorporates a NATO Joint Warfare Centre, a Joint Force Training Centre and a Joint Analysis and Lessons Learned Centre. Not part of the structure but linked to it are national and multinational Centres of Excellence that provide improved opportunities for training, interoperability, testing and developing military doctrines and assessing new concepts.

NATO Response Force

The establishment of the NATO Response Force (NRF) is an integral part of the transformation of NATO's military capabilities, complementing the Prague Capabilities Commitment and the new command structure.

The NRF was created with unprecedented speed. The significance of this achievement lies not only in the development of the force itself, but in the fact that its establishment affects other areas of capability improvement and acts as a catalyst for the sustained transformation and development of NATO forces as a whole. The NRF is one of the most important outcomes of the Prague Summit.

The NRF is a joint force of land, sea and air elements that can be tailored to individual missions and deployed rapidly wherever the North Atlantic Council requires. It is designed as a force that comprises technologically advanced, flexible, deployable, interoperable and sustainable elements, ready to deploy its leading elements within five days and able to sustain itself without further support for thirty days. It is not a permanent or standing force but one composed of units assigned by member countries in rotation, for set periods, and trained and certified together.

This force aims to prevent conflict or the threat of conflict from escalating into a wider dispute that threatens security and stability. It is capable of undertaking appropriate missions on its own or serving as part of a larger force

contributing to the full range of Alliance military operations. It could therefore be deployed in a number of different ways, for example as a show of force and demonstration of Alliance solidarity in the face of aggression; as a key element of a collective defence operation undertaken, in accordance with Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, as a crisis management, peace support or stabilisation force for operations outside the framework of Article 5, or as an advance force for a larger-scale military operation, pending the deployment of other resources.

The prototype NRF comprising some 9500 troops was activated in October 2003. In the same timeframe, at their informal meeting in Colorado Springs, USA, NATO defence ministers participated in a study seminar designed to focus attention on the conceptual role of the NRF and the decision-making process relating to its potential deployment. At a ceremony in Brunssum, the Netherlands, on 15 October 2003, the new force was presented with its colours by General James Jones, Supreme Allied Commander Europe and the strategic commander of the newly established Allied Command Operations.

In an early demonstration of the force's initial capabilities, elements of the force including components from eleven NATO countries participated in a mock crisis response operation in Turkey in November 2003. The crisis involved a fictional threat to UN staff and to civilians located in a country outside the Euro-Atlantic area from terrorist activity and hostile forces. It called for an embargo on movements of forces and weapons, counterterrorist operations and a visible demonstration of Alliance solidarity, political determination and military capabilities.

Exercises and trials have continued to promote the development of the force on its planned schedule. In October 2004, during the informal meeting of NATO defence ministers in Poiana Brasov, Romania, the NATO Secretary General announced that the force had achieved its initial operational capability.

In September 2005, naval and air elements of the NRF were made available to the United States, following an official request for support after the extensive damage inflicted by Hurricane Katrina. The NRF was also used to provide humanitarian aid to Pakistan following the devastating earthquake of October 2005.

The force will be fully operational by October 2006, with a planned land element of about 21 000 troops, and air and maritime elements of roughly the same size.

Alliance ground surveillance

Significant progress in initiating improvements to capabilities in certain specific fields was made prior to the Prague Summit. In autumn 2002, plans

for an Alliance ground surveillance (AGS) capability, a key element of NATO transformation, took a positive turn with the announcement of decisions on the cooperative development of a radar sensor designed to meet both the needs of the Alliance-owned AGS system and the national requirements of the countries participating in the development programme.

NATO is procuring an AGS system that will give Alliance commanders a picture of the situation on the ground in mission areas. It will consist of a mix of manned and unmanned radar platforms that can look down on the ground and relay data to commanders, providing them with “eyes in the sky” over a specific area.

The AGS system will be produced by the Transatlantic Industrial Partnership for Surveillance (TIPS), a consortium of over 80 companies, including the European Aeronautic Defence and Space Company (EADS), Galileo Avionica, General Dynamics Canada, Indra, Northrop Grumman and Thales. The system is scheduled to achieve an initial operational capability in 2010 and full capability in 2012.

Just as NATO’s airborne warning and control system (AWACS) radar aircraft oversees airspace, AGS will be able to look at what is happening on the ground. AGS will provide situational awareness before and during NATO operations. This is an essential capability for modern military operations and will be a key tool for the NATO Response Force (NRF).

CBRN battalion

Another milestone was reached on 1 December 2003, with the achievement of initial operating capability by the Alliance’s Multinational Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Defence Battalion. Designed to provide capabilities specifically for defence against CBRN threats as well as timely assessments and advice to commanders and forces in the field, this measure is consistent with the NRF concept and will complement NRF capabilities. In its initial formation, the battalion was led by the Czech Republic, which provided some 160 specialists that formed the core of the unit, and thirteen NATO member countries participated.

Missile defence

NATO is pursuing projects aimed at protecting Alliance forces, territory and populations against missile threats. This is in response to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, including missiles of all ranges.

By 2010, NATO expects to have the capability to protect deployed troops against short- and medium-range ballistic missiles by intercepting them in the boost, mid-course and final phases. This active layered theatre ballistic missile defence system will also have the capability to counter aircraft, unmanned aerial vehicles and other aerial threats.

NATO is also examining options for protecting Alliance forces, territory and populations against the full range of missile threats. This full-scale missile defence effort was initiated by NATO heads of state and government at the 2002 Prague Summit, which agreed a new Missile Defence Feasibility Study. The study was led by the NATO Consultation, Command and Control Agency (NC3A) in the framework of the NATO Security Investment Programme. Following a competitive bidding process, and based on NC3A recommendation, an 18-month contract was awarded to the winning consortium to examine the technical feasibility, costs and timescales for a missile defence system based on NATO's requirements.

PART VI

THE OPENING UP OF THE ALLIANCE TO NEW MEMBER COUNTRIES

- CHAPTER 21** **The enlargement process**
- CHAPTER 22** **The Membership Action Plan**

CHAPTER 21

THE ENLARGEMENT PROCESS

Provision for the enlargement of NATO is made in Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty. This is the basis of the open door policy adopted by NATO regarding the accession of new member countries. Decisions on the extension of invitations to potential new member countries to begin accession talks are taken jointly by all the existing members.

Enlargement is an ongoing process. While four countries joined the Alliance between 1949 and the early 1980s (Turkey and Greece in 1952, Germany in 1955, Spain in 1982) the accession of new members since the end of the Cold War has been the most spectacular, in terms of numbers and political impact. Ten countries – Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia – joined NATO in two waves of Alliance enlargement and three countries – Albania, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* – are currently participating in the Membership Action Plan (MAP), a programme that prepares aspirants for NATO membership. NATO's enlargement process has both responded to the security needs of those countries aspiring to join the Alliance and helped build greater stability throughout Europe.

The beginnings of change

The roots of the changes which transformed the political map of Europe at the end of the 1980s can be traced to a number of developments during the 1960s and 1970s. Three events stand out in particular: the adoption by the Alliance, in December 1967, of the Harmel doctrine based on the parallel policies of maintaining adequate defence while seeking a relaxation of tensions in East-West relations and working towards solutions to the underlying political problems dividing Europe; the introduction by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in 1969 of Chancellor Willy Brandt's *Ostpolitik*, designed to bring about a more positive relationship with Eastern European countries and the Soviet Union within the constraints imposed by their governments' domestic policies and actions abroad; and the adoption of the Helsinki Final Act in August 1975, which established new standards and codes of conduct with regard to human rights issues and introduced measures to increase mutual confidence between East and West.

A series of similarly important events marked the course of East-West relations in the 1980s. These included NATO's deployment of intermediate-range

nuclear forces (INF) in Europe following the December 1979 double-track decision on nuclear modernisation and arms control; the Washington Treaty, signed in December 1987, which brought about the elimination of US and Soviet land-based INF missiles on a global basis; early signs of change in Eastern Europe associated with the emergence and recognition, despite later setbacks, of the “Solidarity” independent trade union movement in Poland in August 1980; the consequences of the December 1979 Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and the ultimate withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan in February 1989; and, finally, the March 1985 nomination of Mikhail Gorbachev as General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party, and his bold moves towards *perestroika* (restructuring) and *glasnost* (openness).

In March 1989, in the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), promising new arms control negotiations opened in Vienna between the 23 countries of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty Organisation on reductions in conventional forces in Europe (CFE). The NATO Summit Meeting held in Brussels against this backdrop at the end of May 1989 was of particular significance. Members recognised the changes that were underway in the Soviet Union as well as in other Eastern European countries and outlined the Alliance’s approach to overcoming the division of Europe and achieving its long-standing objective of shaping a just and peaceful European order. They reiterated the continuing need for credible and effective deterrent forces and an adequate defence, and set forth a broad agenda for expanded East-West cooperation.

Developments of major significance for the entire European continent and for international relations as a whole continued as the year progressed. By the end of 1989 and during the early weeks of 1990, considerable progress was made towards the reform of the political and economic systems of Poland and Hungary. In the German Democratic Republic, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Romania, steps were taken towards freedom and democracy which went far beyond expectations.

The promise held out for over 40 years to bring an end to the division of Europe, and with it an end to the division of Germany, took on real meaning with the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989. Beyond its fundamental symbolism, it opened the path to rapid and dramatic progress in most Central and Eastern European countries. Within less than a year, on 3 October 1990, the unification of the two German states took place with the backing of the international community and the acquiescence of the Soviet government, on the basis of an international treaty and the democratic will of the German people as a whole. Within just a few years, a number of Central and Eastern European countries had established membership of NATO as their principal

foreign policy goal despite the negative image of the Alliance portrayed by the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact governments during the Cold War.

At its July 1990 London Summit, NATO extended the hand of friendship to its former adversaries and initiated a process of dialogue and cooperation. In December 1991, it created a joint forum for multilateral consultation and cooperation in the form of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), and in January 1994 the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme was launched to provide a framework for bilateral cooperation with each country on an individual basis. The NACC was replaced by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) in May 1997, which has since provided the overall political framework for cooperation between NATO and its Partner countries.

Within a short space of time, all the countries involved had responded positively to these successive initiatives and had begun participating in practical cooperation programmes. Several countries also began to seek support for their future accession to the North Atlantic Treaty. In 1994, the Alliance recognised the need for a considered response, framed in terms of its overall objectives and long-term intentions for extending cooperation further afield and laying the basis for peace and stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area.

At the January 1994 Brussels Summit, NATO leaders stated that they “expect and would welcome NATO expansion that would reach to democratic states to our East”. They reaffirmed that the Alliance was open to membership for other European states in a position to further the principles of the North Atlantic Treaty and contribute to security in the North Atlantic area.

Practical steps were taken to move the process forward in a manner that ensured Alliance goals and policies would not be compromised and also reassured Russia and other countries that the process would pose no threat to them. The Alliance needed to demonstrate that, on the contrary, extending the sphere of stability in the Euro-Atlantic area would enhance their own security and would be in their interests.

Study on NATO Enlargement

Accordingly, in 1995, the Alliance undertook a Study on NATO Enlargement to examine the “why and how” of future admissions into the Alliance. The results of the Study were shared with interested Partner countries and made public. With regard to the “why” of NATO enlargement, the study concluded that, with the end of the Cold War and the disappearance of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, there was both a need for and a unique opportunity to build improved security in the whole Euro-Atlantic area, without recreating new dividing lines.

The study further concluded that enlargement of the Alliance would contribute to enhanced stability and security for 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 characteristic of relations 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 would reinforce 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.

With regard to the "how" of enlargement, the study confirmed that any future extension of Alliance membership would be through accession of new member states to the North Atlantic Treaty in accordance with its Article 10. Once admitted, new members would enjoy all the rights and assume all the obligations of membership. They would need to accept and conform to the principles, policies and procedures adopted by all the members of the Alliance at the time they joined. The willingness and ability to meet such commitments would be a critical factor in any decision taken by the Alliance to invite a country to join.

Other conditions were stipulated, including the need for candidate countries to settle ethnic disputes or external territorial disputes by peaceful means before they could become members and to treat minority populations in accordance with guidelines established by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. The ability of candidate countries to contribute militarily to collective defence and to peacekeeping operations would also be a factor. Ultimately, the study concluded that Allies would decide by consensus whether to invite additional countries to join, basing their decision on their judgement at the time as to whether the membership of a specific country would contribute to security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area.

NATO accession

In order to explore the issues that had been raised in the 1995 Study on NATO Enlargement, NATO decided to conduct "intensified dialogues" with each of the countries that had declared their interest in joining the Alliance. Intensified dialogues were first launched with the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland in early 1997, in the run-up to NATO's first post-Cold War round of enlargement in 1999. As early as July 1997, Allied heads of state and government were able to invite these three countries to begin accession talks. Accession protocols were signed in December 1997 and were then ratified

by all 16 NATO countries. The three countries acceded to the Treaty, thereby becoming members of NATO in March 1999.

At the Prague Summit in November 2002, Allied heads of state and government invited Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia to begin accession talks. All seven of these countries had previously been participants in the Membership Action Plan (MAP). The procedures followed both by the existing NATO members and by the invited countries during the next twelve months illustrate the accession process that would apply to future member countries.

Protocols of accession were signed by the foreign ministers of the invited countries at NATO Headquarters on 26 March 2003. By the end of April 2004, all Alliance member countries had notified the government of the United States of their acceptance of the protocols, in accordance with the North Atlantic Treaty, and on 2 March 2004, the NATO Secretary General formally invited the seven countries to become members. At a ceremony in Washington, DC, on 29 March 2004, each country deposited its formal instruments of accession, as prescribed by the Treaty, thereby legally and formally becoming a member country of the Alliance.

Between the moment when the seven were invited to start accession talks and the projected signing of accession protocols, ratification and membership, the invited countries were involved to the maximum extent in Alliance activities and continued to benefit from participation in the Membership Action Plan. Each of the invited countries also presented a timetable for necessary reforms to be carried out before and after accession in order to enhance their contribution to the Alliance.

A newly constructed extension to NATO Headquarters in Brussels was inaugurated by the Secretary General on 17 March 2004, providing accommodation for the delegations of the new member countries. On 2 April 2004, following the ceremonial raising of the flags of the new members outside NATO Headquarters, the first formal meeting of the North Atlantic Council with the participation of 26 member countries was held.

CHAPTER 22

THE MEMBERSHIP ACTION PLAN

At the Washington Summit in April 1999, NATO launched a Membership Action Plan (MAP) to assist countries wishing to join the Alliance in their preparations by providing advice, assistance and practical support. Nine countries initially adhered to this plan, namely Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.* Croatia joined in 2001. Seven of these countries – Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia – were subsequently invited at the Prague Summit in November 2002 to begin accession talks and formally joined NATO in March 2004.

The MAP initially drew extensively on the experience gained in assisting the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to prepare for membership and from working with the seven members that joined in March 2004. It seeks to help aspirant countries focus their preparations on meeting the goals and priorities set out within it and has continued to provide a range of activities designed to strengthen each country's candidacy, thereby giving substance to NATO's commitment to keep the door to membership open. The Plan is not, however, simply a checklist for aspiring countries to fulfil, and participation in the MAP does not guarantee future membership. Decisions to invite aspirants to start accession talks are taken by consensus among NATO member countries and on a case-by-case basis.

The MAP does not replace the Partnership for Peace programme. Full participation in the latter, and in its associated Planning and Review Process (PARP), is also considered essential as it allows aspirant countries to develop interoperability with NATO forces and to prepare their force structures and capabilities for possible future membership. The PARP serves a variety of purposes. It provides a basis for enhancing transparency in defence policy matters, for identifying and evaluating forces and capabilities which might be made available for multinational training, exercises and operations in conjunction with Alliance forces, and for defence reform.

At the beginning of each MAP cycle, aspirants submit an annual national programme on preparations for possible membership, covering political, economic, defence, military, resource, security and legal issues. They set their own objectives, targets and work schedules and update them annually. At the end of the cycle, NATO draws up progress reports for the individual countries participating in the MAP. These form the basis of a discussion between the North Atlantic Council and the country concerned on progress made.

Albania, Croatia and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* continue to work closely with the Alliance in the MAP framework with a view to meeting the criteria that would enable membership invitations to be extended to them to begin accession talks.

PART VII

PARTNERSHIP AND COOPERATION

- | | |
|-------------------|---|
| CHAPTER 23 | The Euro-Atlantic Partnership: The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace |
| CHAPTER 24 | NATO and Russia |
| CHAPTER 25 | NATO and Ukraine |
| CHAPTER 26 | Cooperation with countries in the Mediterranean region and the broader Middle East |
| CHAPTER 27 | Cooperation with countries in southeastern Europe |

CHAPTER 23

THE EURO-ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP: THE EURO-ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL AND THE PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

The Alliance's policy of developing partnerships with a large number of non-member countries has played a key role in altering the strategic environment in the Euro-Atlantic area since the end of the Cold War. By promoting political dialogue and cooperation in a wide range of areas, different forms of partnership are helping to create a Euro-Atlantic security culture characterised by a strong determination to apply international cooperation to the task of tackling critical security challenges within and beyond the Euro-Atlantic community.

By stimulating and supporting defence reform in many Partner countries, Euro-Atlantic Partnership is also contributing to democratic transformation. It is helping to build modern, effective and democratically responsible armed forces and other defence institutions, and is assisting Partner countries to manage the social and material consequences of reforms.

Today's challenges to Euro-Atlantic security include threats such as terrorism that have domestic and external sources and are transnational in nature. Increasingly such threats come from the periphery of the Euro-Atlantic area. In this environment, international stability and security depend increasingly on domestic reform and on far-reaching international cooperation. The Partnership has a key role to play in both respects.

The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) provides the overall political framework for relations with Partner countries. In addition, each country is able to build up an individual relationship with the Alliance through the Partnership for Peace (PfP) – a programme of bilateral practical cooperation from which Partners can choose activities according to their own priorities.

NATO has also developed special relationships with Russia and Ukraine as well as countries in the Mediterranean region and the broader Middle East. Described in other chapters, cooperation with these countries builds on many of the activities and mechanisms developed in the framework of both the EAPC and the PfP programme – the two complementary pillars that together make-up the Euro-Atlantic Partnership.

The evolution of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership

November 1989 saw the fall of the Berlin Wall, signalling the end of the East-West confrontation that had dominated international relations and divided Europe since the end of the Second World War. Within a short period, the remarkable pace of change in central and eastern Europe left NATO with a new and very different set of security challenges from those that had characterised it previously. Political change on an unprecedented scale had opened up great opportunities for enhancing security in Europe but, inevitably, brought with it new uncertainties and the potential for instability.

Allied leaders responded at their summit meeting in London, in July 1990, by proposing a new cooperative relationship with all the countries of central and eastern Europe. Events accelerated at great speed, and in December 1991 NATO was already launching the first formal institutional structure promoting the new relationship – the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) – a forum which would bring together NATO and its new Partner countries to discuss issues of common concern. It met for the first time on 20 December 1991, the day on which the Soviet Union ceased to exist, and offered the newly independent states help in realising their ambitions to participate fully as democratic countries, both regionally and in the wider world, in addressing multinational concerns.

The sea change in attitudes towards security was also enshrined in a new strategic concept for the Alliance, issued in November 1991, which adopted a broad approach to security reflecting three mutually reinforcing elements: dialogue, cooperation and the maintenance of a collective defence capability. While the defence dimension remained indispensable, the opportunities for achieving Alliance objectives through political means were greater than ever before. Dialogue and cooperation would form essential parts of the approach required to manage the diversity of challenges facing the Alliance. With the Cold War over, these included measures to reduce the risk of conflict arising out of misunderstanding or design and to better manage crises affecting the security of the Allies, steps to increase mutual understanding and confidence among all European states, and new initiatives to expand the opportunities for genuine partnership in dealing with common security problems.

At its inception, NACC consultations focused on residual Cold War security concerns such as the withdrawal of Russian troops from the Baltic states. Political cooperation was also launched on a number of security and defence-related issues. The NACC broke new ground by helping to support reform and build transparency and confidence throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. However, it focused on multilateral, political dialogue and did not provide the opportunity for Partner countries to develop individual cooperative relations with NATO that were tailored to their particular situations and requirements. This changed in

1994 with the launch of the Partnership for Peace. This major programme of practical bilateral cooperation between NATO and individual Partner countries represented a significant leap forward in the cooperative process. Within three years, the progress made was further consolidated with the establishment of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council to replace the NACC and to build on its achievements, paving the way for the development of an enhanced and more operational partnership.

The Partnership process consists in building communication and understanding among all the countries involved, some of which have had longstanding regional, territorial, political, ethnic or religious disputes. Joint activities aimed at finding common solutions to common security challenges have led to important achievements in overcoming past prejudices and in establishing a clear vision of the mutual benefits to be gained from cooperation.

Since the launch of the Partnership process, remarkable progress has been made and the EAPC and PfP programme have become key fixtures of the Euro-Atlantic security architecture. There have been setbacks and difficulties, which were perhaps unavoidable given the complex process of political, economic and social change taking place in central and eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. However, within just a few years, the EAPC and the PfP programme have steadily developed their own dynamic, as successive steps have been taken by NATO and its Partner countries to extend security cooperation, building incrementally on the partnership arrangements they have created.

Today, Partner countries consult regularly with the member countries of the Alliance. They develop individual cooperation on issues encompassing many different aspects of defence and security. Their military forces frequently exercise and interact together and their soldiers regularly serve alongside each other in NATO-led peace-support operations. They are also working together with the member countries of the Alliance in a common cause against the threat of terrorism.

The need for NATO itself to undergo far-reaching transformation in order to meet the new challenges of the evolving security environment has had an important impact on the development of partnership and cooperation, the activities and mechanisms of which have had to be adapted to meet NATO's new priorities. Moreover, cooperation has had to be deepened and broadened in order to meet the aspirations of different Partner countries and remain an attractive proposition to them. Consequently, new initiatives were launched at successive NATO summit meetings in Washington in 1999, Prague in 2002 and Istanbul in 2004 to deepen and enhance cooperation between member and Partner countries.

The changing face of partnership

The Euro-Atlantic Partnership has helped prepare some Partner countries for NATO membership. It also provides a unique framework for other countries not seeking Alliance membership to contribute to Euro-Atlantic security.

Over the years, 30 countries have joined the Partnership for Peace, namely Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Hungary, Ireland, Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Russia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia,* Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Uzbekistan.

Ten of the above Partner countries have since become members of NATO and three candidate countries are working to prepare themselves for future membership (see Part VI).

The successive rounds of enlargement have significantly changed the balance between member and Partner countries. There are marked differences between the situations facing the 20 remaining Partner countries in terms of their situations and development, which has also had a bearing on the focus of partnership activities. Some Partners are in the early stages of developing their defence structures and capabilities. Others are able to contribute significant forces to NATO-led operations and to offer advice, training and assistance based on their own experiences to other Partner countries.

Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia and Montenegro have also expressed their desire to join the Partnership for Peace. NATO fully supports this initiative but has set a number of conditions for the accession of both countries to the programme, including full cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and, in particular, the detention and handover to the Tribunal of persons indicted for war crimes.

The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council

The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) brings together a total of 46 countries – 26 member and 20 Partner countries – in a multilateral forum providing for regular dialogue and consultation between them on political and security-related issues. It serves simultaneously as the political framework for the individual bilateral relationships developed between NATO and countries participating in the PfP programme.

The decision taken in 1997 to create the EAPC reflected the recognition by the Alliance that the time had come to move beyond the achievements of the NACC and to build a security forum that matched the increasingly

sophisticated relationships being developed with Partners under the PfP programme. The level of cooperation already achieved was exemplified by the NATO-led peacekeeping operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where troops from 14 Partner countries deployed in 1996 to serve alongside their Alliance counterparts. The transition from the NACC to the EAPC complemented parallel steps to enhance the role of the Partnership for Peace by increasing the Partner countries' involvement in decision-making and planning across the entire scope of partnership activities.

In addition to short-term consultations in the EAPC on current political and security-related issues, longer-term consultation and cooperation takes place in a wide range of areas. These include crisis management and peace-support operations; regional issues; arms control and issues related to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction; the fight against terrorism; defence issues such as planning, budgeting, policy and strategy; civil emergency planning and disaster preparedness; armaments cooperation; nuclear safety; air traffic management; and scientific cooperation.

The EAPC has at its disposal a range of options which gives it flexibility and allows either for meetings of all the NATO member states and Partner countries or of smaller, open-ended working groups, depending on the subjects under discussion.

Most Partner countries have established diplomatic missions at NATO Headquarters in Brussels, facilitating regular communications and enabling consultation to take place whenever there is a need for it. Meetings of the EAPC are held monthly at the level of ambassadors, annually at the level of foreign and defence ministers and chiefs of defence, as well as occasionally at the summit level or when an exceptional event occurs. In 2005, a new high-level EAPC Security Forum was launched, which will meet annually to discuss important security issues in an informal setting and will bring together senior government officials, parliamentarians, opinion formers and representatives of civil society.

The Partnership for Peace

Based on the practical cooperation and commitment to democratic principles that underpin the Alliance itself, the Partnership for Peace (PfP) seeks to promote reform, increase stability, diminish threats to peace and build strengthened security relationships between individual Partner countries and NATO, as well as among Partner countries.

The essence of the PfP programme is the partnership formed individually between each Partner country and NATO, tailored to individual needs and

jointly implemented at the level and pace chosen by each participating government. Since the creation of the Partnership for Peace, a comprehensive tool kit of practical mechanisms has been developed to support the implementation of PfP aims and objectives and to translate ideas into action. These instruments provide a framework for both bilateral and multilateral actions by extending to Partner countries the opportunity to take part in effective programmes reflecting the substantive nature of their engagement with NATO.

The formal basis for the Partnership for Peace is a Framework Document issued by the Alliance in 1994, together with the invitation to interested countries to participate in the programme. The Framework Document enshrines a commitment by the member countries of the Alliance to consult with any Partner country that perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence or security. Each Partner country also sets out specific undertakings and political commitments to uphold democratic societies, to maintain the principles of international law, to fulfil obligations under the UN Charter, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Helsinki Final Act and international disarmament and arms control agreements, to refrain from the threat or use of force against other states, to respect existing borders, and to settle disputes peacefully. Specific commitments are also made to promote transparency in national defence planning and budgeting, to establish democratic control over armed forces and to develop the capacity for joint action with NATO in peacekeeping and humanitarian operations.

The choice of individual activities within the PfP framework is based on each Partner country's ambitions and capabilities. The areas selected are put forward to the Alliance in a Presentation Document which serves as the basis for Individual Partnership Programmes jointly developed and agreed between NATO and each Partner country. These two-year programmes are drawn up from an extensive menu of activities reflecting Partnership objectives and priorities. Cooperation focuses in particular on military interoperability and on defence reform and managing the consequences of this reform. It also touches on virtually every field of NATO activity, including defence policy and planning, civil-military relations, education and training, air defence, communications and information systems, defence conversion matters, crisis management and civil emergency planning, information and communications programmes and scientific cooperation.

Bilateral programmes and military exercises have helped Partner countries to develop forces with the capacity to participate in peacekeeping activities alongside NATO forces, in accordance with one of the key aims of the Partnership for Peace. Increasingly, they are adapting their military forces to the Alliance's operational norms to help ensure effectiveness in the field and are adopting procedures and systems compatible with those used by NATO.

The Partnership Coordination Cell, established at the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE) in 1994, works with both of NATO's Strategic Commands to contribute to this process and helps coordinate PfP training and exercises.

Significant initiatives were launched at the Washington Summit in April 1999 to increase the operational focus of the Partnership for Peace and the involvement of Partner countries in PfP decision-making and planning. These included the introduction of an Operational Capabilities Concept aimed at developing closer and more focused military cooperation and improving the military effectiveness of multinational forces. A Political-Military Framework was developed to strengthen consultation during an escalating crisis which might call for the deployment of peacekeeping troops and to involve Partner countries earlier in discussions of operational planning and force generation matters. A PfP Training and Education Enhancement Programme was also introduced, designed to help improve interoperability and promote greater cooperation and dialogue among the wider defence and security communities in both NATO and Partner countries. There are also a number of recognised PfP Training Centres that contribute to the development of training opportunities for PfP countries. To integrate Partner countries better in the daily work of the Partnership, PfP Staff Elements manned by officers from Partner countries have been established at eight NATO military headquarters.

Guidance on interoperability or capability requirements is provided under a PfP Planning and Review Process designed to ensure that Partner forces are better able to operate with the forces of NATO member countries in joint peacekeeping operations. This process has contributed significantly to the effectiveness of Partner country participation in NATO-led peace-support operations in the Balkans and in Afghanistan. The mechanism used is modelled on NATO's own force planning system and is available to Partner countries wishing to make use of it. Planning targets known as Partnership Goals are negotiated with each participating country, providing a yardstick for measuring progress in the course of extensive reviews. Requirements have become progressively more complex and demanding and are linked to the capability improvements that NATO member states have set for themselves. The Planning and Review Process is also used by Partner countries to develop effective, affordable and sustainable armed forces and to promote wider defence reform efforts.

A Partnership Real-time Information Management and Exchange System (PRIME), developed by Switzerland in 2001, enables Partner and NATO member countries to exchange information and to request or offer participation and resources in the framework of NATO programmes.

Further steps were taken at the Prague Summit in November 2002 to deepen cooperation in the framework of the Partnership. A comprehensive

review of both the EAPC and the Partnership for Peace recommended enhancing cooperation on defence reform, strengthening the political dialogue with Partner countries and further enhancing their involvement in the planning, conduct and oversight of activities in which they participate. A Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism was also launched to provide a framework to enhance multilateral cooperation in combating terror.

To address the reform needs of Partner countries, a new bilateral mechanism was introduced at the Prague Summit in the form of Individual Partnership Action Plans (IPAPs). These allow the Alliance to tailor its advice and assistance to Partner countries which are willing and able to pursue comprehensive reform plans, in particular on issues related to defence and larger policy and institutional reform. Developed on a two-yearly basis, such plans are designed to bring together all the various cooperation mechanisms through which a Partner country interacts with the Alliance, sharpening the focus of activities in order to support domestic reform efforts more effectively. Intensified political dialogue on relevant issues is an integral part of an IPAP process. IPAPs also seek to make it easier to coordinate bilateral assistance provided by individual NATO member countries and Partners, as well as to coordinate efforts with other relevant international institutions. In November 2004, Georgia became the first country to develop an Individual Partnership Action Plan with NATO, and such plans are also being developed with a number of other Partner countries.

Building on progress made at Prague, further steps were taken at the Istanbul Summit in June 2004 to strengthen the Partnership, to tailor it to specific, key issues and to address the needs and capabilities of individual Partner countries more directly. Defence reform was recognised as the Euro-Atlantic Partnership's key priority, and a Partnership Action Plan on Defence Institution Building was launched to encourage and support Partner countries in building effective and democratically responsible defence institutions.

Opportunities for Partners to enhance their contributions to NATO-led operations are being increased by involving troop-contributing countries earlier in the decision-making process and providing more possibilities for political consultation. The Operational Capabilities Concept is also being enhanced by measures to promote greater military interoperability as well as the transformation of defence structures in keeping with NATO's own evolving operational roles and capabilities. Work is also being undertaken with a view to organising programmes offered within the PfP framework into overarching objectives and priorities, enabling Partner countries to identify more easily those activities of particular relevance to them.

A decision was also taken at the Istanbul Summit that NATO should place special focus on engaging with its Partner countries in two strategically important regions, namely the Caucasus (Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia) and

Central Asia (Kazakhstan, the Kyrgyz Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan). A Special Representative has been assigned for the two regions to act on behalf of the NATO Secretary General, as well as two liaison officers. These positions are designed to strengthen NATO's ability to provide tailored assistance and advice on the implementation of relevant aspects of Individual Partnership Action Plans to the countries that have developed them. They are also designed to further cooperation on issues in the Partnership Action Plans on Defence Institution Building and against Terrorism, as well as through the Planning and Review Process which is of particular importance in the context of defence reform issues.

Defence reform

Many Partner countries are faced with the challenge of transforming the Cold War legacies of vast armies and huge stockpiles of weapons and munitions. Carrying out necessary defence reforms to develop the capabilities needed to address today's security challenges and to make effective contributions to crisis management and peacekeeping operations also represents a major task. It is equally important to find ways to manage the social and economic consequences of these reforms.

One of the most important contributions made by the Partnership for Peace has been in the form of the bilateral programmes developed with individual Partner countries to share expertise and provide assistance in tackling the extensive conceptual and practical problems associated with the defence reform process. NATO has also launched a number of initiatives to support the efforts of Partner countries in areas such as the reintegration of military personnel into civilian life, the redevelopment of military sites and the safe disposal of redundant or obsolete weapons and munitions.

Building effective institutions

Effective and efficient state defence institutions under civilian and democratic control are fundamental to stability in the Euro-Atlantic area and essential for international security cooperation. In recognition of this vital link, a new Partnership Action Plan on Defence Institution Building, endorsed by the heads of state and government of EAPC countries, was launched at the Istanbul Summit in June 2004.

This new mechanism aims to reinforce efforts by Partner countries to initiate and carry forward the reform and restructuring of their defence institutions to meet domestic needs and fulfil international commitments. The Action Plan defines common objectives for work in this area, encourages exchanges of

relevant experience, and helps tailor and focus bilateral defence and security assistance programmes.

The most important objectives of the Action Plan target the development of effective and transparent arrangements for the democratic control of defence activities, civilian participation in developing defence and security policy, effective, transparent legislative and judicial oversight of the defence sector, and the introduction of processes that can properly assess security risks and national defence requirements and match them with affordable and interoperable capabilities. The Action Plan also places emphasis on the importance of effective international cooperation and good-neighbourly relations in defence and security matters. Its implementation seeks to make maximum use of existing EAPC and PfP tools and mechanisms, including the PfP Planning and Review Process, a key instrument for implementing the Action Plan's objectives that is being adapted to better fulfil this role. Effective implementation also necessitates the development of a common understanding of standards and concepts related to defence, defence management and defence reform.

The Trust Fund policy

Of particular significance in the area of defence reform has been the establishment of the NATO/PfP Trust Fund policy in September 2000, to provide a mechanism to assist Partner countries in the safe destruction of stockpiled anti-personnel mines, in support of the implementation of the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and their Destruction. The scope of the Trust Fund policy has been extended to include additional demilitarisation projects aimed at destroying other munitions, small arms and light weapons. Use of Trust Funds has also been broadened to support Partner countries in managing the consequences of defence reform through initiatives such as the retraining of discharged military personnel and the conversion of military bases.

By early 2005, Trust Fund projects had led to the destruction or disposal of some 1.6 million anti-personnel mines in Albania; 12 000 landmines and 7000 tons of surplus munitions and rocket fuel in Moldova; 400 000 anti-personnel mines in Ukraine; 1200 landmines in Tajikistan; and more than 300 missiles in Georgia. Further demilitarisation projects are planned for Albania, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Serbia and Montenegro, and Ukraine.

The Fund mechanism enables NATO member countries to work with individual Partner countries to identify and implement specific projects. In each case, a NATO or Partner country takes the lead in sponsoring and developing the project proposal and identifying potential contributors. The Partner country that benefits directly from the project is expected to take an active part in this

work and provide maximum support to the project within its means. NATO experts provide advice and guidance.

NATO member and Partner countries fund the Trust Fund on a voluntary basis, including through offers of equipment and contributions in kind. In many cases, the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA) serves as the executing agency and is responsible for the implementation of technical and financial aspects.

Peace-support operations

Partner countries have played a critical role in the NATO-led peace-support operations in the Balkans and are now also making an essential contribution to NATO's mission in Afghanistan. Their participation in these operations enables them to gain practical experience of working together with Allied forces and of helping restore stability to crisis areas. It also helps ease the burden of these missions on the member countries of the Alliance and provides a visible demonstration of the broad international consensus that exists on the importance of contributing to crisis resolution and preventing the spread of instability.

Soldiers from a large number of Partner countries have become accustomed to working alongside their NATO counterparts, which enables them to learn how the Alliance operates in complex and difficult circumstances. This practical experience, more than any other single factor, has been critical in improving relations and building confidence and understanding between military forces which until the end of the Cold War formed hostile alliances confronting each other across a divided continent. Today, NATO and Partner countries are working together in the field to confront threats and challenges common to all of them.

The individual participation of Partner and other non-NATO countries in NATO-led peace-support operations is subject to financial and technical agreements worked out between each troop-contributing country and NATO, once the proposed contributions to such operations have been assessed. Each contributing country remains responsible for the deployment of its contingents and for providing the support needed to enable them to function effectively. In some cases support is also made available on a bilateral basis by an individual NATO country.

The Afghanistan mission

NATO has been leading the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan since August 2003. The mission of this UN-mandated force is to assist the Afghan authorities in efforts to bring peace and stability to

the country, which is recovering from two decades of civil war, and to prevent it from being used again as a base for terrorists.

A number of Partner countries have participated in ISAF since NATO took over leadership of the force. Some of these countries have provided valuable specialised forces such as military police and demining teams. Partner countries in Central Asia have also been instrumental in ensuring that ISAF has had the necessary logistic support in terms of equipment and supplies. Relationships developed through the Partnership for Peace have laid the basis for NATO countries to draw up bilateral agreements for the transit of materiel across these states and the basing of forces and supplies on their territory. Given the diverse ethnic make-up of Afghanistan, several Central Asian Partners have also been able to exercise their influence in other ways in support of ISAF objectives.

The Balkan operations

Partner countries have been an integral part of NATO-led peace-support operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Kosovo from the beginning of these operations. In both cases, the largest single non-NATO country contribution to these forces was made by Russia.

Troops from 14 Partner countries were part of the Implementation Force (IFOR) that deployed to Bosnia and Herzegovina after the signing of the Dayton Peace Accord on 14 December 1995. Initially peacekeepers assisted in the implementation of the military aspects of the peace agreement and subsequently, in the framework of the smaller Stabilisation Force (SFOR) that replaced IFOR in December 1996, they helped to deter a resumption of hostilities and to promote a climate in which the peace process could move forward. Some 21 Partner countries had participated at different times in the NATO-led peace-support operation in Bosnia and Herzegovina by the time it was concluded in December 2004, when responsibilities for maintaining security were handed over to a follow-on mission led by the European Union.

Troops from a significant number of Partner countries have also participated from the outset in the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR) established in 1999. KFOR's mission is to deter renewed hostility, establish a secure environment and support the international humanitarian effort and the work of the United Nations in Kosovo.

Combating terrorism

The fight against terrorism is a top priority for the Alliance and its Partners. The September 11 attacks on the United States led to the first-ever invocation

by NATO of Article 5 (the collective defence clause of the Alliance's founding treaty). Meeting at short notice the next day, EAPC ambassadors, representing countries stretching from North America and Europe to Central Asia, unconditionally condemned the attacks in the strongest terms.

The shared determination to join forces against the terrorist threat was given concrete expression in the launch of the Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism at the Prague Summit. This Action Plan provides a framework for sharing intelligence and expertise and for improved cooperation both through political consultation and practical measures. It is leading to the enhancement of cooperation in areas such as border security, terrorism-related training and exercises, and the development of capabilities for defence against terrorist attacks or for dealing with the consequences of such an attack. It is also helping to promote the physical security and safe destruction of surplus munitions, small arms and light weapons, such as shoulder-fired rocket and grenade launchers.

Tackling the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction

Countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) is one of the key security challenges of the 21st century. NATO's dialogue with its Partners plays a distinct role in the achievement of the Alliance's non-proliferation goals, in building up confidence and trust and in creating the conditions of openness and transparency required for non-proliferation efforts to succeed.

The Alliance is seeking to increase common understanding and information-sharing on proliferation-related issues through consultations on both political and defence efforts. A number of Partner countries also have individual expertise and experience which enable them to make a significant contribution to the strengthening of joint efforts in this field.

EAPC workshops on potential risks associated with biological and chemical weapons, as well as research and development into new capabilities and equipment designed to protect against WMD agents and enhance overall preparedness, are helping to facilitate information exchange and to forge best practices.

In addition, disarmament experts from NATO and Partner countries have been able to discuss political and intelligence-sharing aspects of WMD proliferation. In doing so, they have focused on some of the main trends in proliferation and have heard presentations on regional perspectives from non-EAPC countries such as China, Japan, Israel and South Korea. Information has been

exchanged on export control practices and on the implementation of recent non-proliferation initiatives.

Alliance members have also briefed Partner countries on NATO's activities in the specific area of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) defence, and in particular on the creation and deployment of the multinational CBRN Defence Battalion.

Action against mines and small arms

Multilateral initiatives have been launched at the global, regional and local levels to tackle the spread of small arms and to address the need for humanitarian mine action. NATO and Partner countries have sought to complement such efforts by bringing the Partnership's politico-military expertise to bear on these challenges in the Euro-Atlantic area.

The EAPC has set up an *Ad Hoc* Working Group on Small Arms and Light Weapons and Mine Action to provide a forum for exchanging information on how best to control the transfer of such weapons, for example, through national export controls and enforcement mechanisms. The PfP programme also seeks to promote training in stockpile management and secure storage, disposal and destruction of surplus stocks, as well as weapons collection and destruction during peacekeeping operations. In addition, tailored assistance is being provided to individual countries on request.

Assistance for the destruction of stockpiles of mines and small arms and light weapons is also being channelled through PfP Trust Funds. Moreover, NATO and Partner troops deployed in the Balkans and Afghanistan peacekeeping operations have regularly assisted civilian organisations in humanitarian demining efforts.

Disaster preparedness and response

Cooperation on disaster preparedness and response, referred to in NATO as civil emergency planning, makes up the largest non-military component of Partnership for Peace activities. Effective responses to disasters call for the coordination of transport facilities, medical resources, communications, disaster-response capabilities and other civil resources. While all countries are responsible for ensuring that plans are in place at the national level for dealing with emergencies, the potential magnitude and cross-border character of some disasters makes it essential to be able to respond effectively to calls for assistance, cooperation and planning at the international level.

Cooperation between NATO and Partner countries in civil emergency planning includes activities such as seminars, workshops, exercises and training courses, which bring together civil and military personnel from different levels of local, regional and national governments. Other international organisations, such as the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the UN High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Atomic Energy Agency and the European Union, are also important participants, as are non-governmental relief organisations.

A Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) was established in 1998, based on a proposal made by Russia, to coordinate crisis management for disasters occurring in the Euro-Atlantic area (see Part II). The Centre acts as a focal point for information sharing and coordinates responses among NATO and Partner countries to disasters in the Euro-Atlantic area. It organises major civil emergency exercises to practise responses to simulated natural and man-made disaster situations including acts of terrorism. Through the development of contingency plans, appropriate procedures and the necessary equipment, as well as common training and exercises, NATO and Partner countries have been able to coordinate assistance effectively, through the EADRCC, in response to several natural disasters as well as refugee relief efforts during the Kosovo crisis.

Work in this field also embraces the sharing of information and participation in civil emergency planning to assess risks and reduce the vulnerability of civilian populations to terrorism and weapons of mass destruction in the context of the Partnership Action Plan against Terrorism. A Civil Emergency Planning Action Plan has been agreed to assist national authorities in improving their civil preparedness for possible terrorist attacks using chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear weapons. The Plan is implemented through a number of mechanisms including the preparation of inventories of national capabilities ranging from medical assistance and radiological detection to identification laboratories, aeromedical evacuation, and the stockpiling of critical items. NATO and Partner countries have prepared and are continuously updating an inventory of national capabilities that would be available in the event of such an attack.

Security, science and the environment

Two distinct NATO programmes bring together scientists and experts from NATO and Partner countries on a regular basis to work on problems of common concern (see also Part X).

The NATO Programme for Security through Science, run by the NATO Science Committee, aims to contribute to security, stability and solidarity among

countries by applying science to problem solving. It supports collaboration, networking and capacity-building among working scientists in NATO, Partner and Mediterranean Dialogue countries. The programme concentrates its support for collaboration on research topics related to defence against terrorism or countering other threats to security. It also seeks to facilitate the sharing and transfer of technology to address particular priorities of Partner countries.

The programme of the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS) deals with problems of the environment and society by bringing together national agencies to collaborate on short- and long-term studies in these areas. It provides a unique forum for sharing knowledge and experience on technical, scientific and policy aspects of social and environmental matters among NATO and Partner countries, in both the civilian and military sectors.

CHAPTER 24

NATO AND RUSSIA

Since the end of the Cold War, NATO member countries have regarded the development of a positive relationship and cooperation with Russia as a priority. Over the years, much progress has been made in transforming old antagonisms based on ideological, political and military confrontation into an evolving and formally constituted partnership founded on common interests and continuing dialogue.

Today, NATO member states and Russia meet regularly as equals in the NATO-Russia Council to consult on current security issues and to develop practical cooperation in a wide range of areas of common interest. While differences remain on some issues which may take some time to resolve, the driving force behind the new spirit of cooperation is the realisation that NATO member states and Russia share strategic priorities and face common challenges, such as the fight against terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The evolution of relations

The ideological and political division of Europe ended in 1989 with the fall of the Berlin Wall. Following the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact in 1991, and with the upsurge of new security challenges in the post-Cold War environment, NATO began establishing new forms of dialogue and cooperation with the countries of central and eastern Europe and the member countries of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS).

In 1991, Russia became a member of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (which was replaced by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council in 1997). In 1994, it joined NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP), a major programme of bilateral cooperation. In 1996, after the signature of the Dayton Peace Accord, Russia contributed troops and logistical support to the NATO-led peacekeeping force in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Cooperation in complex field conditions in the Balkans significantly reinforced mutual trust and strengthened the political will to take NATO-Russia cooperation to a new level. That transformation occurred in May 1997, with the signature of the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security, which provided the formal basis for NATO-Russia relations. It expressed the common goal of building a lasting peace and established the Permanent Joint Council (PJC) as a forum for consultation and cooperation. As a result,

NATO-Russia relations took on a concrete institutional dimension, in addition to the operational dimension.

In the years that followed, considerable progress was made in building mutual confidence and developing a programme of consultation and cooperation. However, lingering Cold War prejudices prevented the PJC from achieving its potential. In 1999, when differences arose over NATO's Kosovo air campaign, Russia suspended its participation in the PJC, which up to then had met on a regular basis at ambassadorial or ministerial level. Nevertheless, several activities continued without interruption, including peacekeeping in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Moreover, Russia played a key diplomatic role in resolving the Kosovo crisis and, in June 1999, when the NATO-led Kosovo Force was eventually deployed, Russian peacekeepers were a part of it.

From 1999 onwards, NATO-Russia relations started to improve significantly. When Lord Robertson became NATO Secretary General in October of that year, he committed himself to breaking the stalemate in NATO-Russia relations. Similarly, in 2000, upon his election as President of Russia, Vladimir Putin announced that he would work to rebuild relations with NATO in a spirit of pragmatism.

Several key events also accelerated this process. On 12 August 2000, the nuclear submarine Kursk sunk killing all 118 crewmen aboard, highlighting the urgent need for cooperation between NATO and Russia in responding to such tragic accidents. The terrorist attacks on the United States of 11 September 2001 also served as a stark reminder that concerted international action was needed to effectively tackle terrorism and other new security threats. In the immediate aftermath of the terrorist attacks, Russia opened its airspace for the international coalition's campaign in Afghanistan and shared intelligence to support the anti-terrorist coalition.

High-level contacts between NATO and Russia in the following months, including two meetings of Lord Robertson with President Putin and a meeting of Allied and Russian foreign ministers in December 2001, explored possibilities for giving new impetus and substance to the NATO-Russia relationship.

The NATO-Russia Council

Intensive negotiations led to agreement on a joint declaration on "NATO-Russia Relations: A New Quality", signed by Russian and Allied heads of state and government in Rome in May 2002. In this declaration, which builds on the goals and principles of the Founding Act, NATO and Russian leaders pledged to enhance their ability to work together as equals in areas of common interest and to stand together against common threats and risks to their security.

The agreement established the NATO-Russia Council (NRC), which replaced the PJC. The 26 NATO member countries and Russia participate in the NRC as equal partners, identifying and pursuing opportunities for joint decision and joint action across a wide spectrum of security issues in the Euro-Atlantic area. The change from the PJC to the NRC (which meets “at 27” rather than in the “NATO + 1” format) represented a new philosophical approach to the relationship. This has contributed significantly to creating a strengthened climate of confidence, making political exchange and consultations far more conducive to concrete cooperation.

NRC meetings are chaired by the NATO Secretary General and are held at different levels – at least once a month at the level of ambassadors, twice a year at ministerial level and as needed at summit level. A Preparatory Committee, which meets at least twice a month, supports the work of the NRC and oversees ongoing cooperation. Work in specific areas is developed in the framework of *ad hoc* or permanent working groups. Meetings are also held once a month between military representatives and twice a year at the level of chiefs of defence staff.

The NRC and its subordinate structures operate on the principle of consensus and continuous political dialogue. The members of the NRC act in their national capacities and in a manner consistent with their respective collective commitments and obligations. Both NATO members and Russia reserve the right to act independently, although their common objective in the framework of the NRC is to work together in all areas where they have shared interests and concerns. These areas were identified in the Founding Act and cooperation is being intensified on a number of key issues which include the fight against terrorism, crisis management, non-proliferation, arms control and confidence-building measures, theatre missile defence, logistics, military-to-military cooperation, defence reform and civil emergencies. New areas may be added to the NRC’s agenda by the mutual consent of its members.

The NRC has created several working groups and committees to develop cooperation in these areas and others such as scientific cooperation and challenges of modern society. Views are also exchanged within the NRC on current international issues affecting the security of the Euro-Atlantic area, such as the situations in the Balkans, Afghanistan, Georgia, Ukraine, Iraq, and the broader Middle East region. It also helps build political will for undertaking additional joint practical initiatives, such as an ongoing project to explore its potential contribution to combating the threat posed by Afghan narcotics.

Another concrete manifestation of the level of political cooperation achieved by the NRC, stemming from the frank exchanges of views which it facilitates, is the joint statement adopted by NRC foreign ministers on 9 December 2004, at the height of a serious political crisis taking place in Ukraine. The NRC

appealed to all parties to continue to avoid the use or instigation of violence, to refrain from intimidation of voters, and to work to ensure a free and fair electoral process reflecting the will of the Ukrainian people. The members of the NRC reiterated their support for democracy in Ukraine together with the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the country – elements considered vital for the common and indivisible security and stability of all.

Since its establishment, the NRC has evolved into a productive mechanism for consultation, consensus-building, cooperation, joint decision-making and joint action and has become a fundamental pillar of the NATO-Russia partnership. The positive evolution of NATO-Russia cooperation offers good prospects for its future and its further concrete development. Maintaining this momentum, based on past political and operational achievements, will be an important factor in developing greater opportunities for future cooperation.

Facilitating contacts and cooperation

A Russian Mission to NATO was established in March 1998 to facilitate NATO-Russia consultation and cooperation. At the beginning of 2001, a NATO Information Office (NIO) was opened in Moscow to improve mutual understanding by disseminating information and publications, and organising conferences and seminars for key target audiences and academies for young students. In particular, the NIO focuses on explaining the rationale for NATO-Russia cooperation, which highlights the increasing number of areas where the interests of NATO member states and Russia converge, such as the fight against terrorism, countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and exchanging experience on defence reform and military transformation.

A Military Liaison Mission was established in Moscow in May 2002 to improve transparency and facilitate regular contacts, exchange of information and consultations between NATO's Military Committee and Russia's Ministry of Defence. In 2003, a direct, secure telephone communication link was established between the offices of the NATO Secretary General and the Russian Minister of Defence. A Russian Military Liaison Branch Office was established at NATO's strategic operational command in Mons, Belgium (the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe, SHAPE) in 2004. Russian officers are also assigned to the Partnership Coordination Cell at SHAPE to facilitate participation in PfP activities.

The fight against terrorism

Nowhere have positions between NATO member countries and Russia converged more clearly than in the fight against terrorism, which has become

a major threat to international security and stability and requires an increasingly coordinated response. In the summer of 2004, a number of tragic events perpetrated by terrorists in Russia brought the NRC together in extraordinary session for the first time in its history. NRC ambassadors strongly condemned terrorism in all its manifestations and renewed their determination to strengthen and intensify common efforts to eliminate this shared threat.

Concrete steps have followed, including the development of a comprehensive NRC Action Plan on Terrorism approved by NRC foreign ministers on 9 December 2004. The Action Plan gives structure and purpose to NRC cooperation in this key area and consolidates NRC cooperation aimed at preventing terrorism, combating terrorist activities and managing the consequences of terrorist acts.

Joint assessments of specific terrorist threats are being developed and kept under review. Three high-level conferences – in Rome and Moscow in 2002 and in Norfolk, Virginia, United States in 2004 – have explored the role of the military in combating terrorism, generating recommendations for ways to develop practical military cooperation in this area. A conference held in Slovenia in June 2005 focused on the challenges encountered by national authorities in Russia, Spain, Turkey and the United States while managing the consequences of recent terrorist acts, and on how lessons learned have since been integrated into policies and practice.

Specific aspects of combating terrorism are also a key focus of activities in many areas of cooperation under the NRC, such as civil emergency planning, non-proliferation, airspace management, theatre missile defence, defence reform and scientific cooperation.

Addressing other new security threats

The unprecedented threat posed by the increasing availability of ballistic missiles is being addressed by cooperation in the area of theatre missile defence, where NATO and Russia have achieved impressive results. A ground-breaking joint Command Post Exercise took place in the United States in March 2004, using a computer-simulated scenario to evaluate an experimental concept of operations on theatre missile defence. This was followed up by a second exercise in the Netherlands in March 2005. The aim is to establish a level of force interoperability that would enable NATO and Russia to work together quickly and effectively to counter ballistic missile threats against NATO and Russian troops engaged in a joint mission. An NRC Interoperability Study in the field of theatre missile defence entered its second phase in 2005.

An NRC initiative on chemical, biological and radiological protection is underway. Joint work is also being taken forward on nuclear issues and cooperation against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

NRC cooperation is also being undertaken in the field of airspace management to enhance air safety and transparency and to counter the threat of the potential use of civilian aircraft for terrorist purposes. Under the Cooperative Airspace Initiative, a feasibility study for reciprocal data exchange is being carried out.

Operational cooperation

For over seven years, until withdrawing its contingents in summer 2003, Russia provided the largest non-NATO contingents to the NATO-led peacekeeping forces in the Balkans, where Russian soldiers worked alongside Allied and other Partner counterparts to support the international community's efforts to build lasting security and stability in the region. Russian peacekeepers first deployed to Bosnia and Herzegovina in January 1996, where they were part of a multinational brigade in the northern sector, conducting daily patrols and security checks and helping with reconstruction and humanitarian tasks. Having played a vital diplomatic role in securing an end to the Kosovo conflict, despite differences over NATO's 1999 air campaign, Russian troops deployed to Kosovo in June 1999, where they worked as part of multinational brigades in the east, north and south of the province, helped run the Pristina airfield and provided medical facilities and services.

Building on the experience of cooperation in peacekeeping in the Balkans, a generic concept for joint peacekeeping operations is being developed, which would serve as a basis for joint NATO-Russia peacekeeping operations and should provide a detailed scheme of joint work aimed at ensuring smooth, constructive and predictable cooperation between NATO Allies and Russia in case of such an operation.

In December 2004, modalities were finalised with regard to Russian participation in NATO's maritime Operation Active Endeavour (OAE) in the Mediterranean. Russia's contribution to this operation marks the beginning of a new phase of operational activities involving the development of greater military interoperability in relation to both crisis management and the fight against terrorism. NATO member states have also welcomed Russia's offer to provide practical support for the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan.

On 21 April 2005, in the margins of the informal meeting of NRC foreign ministers in Vilnius, Lithuania, Russia acceded to NATO's PfP Status of Forces

Agreement, thereby establishing a necessary legal framework for further operational activities and intensified practical cooperation.

Defence reform

Russia and NATO member countries share an interest in defence reform, given the common need for armed forces that are appropriately sized, trained and equipped to deal with the full spectrum of 21st century threats. NRC cooperation in the area of defence reform covers many different aspects including resource management, defence industry conversion, defence and force planning, and macro-economic, financial and social issues. Other areas of cooperation include managing military nuclear waste, strategic air transport and military infrastructure engineering, and logistics interoperability, a prerequisite for effective cooperation across the board. Exploratory work on how to improve the general interoperability of NATO and Russian forces is also underway. Moreover, two fellowships for Russian scholars have been set up at the NATO Defense College in Rome to promote research on defence reform.

In June 2001 a NATO-Russia Retraining Centre was established in Moscow for discharged military personnel and their families, and in 2003 a further six regional retraining centres spread throughout Russia were set up.

Military-to-military cooperation

A key objective of military-to-military cooperation is to improve interoperability between Russian and Allied forces, since modern militaries must be able to operate within multinational command and force structures when called upon to work together in peace-support or other crisis-management operations. A substantial exercise and training programme is being implemented.

In the wake of the loss of the Russian nuclear submarine Kursk, in August 2000, joint work has also been undertaken on submarine crew escape and rescue. A Framework Agreement was signed in February 2003, which represented an important step towards standardising search and rescue procedures, collaborating in equipment development, exchanging information and facilitating joint exercises to test procedures.

A framework for reciprocal naval exchanges and port visits is being developed, and possible activities to enhance exercises between NATO and Russian naval formations are being developed. In 2005, training exercises were conducted to help prepare Russian crews for future support for Operation Active Endeavour.

Logistics cooperation

Today's security environment calls for more mobile forces and multinational operations, which require improved coordination and the pooling of resources wherever possible. Various NRC initiatives are pursuing cooperation in the area of logistics on both the civilian and military side. Meetings and seminars have focused on establishing a sound foundation of mutual understanding in this field by promoting information-sharing in areas such as logistics policies, doctrine, structures and lessons learned.

Opportunities for practical cooperation are being explored in areas such as air transport and air-to-air refuelling. Such practical cooperation between NATO and Russia will be significantly facilitated by the PfP Status of Forces Agreement, once ratified, as well as by a Transit Agreement and a memorandum of understanding on Host Nation Support which were being finalised in 2005.

Progress in arms control

NATO and Russia also discuss issues related to arms control and confidence-building measures. Within this framework they have reaffirmed their commitment to the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) as a cornerstone of European security. Progress in this sphere is dependent upon Russia's implementation of its remaining commitments articulated in the Final Act of the 1999 Istanbul Conference of the State Parties to the CFE Treaty, with respect to Georgia and Moldova. NATO member states have stated that fulfilment of these commitments will create the necessary conditions for achieving ratification of the Agreement on Adaptation of the CFE Treaty by all 30 States Parties to the Treaty and securing its entry into force.

Civil emergencies and disaster relief

Cooperation between NATO and Russia in the area of disaster response dates back to the signing of a memorandum of understanding on civil emergency planning and disaster preparedness in 1996. Practical forms of cooperation include joint work to better prepare for protecting civilian populations and responding to different kinds of emergency situation. A Russian proposal led to the establishment at NATO in 1998 of a Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC), which was used to coordinate assistance from EAPC member countries to refugee relief operations during the Kosovo conflict and has subsequently been called upon to coordinate relief in the wake of flooding, earthquakes, landslides, fires and other disasters in different Partner countries.

In the framework of the NRC, work has initially concentrated on improving interoperability, procedures and the exchange of information and experience. Russia hosted civil emergency planning and response exercises in 2002 and 2004. Russia has co-sponsored an initiative with Hungary to develop a rapid response capability in the event of an emergency involving chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear agents.

Scientific and environmental cooperation

Scientific cooperation with Russia dates back to 1998, when a Memorandum of Understanding on Scientific and Technological Cooperation was signed. More scientists from Russia than from any other Partner country have benefited from fellowships and grants under NATO's science programmes.

A key focus of current scientific cooperative activities under the NRC is the application of civil science to defence against terrorism and new threats, such as in explosives detection, examining the social and psychological impact of terrorism, protection against chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear agents, cyber-security and transport security. Another area of collaboration is the forecasting and prevention of catastrophes. Environmental protection problems arising from civilian and military activities are another important area of cooperation.

CHAPTER 25

NATO AND UKRAINE

NATO's relationship with Ukraine has developed progressively since the country gained independence in 1991. Given Ukraine's strategic position as a bridge between eastern and western Europe, NATO-Ukraine relations are central to building peace and stability within the Euro-Atlantic region.

NATO and Ukraine are actively engaged in international peace-support operations and in addressing common security challenges. Over the years, a pattern of dialogue and practical cooperation in a wide range of other areas has become well established. A key aspect of the partnership is the support given by NATO and individual member countries for Ukraine's reform efforts, which received renewed momentum following the dramatic events of the 2004 "Orange Revolution" and remain critical to Ukraine's aspirations to closer Euro-Atlantic integration.

The evolution of relations

Formal relations between NATO and Ukraine began in 1991, when Ukraine joined the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (later replaced by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council) immediately upon achieving independence following the break-up of the Soviet Union. In 1994, Ukraine became the first member state of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) to join the Partnership for Peace (PfP). During the 1990s, the country also demonstrated its commitment to contributing to Euro-Atlantic security through its support for NATO-led peacekeeping operations in the Balkans.

In Madrid on 9 July 1997, the Ukrainian president and NATO heads of state and government signed a Charter for a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine. It provides the formal basis for NATO-Ukraine relations and was an opportunity for NATO member countries to reaffirm their support for Ukrainian sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity, democratic development, economic prosperity and status as a non-nuclear weapons state, as well as for the principle of inviolability of frontiers. The Alliance regards these as key factors of stability and security in Central and Eastern Europe and on the continent as a whole.

The Charter also established the NATO-Ukraine Commission (NUC), which is the decision-making body responsible for developing the relationship between NATO and Ukraine and for directing cooperative activities. It provides a forum for consultation on security issues of common concern and is tasked

with ensuring the proper implementation of the Charter's provisions, assessing the overall development of the NATO-Ukraine relationship, surveying planning for future activities and suggesting ways of improving or further developing cooperation. It is also responsible for reviewing cooperative activities organised within different frameworks such as the Partnership for Peace, as well as activities in the military-to-military sphere, developed in the context of Annual Work Plans undertaken under the auspices of the Military Committee with Ukraine.

All NATO member countries and Ukraine are represented in the NUC, which meets regularly at the level of ambassadors and military representatives, and periodically at the level of foreign and defence ministers and chiefs of staff, as well as at summit level. Joint working groups have been set up to take work forward in specific areas, namely defence reform, armaments, economic security, and scientific and environmental cooperation, which are areas identified by the Charter for political consultation and practical cooperation. Other areas include operational issues, crisis management and peace support, military-to-military cooperation and civil emergency planning.

In May 2002, shortly before the fifth anniversary of the signing of the Charter, then-President Leonid Kuchma announced Ukraine's goal of eventual NATO membership. Later that month, at the meeting of the NUC at ministerial level in Reykjavik, foreign ministers underlined their desire to take their relationship forward to a qualitatively new level, including through intensified consultations and cooperation on political, economic and defence issues.

The NATO-Ukraine Action Plan

The NATO-Ukraine Action Plan was adopted at a NUC meeting of foreign ministers in Prague in November 2002. The Action Plan is built on the Charter, which remains the basic foundation underpinning NATO-Ukraine relations. Its purpose is to clearly identify Ukraine's strategic objectives and priorities in pursuit of its aspirations for full integration into Euro-Atlantic security structures and to provide a strategic framework for existing and future cooperation. It also aims to deepen and broaden the NATO-Ukraine relationship and sets out jointly agreed principles and objectives covering political and economic issues, information issues, security, defence and military issues, information protection and security, and legal issues.

The adoption of the Action Plan – at a time when the Alliance expressed grave concerns about reports of the authorisation at the highest level of the transfer of air-defence equipment from Ukraine to Iraq – demonstrated the strength of the Allies' commitment to develop strong NATO-Ukraine relations and to encourage Ukraine to work towards closer Euro-Atlantic integration. NATO countries urged Ukraine to take the reform process forward vigorously

in order to strengthen democracy, the rule of law, human rights and the market economy. They also emphasised that helping Ukraine to transform its defence and security sector institutions is a key priority of NATO-Ukraine cooperation.

To support the implementation of the Action Plan's objectives, Annual Target Plans are agreed within the framework of the NATO-Ukraine Commission. Ukraine sets its own targets in terms of the activities it wishes to pursue both internally and in cooperation with NATO. The NUC monitors their implementation; assessment meetings are held twice a year while a progress report is prepared annually.

Taking stock of progress under the Action Plan in mid-2004, the Allies emphasised the need for Ukraine's leadership to take firm steps to ensure a free and fair electoral process, guaranteed media freedoms and rule of law, strengthened civil society and judiciary, improved arms export controls and progress on defence and security sector reform and the allocation of financial support to its implementation. They also acknowledged the substantial progress that had been made in pursuing defence reform in Ukraine in 2004, in particular the completion by Ukraine of a comprehensive defence review, which called for a major overhaul of Ukraine's defence posture to be coupled with major modernisation of the Ukrainian armed forces.

In the autumn of 2004, the Allies closely followed political developments surrounding the presidential elections in Ukraine, where the legitimacy of the results of the second round was contested by the opposition and by international observers, leading to the Orange Revolution of popular protest and a court-ordered re-run of the second round. Under these circumstances, it was decided to postpone a meeting of the NATO-Ukraine Commission at ministerial level, scheduled for December 2004, until a later date. In announcing this decision, NATO's Secretary General emphasised that respect for free and fair elections constituted one of the basic principles underlying the Distinctive Partnership.

Viktor Yushchenko won the re-run of the second round. Shortly after his inauguration in January 2005, he was invited to a summit meeting in Brussels on 22 February. NATO leaders expressed support for the new President's ambitious reform plans for Ukraine, which corresponded broadly to the objectives undertaken by Ukraine in the NATO-Ukraine Action Plan. They agreed to sharpen and refocus NATO Ukraine cooperation in line with the new government's priorities.

The Intensified Dialogue

Two months later, at the NUC meeting of foreign ministers in Vilnius, Lithuania, on 21 April 2005, the Allies and Ukraine launched an Intensified

Dialogue on Ukraine's aspirations to NATO membership. The first concrete step in this process was taken on 27 June 2005, during a visit by the Secretary General to Kyiv, when the Ukrainian government formally presented an initial discussion paper.

The discussion paper addressed key issues set out in the 1995 Study on NATO Enlargement (see Part VI) – domestic and foreign policy, defence and security sector reform as well as legal and security issues – and highlighted in specific terms those areas where progress would be needed to bring Ukraine's aspirations closer to reality. This paper has provided the basis for the holding of structured expert discussions, launched in September 2005, which give Ukrainian officials the opportunity to learn more about what would be expected from Ukraine as a potential member of the Alliance and also allow NATO officials to examine Ukrainian reform policy and capabilities in greater detail.

At Vilnius, the Allies and Ukraine also announced a package of short-term actions designed to enhance NATO-Ukraine cooperation in key reform areas: strengthening democratic institutions, enhancing political dialogue, intensifying defence and security sector reform, improving public information, and managing the social and economic consequences of reform. These are high priorities for the Ukrainian government, as they are vital to the success of the democratic transformation that the Ukrainian people demanded in December 2004. These are also areas where NATO can offer specific expertise and, in some cases, material assistance.

The Intensified Dialogue addresses issues specifically related to Ukraine's possible NATO membership. The package of short-term measures is designed to focus practical cooperation in support of urgent reform goals. Both of these initiatives are intended to complement and reinforce existing cooperation in the framework of the NATO-Ukraine Action Plan.

The launch of the Intensified Dialogue with Ukraine marks a real milestone in NATO-Ukraine relations and in Ukraine's pursuit of Euro-Atlantic integration. It is a clear signal from NATO Allies that they support Ukraine's aspirations. Nonetheless, this process does not guarantee an invitation to join the Alliance – such an invitation would be based on Ukraine's performance in the implementation of key reform goals. NATO and individual Allies are committed to providing assistance and advice, but the pace of progress remains in Ukraine's hands.

Facilitating contacts and cooperation

Ukraine was one of the first countries to open a diplomatic mission to NATO in 1997, and a Military Liaison Mission was opened in 1998. Ukrainian

military personnel also serve at the Partnership Coordination Cell located at NATO's military operational headquarters in Mons, Belgium.

In May 1997 NATO opened an Information and Documentation Centre (NIDC) in Kyiv. The role of the Centre is to provide a focal point for information activities designed to promote the mutual benefits of Ukraine's partnership with NATO and explain Alliance policies to the Ukrainian public. The Centre seeks to disseminate information and stimulate debate on Euro-Atlantic integration and security issues through publications, seminars, conferences and information academies for young students and civil servants. Moreover, the Centre has recently opened a series of information points in several regions of the country outside Kyiv.

A civilian-led NATO Liaison Office (NLO) was established in Kyiv in April 1999 to work directly with Ukrainian officials to encourage them to make full use of opportunities for cooperation under the NATO-Ukraine Charter and the PfP programme. It is active in supporting Ukraine's efforts to reform its defence and security sector, in strengthening cooperation under the Action Plan, and in facilitating contacts between NATO and Ukrainian authorities at all levels. The Office also has a military liaison element that works closely with Ukraine's armed forces to facilitate participation in joint training, exercises, and NATO-led peacekeeping operations. In August 2004, a NATO-Ukraine Defence Documentation Office was also opened to improve access to documentation for units and staffs of the armed forces involved in PfP activities.

Peace-support and security cooperation

Ukraine has over the years contributed an infantry battalion, a mechanised infantry battalion and a helicopter squadron to the NATO-led peacekeeping force in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Deployments to the NATO-led operation in Kosovo have included a helicopter squadron as well as nearly 300 peacekeepers, who continue to serve in the US-led sector as part of the joint Polish-Ukrainian battalion.

Ukraine is further contributing to international stability and the fight against terrorism by providing overflight clearance for forces deployed in Afghanistan as part of the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), or as part of the coalition forces under the US-led Operation Enduring Freedom. Some 1600 Ukrainian troops were also deployed to Iraq, as part of a Polish-led multinational force in one of the sectors of the international stabilisation force, which includes peacekeepers from several NATO and Partner countries.

The Allies have welcomed Ukraine's offer to support Operation Active Endeavour, NATO's maritime operation in the Mediterranean aimed at helping

deter, disrupt and protect against terrorism. An exchange of letters signed by NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer and Minister of Foreign Affairs Borys Tarasyuk in Vilnius on 21 April 2005 set out agreed procedures for Ukraine's support. This paved the way for contacts at the working level to discuss plans to integrate Ukraine's contribution into the operation. Ukraine's support will further enhance NATO-Ukraine cooperation against terrorism and interoperability between NATO and Ukrainian military forces and add another concrete dimension to Ukraine's already impressive array of contributions to Euro-Atlantic security.

Defence and security sector reform

Cooperation in the area of defence and security sector reform has been crucial to the ongoing transformation of Ukraine's security posture and remains an essential part of its democratic transition. Since gaining independence in 1991 and inheriting a significant part of the armed forces of the former Soviet Union, Ukraine has been in the process of establishing and then reforming its armed forces and other parts of its security structures in order to bring them in line with the requirements of the changed security environment, democratic conditions and available resources. It has sought NATO's support in helping to transform massive conscript forces into smaller, professional, more mobile armed forces capable of meeting its security needs as well as contributing actively to European stability and security. Priorities for NATO in this context are the strengthening of the democratic and civilian control of Ukraine's armed forces and improving their interoperability with NATO forces.

Recognising the importance of this process, NATO has extended practical assistance in managing defence and security sector reforms. The NATO-Ukraine Joint Working Group on Defence Reform (JWGDR) is the primary focus for cooperation in defence and security sector reform. It was established in 1998, under the auspices of the NATO-Ukraine Commission, to pursue initiatives in the area of civil-military relations, democratic control of the armed forces, defence planning, policy, strategy and national security concepts. All NATO member countries and Ukraine are represented in annual meetings of the JWGDR at senior level, co-chaired by NATO's Assistant Secretary General for Defence Policy and Planning and the Deputy Secretary of Ukraine's National Security and Defence Council and bringing together high-ranking officials from NATO member states and Ukraine. Once a year, the JWGDR organises high-level informal consultations on defence reform and defence policy involving Ukrainian and NATO Defence Ministers, as well as key defence and security experts.

The JWGDR allows Ukraine to draw on the experience and expertise of NATO countries and serves as a channel for providing assistance. It also

provides the institutional basis for cooperation with ministries and agencies engaged in supporting defence and security sector reform in Ukraine. Key aspects of cooperation have included helping Ukraine to develop a new security concept and military doctrine, as well as providing support for defence budgeting and planning, military downsizing and conversion, the establishment of rapid reaction forces, professionalisation of the armed forces and the completion and implementation of a comprehensive defence review.

The JWGDR has launched several initiatives aimed at supporting the transformation of the Ukrainian security posture, including the use of the PfP Planning and Review Process (PARP) to support reforms in individual components of Ukraine's security sector, the provision of assistance in managing the process of the defence review, the organisation of roundtables with the Ukrainian Parliament (the Verkhovna Rada), with the participation of NATO experts and representatives of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly (see Part IX), on topics linked to the legislative programme of the Ukrainian Parliament, support for efforts to strengthen the role of civilians in the Ministry of Defence and establish an effective defence organisation, the arrangement of meetings to harmonise bilateral assistance to Ukraine, and various forms of cooperation with the Ukrainian Border Guard, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Emergencies. Activities are thus not limited to the armed forces or the Ministry of Defence but aim to provide support for reforms undertaken in all the security sector institutions.

Ukraine's drive to reform its defence and security sector also benefits from participation in the Partnership for Peace and in the PfP Planning and Review Process, which enables joint goals to be developed for shaping force structures and capabilities to help Ukraine to meet its objectives for interoperability with the Alliance. Ukraine's participation in other PfP activities, through its annual Individual Partnership Programme, has also remained steady and, in 2005, is expected to include participation in some 400 activities, including language training, military exercises and consideration of operational concepts.

Much-needed assistance in implementing demilitarisation projects is being channelled through PfP Trust Funds, which permit individual NATO countries to pool voluntary financial contributions so as to increase their collective impact on the demilitarisation process. The first such project, implemented by the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA) as the executing agency, resulted in the safe destruction of 400 000 landmines and was the first step in destroying Ukraine's stockpile of almost seven million anti-personnel mines. Canada was the lead country for the project, supported by financial contributions from Hungary, Poland and the Netherlands. A second PfP Trust Fund project to destroy 133 000 tons of conventional munitions, 1.5 million small arms and other weapons was launched in 2005. The first three-year phase of

the project, which is to be carried out over an estimated twelve years, will be led by the United States. It will be the largest demilitarisation project of its kind ever undertaken.

Economic aspects of defence

Cooperation with Ukraine on economic aspects of defence has two main axes: retraining activities, and institutional dialogue, concentrating on issues related to defence economics, economic security and economic aspects of defence industry restructuring and Euro-Atlantic integration.

As part of the dialogue in this area, exchanges of experience are promoted with experts on security aspects of economic developments, including defence budgets and management of defence resources and their relationship with the macro-economy and restructuring in the defence sector. Courses in defence economics – covering the whole budgetary process from financial planning to financial control – have also been organised.

Managing the economic and social consequences of defence reform is a key area of cooperation. Under an agreement with Ukraine's National Coordination Centre, which is in charge of social adaptation of discharged military servicemen, NATO is financing and implementing language and management courses in Ukraine. NATO has doubled the resources devoted to cooperation in this area, following the launch of the Intensified Dialogue with Ukraine.

Military-to-military cooperation

Cooperation between NATO and Ukrainian militaries is developed in the framework of the NATO-Ukraine Military Work Plan under the auspices of the Military Committee with Ukraine. A key focus is to help Ukraine implement its defence reform objectives, complementing the work carried out under the JWGDR with military expertise.

NATO military staff have also taken the lead in developing a legal framework to enable NATO and Ukraine to further develop operational cooperation. These include the PfP Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) and its additional protocol, which was ratified on 1 March 2000 by the Ukrainian Parliament and entered into force on 26 May 2000. This agreement exempts participants in PfP events from passport and visa regulations and immigration inspection on entering or leaving the territory of a receiving state and thereby facilitates Ukrainian participation in PfP military exercises. A memorandum of understanding on Host Nation Support, ratified in March 2004, addresses issues related to the

provision of civil and military assistance to Allied forces located on, or in transit through, Ukrainian territory in peacetime, crisis or war. A Memorandum of Understanding on Strategic Airlift was signed in June 2004, which will permit Ukraine to make a substantial contribution to NATO's capability to move out-sized cargo.

A wide range of PfP activities and military exercises, sometimes hosted by Ukraine, allow military personnel to train for peace-support operations and gain hands-on experience of working with forces from NATO countries and other partners. Senior Ukrainian officers regularly participate in courses at the NATO Defense College in Rome, Italy, and the NATO School at Oberammergau, Germany. Contacts with these establishments have been instrumental in setting up a new multinational faculty at the Ukrainian Defence Academy.

Armaments cooperation

Technical cooperation between Ukraine and NATO in the field of armaments focuses on enhancing interoperability between defence systems to facilitate Ukrainian contributions to joint peace-support operations. Cooperation in this area started when Ukraine joined the PfP programme and began participating in an increasing number of the armaments groups which meet under the auspices of the Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD) – a senior NATO body which identifies opportunities for cooperation between countries in defence equipment procurement processes, focusing in particular on technical standards. A Joint Working Group on Armaments, which met for the first time in March 2004, is supporting the further development of cooperation in this area.

Civil emergency planning

Ukraine's western regions are prone to heavy flooding; NATO countries and other partners provided assistance after severe floods in 1995, 1998 and 2001. Since 1997, in accordance with a memorandum of understanding on Civil Emergency Planning and Disaster Preparedness, a key focus of cooperation has been to help Ukraine to prepare better for such emergencies and to manage their consequences more effectively. PfP exercises, including one held in Ukraine's Trans-Carpathian region in September 2000, help to test disaster-relief procedures. A project was launched in 2001, involving neighbouring countries, to develop an effective flood-warning and response system for the Tisza River catchment area. PfP exercises also help develop plans and effective disaster-response capabilities to deal with other natural emergencies such

as avalanches and earthquakes, or man-made accidents or terrorist attacks involving toxic spills or chemical, biological, radiological or nuclear agents.

Science and environmental issues

Ukraine's participation in NATO science programmes began in 1991 and has since been boosted by the creation of a Joint Working Group on Scientific and Environmental Cooperation. Over the years, Ukraine has been second only to Russia in terms of benefiting from NATO grants for scientific collaboration. In addition to applying science to defence against terrorism and new threats, in line with the new direction of NATO's science programme, Ukraine's priority areas for cooperation include information technologies, cell biology and biotechnology, new materials, environmental protection, and the rational use of natural resources. Environmental cooperation focuses in particular on defence-related environmental problems. NATO has also sponsored several projects to provide basic infrastructure for computer networking among Ukrainian research communities and to facilitate their access to the Internet.

Public information

As the Intensified Dialogue process moves forward, it will be important for the Ukrainian administration to convince the Ukrainian people that its ambitious reform programme and its aspirations to NATO membership are in the country's interest. It is clear that many people in Ukraine are still suspicious of NATO and associate the Alliance with Cold War stereotypes. The Allies have offered, as part of the short-term actions agreed at Vilnius, to cooperate with the Ukrainian authorities in raising awareness about what NATO is today and in better explaining the NATO-Ukraine relationship. Encouraging people to take a fresh look at the Alliance would allow them to discover how NATO has transformed itself since the end of the Cold War and has developed new partnerships throughout the Euro-Atlantic area to meet new security challenges, including a strategic relationship with Russia. The Ukrainian public also needs to be made more aware of the pattern of dialogue and practical, mutually beneficial cooperation between NATO and Ukraine, which has become well established in a wide range of areas over the past decade. This shared experience of cooperation will provide a solid foundation for the further deepening of the NATO-Ukraine relationship in the years to come.

CHAPTER 26

COOPERATION WITH COUNTRIES IN THE MEDITERRANEAN REGION AND THE BROADER MIDDLE EAST

NATO is developing closer security partnerships with countries in the Mediterranean region and the broader Middle East. This marks a shift in Alliance priorities towards greater involvement in these strategically important regions of the world, whose security and stability is closely linked to Euro-Atlantic security.

The current drive towards increasing dialogue and cooperation with countries in these regions builds on two key decisions taken at the NATO summit meeting in Istanbul in June 2004. Countries participating in NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue, which had been launched ten years earlier, were invited to establish a more ambitious and expanded partnership. In parallel, a new, distinct but complementary Istanbul Cooperation Initiative was launched to reach out to interested countries in the broader Middle East region with a proposal to enhance security and stability by fostering mutually beneficial bilateral relationships.

Building bridges with the Mediterranean region and the broader Middle East are as important for NATO as overcoming the legacy of the East-West division in the 1990s. The challenges are different but just as complex. As was the case then, a major effort is required to overcome prejudices, tackle misperceptions, and build trust and understanding.

The importance of security and stability in these regions

There are several reasons why it is important for NATO to promote dialogue and foster stability and security in North Africa and the broader Middle East. One key reason is that a number of today's security challenges – terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, failed states and transnational organised crime – are common to both NATO member states and to countries in these regions. As a consequence, they require common responses. Moreover, in addressing these challenges, NATO is becoming more engaged in areas beyond Europe including a security assistance operation in Afghanistan, a maritime counter-terrorist operation in the Mediterranean and a training mission in Iraq (see Part IV). It is important to discuss these developments with countries in the Mediterranean region and the broader Middle East.

The potential in these regions for instability due to many unresolved political, social and economic issues is also a concern. In the Middle East, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict remains a major source of tension. Progress towards a lasting and comprehensive settlement of this conflict should be a priority for the countries of the region and for the international community as a whole. While NATO as such is not involved in the Middle East peace process, the Allies support the objectives of the Road Map – an initiative outlining steps to be taken towards a permanent settlement of the conflict, which is sponsored by the two parties directly concerned and the Quartet of the European Union, Russia, the United Nations and the United States.

Energy security is another concern, since as much as 65 per cent of Europe's imports of oil and natural gas passes through the Mediterranean. A secure and stable environment in the Mediterranean region is important not only to Western importing countries but also to the region's energy producers and to the countries through which oil and gas transit.

The Mediterranean Dialogue

NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue was initiated in 1994 by the North Atlantic Council in order to contribute to regional security and stability, achieve better mutual understanding and dispel misconceptions about NATO's policies and objectives among Dialogue countries. Over the years, the number of participating countries has increased: Egypt, Israel, Mauritania, Morocco, and Tunisia joined in 1994, followed by Jordan in 1995 and Algeria in 2000.

The Dialogue reflects the Alliance's view that security in Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean. It has formed an integral part of NATO's adaptation to the post-Cold War security environment and has been an important component of the Alliance's policy of outreach and cooperation.

Initially, NATO wanted to create a forum for confidence-building and transparency in which Allies could learn more about the security concerns of Dialogue countries and dispel misperceptions about NATO's aims and policies. Since then, political discussions have become more frequent and intense, and the Dialogue has been given more structure and opportunities for more concrete cooperation.

The launch of the Mediterranean Dialogue and its subsequent development have been based upon important principles:

- The development of the Dialogue is based on joint ownership. This encompasses respect for the specific regional, cultural and political situation of each individual Mediterranean partner and takes these factors into account in the context of the Dialogue. It makes it clear

that the Dialogue is to be perceived as a two-way street, with partner countries participating as shareholders in a cooperative effort. It draws on the experience gained and the added value resulting from the development of NATO's other partnerships.

- The Dialogue is progressive in terms of participation and substance. This flexibility has allowed the number of Dialogue partners to grow and the content of the Dialogue to evolve over time.
- All Mediterranean partners are offered cooperation activities and discussions with NATO on the same basis. Dialogue countries are free to choose the extent and intensity of their participation, allowing a certain degree of self-differentiation. This non-discriminatory framework is an essential feature of the Dialogue and has been key to its development.
- The Dialogue is intended to reinforce and complement other international efforts such as the European Union's Barcelona Process (Euro-Mediterranean Partnership) and the Mediterranean Initiative of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

The Dialogue has both a political and a practical dimension.

The political dimension

The political dialogue consists of regular bilateral meetings, involving individual Dialogue countries and NATO member countries, as well as multilateral meetings involving all seven Dialogue participants in joint meetings with NATO member countries. (Within NATO, the bilateral meetings are referred to as "NATO + 1", while those including all participants are called "NATO + 7" meetings.) They each take place at ambassadorial and working levels. The political dialogue also includes multilateral conferences at ambassadorial level and visits by senior officials.

Political consultations with individual participating countries are held annually both at ambassadorial and working level. These discussions provide an opportunity for sharing views on a range of issues relevant to the security situation in the Mediterranean, as well as on the further development of the political and practical cooperation dimensions of the Dialogue.

The Istanbul decision to create a more ambitious and expanded framework for the Mediterranean Dialogue calls for an enhancement of the political dialogue, including the organisation of ministerial meetings and the possibility of adopting at the earliest possible time a joint political declaration. On 8 December 2004, NATO foreign ministers and their counterparts from the

Mediterranean Dialogue countries met for the first time at ministerial level at a working dinner held to mark the tenth anniversary of the Dialogue.

This meeting highlighted a common view among the participating countries with regard to the need for enhanced public diplomacy in order to build up a more positive image, greater confidence and trust, and better understanding of NATO's policies and objectives among the countries of the region. As part of this process and reflecting the new dynamic in the Dialogue, the NATO Secretary General met heads of state and government and key ministers in a series of landmark visits to Dialogue countries in late 2004 and early 2005.

The practical dimension

The Mediterranean Dialogue also aims at pursuing practical cooperation. Since 1997, an Annual Work Programme has been established including seminars, workshops and other practical activities. The Work Programme has subsequently been expanded to include an increasing number of activities covering 21 areas of cooperation, notably in the fields of information, science and the environment, civil emergency planning, crisis management, defence policy and strategy, border security, small arms and light weapons, humanitarian mine action, defence reform and defence economics, as well as consultations on terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.

The military dimension of the Annual Work Programme entails invitations to Dialogue countries to observe and participate in NATO/PfP military exercises, attend courses and other academic activities at the NATO School in Oberammergau, Germany, and the NATO Defense College in Rome, Italy, and visit other NATO military bodies.

The military programme also includes port visits by NATO's Standing Naval Forces, on-site training of trainers by mobile training teams, and visits by NATO experts to assess possibilities for further cooperation in the military field. Consultation meetings on the military programme involving military representatives from NATO and the seven Mediterranean Dialogue countries are held twice a year. In an early manifestation of the enhancement of the Dialogue, the first formal meeting of the NATO Military Committee at the level of chiefs of defence staff, with the participation of the seven Dialogue countries, took place at NATO Headquarters in Brussels in November 2004. Discussions included a strong focus on the need for efficient counter-terrorist intelligence sharing and ways of facilitating cooperation to achieve this.

The practical interaction between NATO and Mediterranean Dialogue countries is well embodied by past and present contributions made by Egypt, Jordan and Morocco to NATO-led operations in the framework of the

Implementation Force (IFOR) and the Stabilisation Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the Kosovo Force (KFOR).

Towards a genuine partnership

Measures to strengthen cooperation with Mediterranean Dialogue countries were introduced at NATO summit meetings in Washington (1999) and Prague (2002). At the Istanbul Summit in 2004 the Dialogue was taken one step further with the aim of elevating it to a genuine partnership.

Taking advantage of the fact that opportunities for effective cooperation with Dialogue countries have increased, Allied leaders proposed a more ambitious and expanded partnership. This decision sought to take into account the interests of Dialogue countries and to draw on the experience and tools developed by NATO in other partnership frameworks. The overriding objectives of the Mediterranean Dialogue remain the same but the future focus is on developing more practical cooperation. Specific objectives are to enhance political dialogue, to achieve interoperability (that is, to improve the ability of the militaries of Dialogue countries to work with NATO forces), to contribute to the fight against terrorism and to cooperate in the area of defence reform.

Proposals are to expand and strengthen practical cooperation in a number of priority areas including a joint effort aimed at better explaining NATO's transformation and cooperative efforts; promoting military-to-military cooperative activities aimed at interoperability; improving the scope for the participation of Dialogue country forces in NATO-led crisis response operations such as disaster and humanitarian relief, search and rescue, and peace-support operations; promoting democratic control of armed forces and facilitating transparency in defence planning and budgeting; combating terrorism, for example through effective intelligence sharing and cooperation in the context of NATO's maritime anti-terrorism measures in the Mediterranean; contributing to NATO's work on the threat from weapons of mass destruction; promoting cooperation in the sphere of border security, for example in connection with combating terrorism or countering the proliferation of small arms and light weapons and illegal trafficking; and enhanced cooperation on civil emergency planning, including the possibility, in the case of disaster situations for Mediterranean partners, to request the assistance of the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre, which is based at NATO Headquarters.

Cooperation in a number of other areas is also being pursued. These include airspace management, armaments, conceptual aspects of defence and security, defence reform and defence economics, scientific and environmental issues, logistics, medical matters, meteorological issues, oceanography,

standardisation, exercises and training, and military education, training and doctrinal issues.

Enhanced cooperation may include increased use of mechanisms such as the Trust Fund Policy that has provided support for projects such as the destruction of landmines and other munitions in a number of Partnership for Peace countries, the development of action plans and individual cooperation programmes, and greater opportunities for participation in educational and training programmes and in exercises. Provision for appropriate legal and security measures and liaison arrangements to facilitate the full participation of Mediterranean partners in these enhanced activities would also be required.

The Istanbul Cooperation Initiative

In a separate but complementary undertaking at the June 2004 summit meeting, the Alliance launched an Istanbul Cooperation Initiative and invited interested countries in the broader Middle East region to take part, beginning with the member countries of the Gulf Cooperation Council (Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar, Oman, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates). Of these, Bahrain, Kuwait, Qatar and the United Arab Emirates had already accepted the invitation by mid-2005; the Alliance hopes that the others will also do so. The objective is to foster mutually beneficial bilateral relations with the countries of the region as a means of enhancing regional security and stability, with a particular focus on practical cooperation in the defence and security fields. Key priorities are the fight against terrorism and countering the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The Initiative complements other international processes and initiatives relating to the area, including NATO's parallel but distinct Mediterranean Dialogue, but does not duplicate any of them nor seek to create a political debate over issues more appropriately handled in other fora.

The Initiative is open to interested countries in the region which subscribe to its aims and are willing to develop and implement agreed work plans reflecting their individual ideas and proposals. As with the Mediterranean Dialogue, it is based on the principle of joint ownership, which means fully respecting the mutual interests of NATO and of the participating countries, taking into account their diversity and specific needs. It will focus on practical cooperation in areas where NATO can "add value" – in other words areas such as security in particular where NATO's strengths and experience can be drawn on to create opportunities for contributing to longer-term security and stability in the region through forms of cooperation not available in other contexts.

The practical implementation of this Initiative will be based on specific activities involving different forms of cooperation and assistance, applying

lessons learned and appropriate mechanisms and instruments derived from other NATO initiatives including the Partnership for Peace and the Mediterranean Dialogue. Such activities, tailored to individual needs, may include advice on defence reform, budgeting and planning and on civil-military relations; military-to-military cooperation aimed at improving interoperability including through participation in selected exercises and education and training programmes; case-by-case participation in NATO-led peace-support operations; fighting terrorism through information sharing and maritime cooperation, for example; contributing to Alliance work on the threat from weapons of mass destruction; promoting cooperation in the sphere of border security, for example in connection with combating terrorism or countering the proliferation of small arms and light weapons and illegal trafficking; and cooperation in areas relating to civil emergency planning. NATO has developed a menu of practical activities in these priority areas which forms the basis of individual work plans to be jointly developed and implemented with interested countries.

As in the case of the Mediterranean Dialogue, an underlying requirement for the success of the Initiative is the development of ownership of its objectives and activities by the countries of the region. Recognising this requirement, the policy document issued by NATO in July 2004 refers to the need for a clear understanding of NATO and of the objectives of the Initiative among governments and opinion-formers in participating countries. It proposes that consideration should be given to a joint effort of public diplomacy and a process of regular consultation, to ensure that the views of participating countries are taken into account as the Initiative is gradually developed and implemented.

CHAPTER 27

COOPERATION WITH COUNTRIES IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE

Conflict and instability in the Balkans in the 1990s posed direct challenges to the security interests of NATO member countries as well as to wider European peace and stability. This led the Alliance to undertake peace-support and crisis-management operations first in Bosnia and Herzegovina and later in Kosovo and then the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* (see Part IV).

In 1999, the Kosovo crisis led the international community to reassess its engagement in the region and to adopt a more comprehensive approach to fostering security and stability. This was manifest in the launch of NATO's South East Europe Initiative as well as the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe.¹ Since then, NATO's involvement in building security and stability in southeastern Europe has expanded beyond peacekeeping to promoting security cooperation in the region.

The South East Europe Initiative

NATO's South East Europe Initiative (SEEI) was launched at the Washington Summit in April 1999 to promote regional cooperation and long-term security and stability in the region.

The initiative was based on four pillars: a Consultative Forum on Security Issues on South East Europe, an open-ended *Ad Hoc* Working Group (AHWG) on Regional Cooperation in South East Europe under the auspices of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), Partnership for Peace (PfP) working tools, and targeted security cooperation programmes for countries in the region.

The Consultative Forum met initially at summit level on the margins of the NATO's Washington Summit and has subsequently met at ambassadorial level at NATO Headquarters. It currently includes NATO countries, four southeastern European Partner countries (Albania, Croatia, Moldova and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*), and Bosnia and Herzegovina and

1 The Stability Pact was initiated by the European Union in May 1999. It was subsequently formally adopted at an international conference held in Cologne, Germany on 10 June 1999 and placed under the auspices of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. It is designed to contribute to lasting peace, prosperity and stability in southeastern Europe through coherent and coordinated action, by bringing together the countries of the region and other interested countries and organisations with capabilities to contribute. It establishes specific mechanisms to coordinate joint actions.

Serbia and Montenegro, which are not yet part of the EAPC or the Partnership for Peace.

The EAPC-AHWG identified ideas on promoting regional cooperation that will be further developed. These ideas have been incorporated into a set of activities modelled on activities carried out under NATO's PfP Programme.

The methodology of the PfP initiative has been used to address a number of issues which are important to southeastern Europe, including transparency in defence planning, crisis management and defence management. Activities such as workshops on those topics have been designed to have a region-wide focus. Some of them have been led by the participating countries in the region, facilitated by NATO, and others by NATO itself. Intended to complement each other, they are helping to promote stability through regional cooperation and integration.

A South East Europe Security Cooperation Steering Group (SEEGROUP) has been established to coordinate regional projects. The SEEGROUP meets regularly at NATO Headquarters in Brussels and has focused increasingly on expanding the role of the participating countries in the management of regional projects and in the implementation of an annual Action Plan. Projects include a comparative study of the national defence strategies of the countries in the region (SEESTUDY); an exchange of politico-military and other early-warning, conflict-prevention and crisis-management information (SECHANGE); work on reduction of the proliferation and improved control of small arms and light weapons; border management and security; support for defence reforms; improvement of cooperation in enhancing counter-terrorism capabilities (SEEPRO); civil emergency planning activities; and the instigation of a clearing-house approach for the exchange of security-related information.

Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia and Montenegro have expressed their desire to join the Partnership for Peace. NATO is prepared to welcome them as Partner countries once they have met a number of conditions, which include full cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia – in particular, detaining and turning over to the Tribunal persons indicted for war crimes – and key defence reforms. To help these countries carry out the necessary reforms, a special Security Cooperation Programme with Bosnia and Herzegovina was launched in 1997, a series of "Measures of Cooperation with Serbia and Montenegro" was introduced in June 2004, and a Tailored Cooperation Programme was launched in July 2004.

NATO provides advice and expertise on the retraining of military officers discharged as part of force structure reforms in partner countries of the region. This takes the form of a NATO project, carried out in the framework of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe in cooperation with the World Bank and

other donors. It originally applied to Bulgaria and Romania while they were preparing for NATO accession. By mid-2002, over 5000 military officers had taken advantage of the retraining programmes. The process was then extended to other countries of the western Balkans, for example Albania, Croatia, Serbia and Montenegro, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.* This has offered an opportunity for new members of NATO that had benefited from this project to become providers of expertise to other partner countries. Work on the closure of military sites in southeastern Europe and their conversion to civilian use has also been also initiated.

PART VIII

NATO-EU RELATIONS

CHAPTER 28

**The strategic partnership between NATO and
the European Union**

CHAPTER 28

THE STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN NATO AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

Both NATO and the European Union (EU) have, since their inception, contributed to maintaining and strengthening security and stability in western Europe. NATO has pursued this aim in its capacity as a strong and defensive political and military alliance and, since the end of the Cold War, has extended security in the wider Euro-Atlantic area both by enlarging its membership and by developing other partnerships. The European Union has created enhanced stability by promoting progressive economic and political integration, initially among western European countries and subsequently also by welcoming new member countries. As a result of the respective organisations' enlargement processes, an increasing number of European countries have become part of the mainstream of European political and economic development, and many are members of both organisations.

No formal relationship existed between NATO and the European Union until 2000. Prior to that, during the 1990s the Western European Union (WEU) acted as the interface for cooperation between NATO and those European countries seeking to build a stronger European security and defence identity within NATO.

The situation changed fundamentally in 1999 when, against the backdrop of the conflicts in the Balkans, EU leaders decided to develop a European Security and Defence Policy within the European Union itself, in coordination with NATO, and to take over responsibility for most of the functions that had been exercised by the Western European Union. The following year, NATO and the European Union started to work together to develop a framework for cooperation and consultation. This led to the development of a strategic partnership (NATO-EU Declaration on the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP)) between the two organisations and the agreement of the Berlin Plus arrangements, which provide access to NATO's collective assets and capabilities for military operations led by the European Union.

These developments established the basis for NATO-EU cooperation in the sphere of crisis management in the western Balkans as well as for the development of cooperation on other issues.

The evolution of NATO-EU relations

The Cold War period

Despite shared objectives and common interests in many spheres, the parallel development of NATO and the European Union throughout the Cold War period was characterised by a clear separation of roles and responsibilities, and the absence of formal or informal institutional contacts between them. While a structural basis for a specifically European security and defence role existed in the form of the Western European Union, created in 1948, for practical purposes western European security was preserved exclusively by NATO. For its part, the Western European Union undertook a number of specific tasks, primarily in relation to post-war arms control arrangements in western Europe. However, its role was limited and its membership was not identical to that of the European Union.

Given this institutional background, when questions arose concerning the need for a more equitable sharing of the burden of European security between the two sides of the Atlantic, they were discussed primarily at the bilateral, political level. A number of representational initiatives on the part of the European member countries of NATO were conducted with a view to reassuring the United States about the level of the European commitment to security and defence. However, no multilateral or institutional arrangements existed for developing independent structures outside the Alliance framework.

NATO-WEU cooperation and the development of a European Security and Defence Identity within NATO

In the early 1990s, it became apparent that European countries needed to assume greater responsibility for their common security and defence. A rebalancing of the relationship between Europe and North America was essential for two reasons: first, to redistribute the economic burden of providing for Europe's continuing security, and second, to reflect the gradual emergence within European institutions of a stronger, more integrated European political identity, and the conviction of many EU members that Europe must develop the capacity to act militarily in appropriate circumstances where NATO is not engaged militarily.

The emergence of these new approaches to the problems of European security was profoundly influenced by the conflicts in the western Balkans during the 1990s. The inability of Europe to intervene to prevent or resolve such conflicts led to a collective realisation that the European Union must redress the imbalance between its far-reaching economic power and the limitations on

its political power. It had become obvious to many that a coordinated diplomatic effort to end conflict by political means needed to be backed up, if necessary, by credible military force. This led the European Union to become increasingly committed during the 1990s to conflict prevention and crisis management beyond its borders.

An important step in this direction was taken in 1992 with the Treaty of Maastricht, which included an agreement by EU leaders to develop a Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP) “including the eventual framing of a common defence policy which might in time lead to a common defence”. As an integral part of the development of the European Union, the Western European Union was requested to elaborate and implement EU decisions and actions with defence implications. The initiative to develop European defence capabilities through the Western European Union was later carried forward on the basis of the 1997 EU Treaty of Amsterdam. This Treaty, which entered into force in May 1999, incorporated the so-called WEU Petersburg tasks – humanitarian search and rescue missions, peacekeeping missions, crisis management tasks including peace enforcement, and environmental protection – providing the basis for the operative development of a common European defence policy.

In the same timeframe, a decision was taken at the 1994 NATO summit meeting in Brussels to develop a European Security and Defence Identity within NATO. This led to the introduction of practical arrangements to enable the Alliance to support European military operations undertaken by the Western European Union.¹ Decisions which served to reinforce this development were taken by the Alliance at subsequent meetings of NATO foreign and defence ministers in Berlin and Brussels in June 1996, and at the 1997 NATO summit meeting in Madrid.

In this way, the Western European Union was simultaneously developed as the defence component of the European Union and as a means of strengthening the European pillar of NATO. European member countries of the Alliance recognised that in the process of achieving a genuine European military capability, unnecessary duplication of the command structures, planning staffs and military assets and capabilities already available within NATO should be avoided. Moreover, such an approach would serve to strengthen the European contribution to the Alliance’s missions and activities, while responding to the

1 These arrangements included several provisions that are laid out in the June 1996 Final Communiqué. They include the availability of Alliance assets for the WEU, the elaboration of appropriate multinational European command arrangements within NATO for commanding and conducting WEU-led operations, and the concept of Combined Joint Task Forces, the purpose of which was to provide more flexible and deployable forces able to respond to new demands of all Alliance missions as well as separable but not separate deployed headquarters that could be employed by the WEU.

European Union's goal of developing a common foreign and security policy as well as to the overall need for a more balanced transatlantic partnership.

The arrangements made for NATO-WEU cooperation from 1991 to 2000 laid the groundwork for the subsequent development of the future NATO-EU relationship. In practice these arrangements were designed to ensure that if a crisis arose in which the Alliance decided not to intervene but the Western European Union chose to do so, the WEU could request the use of Alliance assets and capabilities to conduct an operation under its own political control and strategic direction.

New impetus for the development of this relationship was provided by the British-French summit meeting at St Malo, in December 1998. France and the United Kingdom agreed that the European Union "must have the capacity for autonomous action, backed up by credible military forces, the means to decide to use them, and a readiness to do so, in order to respond to international crises". They issued a joint statement outlining their determination to enable the European Union to give concrete expression to these objectives.

Transfer of WEU responsibilities to the European Union

In the new climate that prevailed after the Anglo-French initiative, further decisions could be made. At the Washington Summit in April 1999, NATO leaders welcomed the new impetus given to the strengthening of the European Security and Defence Policy, affirming that a stronger European role would help contribute to the vitality of the Alliance in the 21st century. NATO leaders further stated that as this process went forward, NATO and the European Union should ensure the development of effective mutual consultation, cooperation and transparency, building on existing mechanisms between NATO and the Western European Union.

They also set in train further work to address a number of principles for future cooperation with the European Union and, in particular, satisfactory resolution of outstanding questions. These related in particular to three issues that had long proved difficult to resolve, namely:

- the means of ensuring the development of effective mutual consultation, cooperation and transparency between the European Union and the Alliance, based on the mechanisms that had been established between NATO and the Western European Union;
- the participation of non-EU European Allies in the decisions and the operations that might be conducted by the European Union; and
- practical arrangements for ensuring EU access to NATO planning capabilities and NATO's assets and capabilities.

EU leaders meeting in Cologne in June 1999 welcomed the St Malo statement and, taking into account the Amsterdam Treaty which incorporated the WEU Petersburg tasks, agreed on the concept and the objective of a European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) for the European Union. They decided “to give the EU the means and capabilities to assume its responsibilities regarding a common European policy on security and defence” and also made a commitment to ensure the development of effective mutual consultation, cooperation and transparency with NATO. Similar reassurances were offered at subsequent European Council meetings, particularly in Helsinki (December 1999) and Nice (December 2000).

At the Helsinki meeting, the European Council established a “Headline Goal” for EU member states in terms of developing military capabilities for crisis-management operations. Its objective was to enable the European Union, by 2003, to deploy and sustain for at least one year military forces of up to 60 000 troops to undertake the full range of the Petersburg tasks referred to above, in the context of EU-led military operations in response to international crises where NATO as a whole is not engaged militarily. In addition, the European Union decided to create permanent political and military structures, including a Political and Security Committee, a Military Committee and a Military Staff, to ensure the necessary political guidance and strategic direction for such operations. The crisis management role of the Western European Union was also transferred to the EU at the Helsinki meeting (decision taken at the WEU Council Ministerial meeting in Marseilles in December 2000). The residual responsibilities of the WEU remain unaffected and are handled by a much reduced formal political structure and a small secretariat.

Built on decisions taken in Cologne and Helsinki, the Treaty of Nice signed in December 2000 (which came into effect in February 2003) provides the EU with the political framework for military operations (ESDP) and permanent political and military structures.

At the end of 2000, with the formal transfer of responsibilities for EU decisions and actions with defence implications from the Western European Union to the European Union itself, the relationship between NATO and the EU took on a new dimension.

Towards a strategic partnership with the European Union

Negotiations initiated in September 2000 led to an exchange of letters between NATO’s Secretary General and the EU Presidency in January 2001 to define the scope of cooperation and the modalities of “consultations and cooperation on questions of common interest relating to security, defence and

crisis management, so that crises can be met with the most appropriate military response and effective crisis management ensured”.

The exchange of letters provided for joint meetings at different levels. It prescribed two joint NATO-EU foreign ministers meetings every year and a minimum of three joint meetings per semester at ambassadorial level of the North Atlantic Council and the EU Political and Security Committee (known as NAC-PSC meetings). In addition, two joint Military Committee meetings would be held each semester, and meetings between subordinate committees would be scheduled on a regular basis. The exchange of letters also provided for meetings at staff level.

Since then, NAC-PSC meetings have become a normal feature of cooperation between the two organisations. The September 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States provided a further incentive to enhance cooperation. The very next day, NATO’s Secretary General participated in the deliberations of the EU General Affairs Council to analyse the international situation following the attacks. Formal contacts and reciprocal participation in meetings have subsequently increased.

At the Prague Summit in November 2002, NATO leaders reaffirmed their commitment to enhance NATO-EU cooperation, the effectiveness of which had already been evident in joint efforts to restore peace and create the conditions for progress in the Balkans.

In the NATO-EU Declaration on ESDP issued in December 2002, the two organisations “welcomed the strategic partnership established between the EU and NATO in crisis management, founded on our shared values, the indivisibility of our security and our determination to tackle the challenges of the new century” . A few months later, NATO and the European Union gave substance to this strategic partnership and opened the way for coordinated action by agreeing a series of documents that provided for exchanges of classified information and for cooperation in crisis management, including through the Berlin Plus arrangements.

The development of practical NATO-EU cooperation

The Berlin Plus arrangements

The Berlin Plus arrangements are based on the recognition that member countries of both organisations only have one set of forces and limited defence resources on which they can draw. Under these circumstances, and to avoid an unnecessary duplication of resources, it was agreed that operations led

by the European Union would be able to benefit from NATO assets and capabilities. In effect, these arrangements enable NATO to support EU-led operations in which the Alliance as a whole is not engaged. They have facilitated the transfer of responsibility from NATO to the European Union of military operations in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* and in Bosnia and Herzegovina (see below).

Agreed in March 2003, these arrangements are referred to as Berlin Plus because they build on decisions taken in Berlin in 1996 in the context of NATO-WEU cooperation. The main features of the Berlin Plus arrangements consist of the following main elements:

- assured EU access to NATO planning capabilities able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations;
- the presumption of availability to the European Union of pre-identified NATO capabilities and common assets for use in EU-led operations;
- identification of a range of European command options for EU-led operations, further developing the role of NATO's Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe (DSACEUR) in order for him to assume his European responsibilities fully and effectively;
- the further adaptation of NATO's defence planning system to incorporate more comprehensively the availability of forces for EU-led operations;
- a NATO-EU agreement covering the exchange of classified information under reciprocal security protection rules;
- procedures for the release, monitoring, return and recall of NATO assets and capabilities;
- NATO-EU consultation arrangements in the context of an EU-led crisis management operation making use of NATO assets and capabilities.

Cooperation in the western Balkans

The crisis in southern Serbia and the unstable political situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* became a focus of international concern in 2001. A series of joint visits to the region by NATO's Secretary General and the EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy underscored the unity of purpose and commitment shared by NATO and the European Union with regard to the security of the region.

On 30 May 2001, at the first formal NATO-EU foreign ministers' meeting in Budapest, the NATO Secretary General and the EU presidency issued a joint statement on the western Balkans. Later, they met in Brussels in December 2001 and in Reykjavik in May 2002 to review their cooperation across the board. They underlined their continuing commitment to strengthening the peace process in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* as well as elsewhere in the western Balkans, and reaffirmed their commitment to a close and transparent relationship between the two organisations.

Cooperation on the ground contributed positively to the improved situation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.* From August 2001 to the end of March 2003, NATO provided security for EU and OSCE monitors of the peace plan brokered with the support of the international community in the city of Ohrid. On 31 March 2003, the NATO-led peacekeeping mission (Operation Amber Fox) was terminated and responsibility for this task was formally handed over to the European Union, with the agreement of the government in Skopje. Renamed Operation Concordia, this was the first EU-led military crisis-management operation. Undertaken on the basis of the Berlin Plus arrangements, it marked the real starting point for cooperation between NATO and the European Union in addressing an operational crisis-management task.

On 29 July 2003, NATO and the European Union formally agreed on a “concerted approach to security and stability in the western Balkans” and outlined their strategic approach to the problems of the region. Both organisations expressed determination to continue to build on their achievements in working together to bring an end to conflict and to help stabilise the region as a whole.

At the Istanbul Summit in June 2004, in view of the positive evolution of the security situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Alliance leaders confirmed their decision to terminate NATO’s peacekeeping mission there, which it had led since 1996, and welcomed the readiness of the European Union to assume responsibility for a new mission, Operation Althea, based on the Berlin Plus arrangements. Close cooperation and coordination with regard to the planning and implementation of the EU mission was facilitated by the appointment of the NATO Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe (DSACEUR) as the EU Operation Commander.

NATO leaders stressed that NATO would nevertheless remain committed to the stabilisation of the country and would maintain a residual military presence through a NATO headquarters in Sarajevo. This headquarters is responsible primarily for providing assistance in the defence reform process and other tasks including counter-terrorism and support for the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

A ceremony marking the handover of the primary responsibility for security in Bosnia and Herzegovina from NATO to the European Union took place in Sarajevo on 2 December 2004. The new NATO military headquarters was formally established on the same day.

Cooperation on other issues

The strategic partnership also covers other issues of common interest. These include concerted efforts with regard to the planning and development of military capabilities. NATO experts have provided military and technical advice for both the initial preparation and the subsequent implementation of the European Union's European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP), which was created in November 2001. ECAP aims to provide the forces and capabilities required to meet the EU Headline Goal set at Helsinki in 1999. A NATO-EU Capability Group, established in May 2003, is working to ensure that the Alliance's capabilities initiatives and the ECAP are mutually reinforcing and is also examining the relationship between the NATO Response Force and newly created EU Battle Groups, as part of the NATO-EU agenda under the Berlin Plus arrangements.

The EU rapid reaction units, composed of battle groups, were part of the new Headline Goal for 2010 announced in February 2004. They are to be completely developed by 2007. The Headline Goal also led to the creation of an EU Defence Agency that focuses on the development of defence capabilities, research, acquisition and armaments.

Through information exchanges on their respective activities, consultations and contacts at expert and staff level, and joint meetings, NATO and the European Union also undertake joint work on issues such as the fight against terrorism, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD), the situation in Moldova, Mediterranean issues and cooperation in Afghanistan. Additional spheres of information exchange and cooperation include protection of civilian populations against chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear attacks and other civil emergency planning and WMD-related issues. Cooperation can sometimes involve reciprocal participation in exercises. In November 2003 for instance, the first joint NATO-EU crisis management exercise (CME/CMX 03) was held. It was based on a range of standing Berlin Plus arrangements and concentrated on how the EU plans for an envisaged EU-led operation with recourse to NATO assets and capabilities, where NATO as a whole is not engaged.

PART IX

THE WIDER INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK FOR SECURITY

- | | |
|-------------------|--|
| CHAPTER 29 | NATO's relations with the United Nations |
| CHAPTER 30 | NATO and the Organization for Security and
Co-operation in Europe |
| CHAPTER 31 | Cooperation with other international organisations |
| CHAPTER 32 | Cooperation with parliamentary and
non-governmental organisations |

CHAPTER 29

NATO'S RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations (UN) is at the core of the wider institutional framework within which the Alliance operates, a principle which is enshrined in NATO's founding treaty. UN Security Council resolutions have provided the mandate for NATO's major peace-support operations in the Balkans and in Afghanistan, and also provide the framework for NATO's training mission in Iraq. More recently, NATO has provided logistical assistance to the African Union's UN-endorsed peacekeeping operation in the Darfur region of Sudan.

In recent years, cooperation between NATO and the United Nations has developed well beyond their common engagement in the western Balkans and in Afghanistan. The relationship between the two organisations has been steadily growing at all levels – on the ground, conceptually and politically, as well as institutionally. Cooperation and consultations with UN specialised bodies go beyond crisis management and cover a wide range of issues, including civil emergency planning, civil-military cooperation, combating human trafficking, action against mines, and the fight against terrorism.

The North Atlantic Treaty and the UN Charter

The acknowledgement of a direct relationship between the North Atlantic Treaty and the Charter of the United Nations is a fundamental principle of the Alliance. The Charter, signed in San Francisco on 26 June 1945 by fifty countries, provides the legal basis for the creation of NATO and establishes the overall responsibility of the UN Security Council for international peace and security. These two fundamental principles are enshrined in NATO's North Atlantic Treaty signed in Washington on 4 April 1949.

The preamble to the Washington Treaty makes it clear that the UN Charter is the framework within which the Alliance operates. In its opening phrases, the signatories of the Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter. In Article 1 they also undertake to settle international disputes by peaceful means and to refrain from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the UN Charter. Article 5 of the Treaty makes explicit reference to Article 51 of the UN Charter in asserting the right of the Allies to take, individually or collectively, such action as they deem necessary for their self-defence. This includes the use of armed force. Moreover, it commits the member countries to terminating any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result, when the UN Security Council has itself taken

the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

Further reference to the UN Charter can be found in Article 7 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which states that the Treaty does not affect and shall not be interpreted as affecting in any way the rights and obligations of Allies under the Charter and reaffirms the primary responsibility of the UN Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security. And finally, a clause in Article 12 of the Treaty provides for a review of the Treaty after ten years if any of the Parties to it so requests. It stipulates that the review would take place in the light of new developments affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal and regional arrangements under the UN Charter.

The North Atlantic Treaty came into force on 24 August 1949. None of the Parties to it have requested a review of the Treaty under Article 12, although at each stage of its development the Alliance has kept the implementation of the Treaty under continuous review for the purpose of securing its objectives.

Practical cooperation

Although the formal link between the United Nations and the North Atlantic Alliance has remained solidly anchored in the connection between their respective founding documents since the foundation of the Alliance in 1949, working relations between the institutions of the United Nations and those of the Alliance remained limited for most of this period. The situation changed in 1992, against the backdrop of growing conflict in the western Balkans, where their respective roles in crisis management led to an intensification of practical cooperation between the two organisations.

In July 1992, NATO ships belonging to the Alliance's Standing Naval Force Mediterranean, assisted by NATO Maritime Patrol Aircraft, began monitoring operations in the Adriatic in support of a UN arms embargo against all the republics of the former Yugoslavia. A few months later, in November, NATO and the Western European Union (WEU) began enforcement operations in support of UN Security Council resolutions aimed at preventing an escalation of the conflict.

The readiness of the Alliance to support peacekeeping operations under the authority of the UN Security Council was formally stated by NATO foreign ministers in December 1992. Measures already being taken by NATO countries, individually and as an Alliance, were reviewed and the Alliance indicated that it was ready to respond positively to further initiatives that the

UN Secretary General might take in seeking Alliance assistance in this field. A number of measures were subsequently taken, including joint maritime operations under the authority of the NATO and WEU Councils, NATO air operations, close air support for the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR), air strikes to protect UN “Safe Areas”, and contingency planning for other options which the United Nations might take.

Following the signature of the General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina (the Dayton Agreement) on 14 December 1995, NATO was given a mandate by the United Nations, on the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 1031, to implement the military aspects of the peace agreement. This was NATO’s first peacekeeping operation. A NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) began operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina to fulfil this mandate on 16 December 1995. One year later, it was replaced by a NATO-led Stabilisation Force (SFOR). Throughout their mandates both multinational forces worked closely with other international organisations and humanitarian agencies on the ground, including UN agencies such as the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the International Police Task Force (IPTF).

From the onset of the conflict in Kosovo in 1998 and throughout the crisis, close contacts were maintained between the UN Secretary General and NATO’s Secretary General. Actions were taken by the Alliance in support of UN Security Council resolutions both during and after the conflict. The Kosovo Force (KFOR) was deployed on the basis of UN Security Council Resolution 1244 of 12 June 1999 to provide an international security presence as the prerequisite for peace and reconstruction of Kosovo.

In 2000 and 2001, NATO and the United Nations also cooperated successfully in containing major ethnic discord in southern Serbia and preventing a full-blown civil war in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.*

More recently, cooperation between NATO and the UN has played a key role in Afghanistan. On 11 August 2003, the Alliance formally took over the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF), a UN-mandated force originally tasked with helping provide security in and around Kabul. ISAF has subsequently been authorised by a series of UN Security Council resolutions to expand its presence into other regions of the country to extend the authority of the central government and to facilitate development and reconstruction. The Alliance also temporarily deployed extra forces to Afghanistan to increase ISAF’s support for the Afghan authorities’ efforts to provide a secure environment for presidential elections in October 2004 and for the parliamentary and municipal elections in September 2005.

In Iraq, under the terms of UN Security Council Resolution 1546 and at the request of the Iraqi Interim Government, NATO is providing assistance in training and equipping Iraqi security forces.

In June 2005, following a request from the African Union and in close coordination with the United Nations and the European Union, NATO agreed to support the African Union in the expansion of its mission to end the continuing violence in the Darfur region of Sudan. NATO assisted by airlifting peacekeepers from African troop-contributing countries to the region over the summer months, and also helped train African Union officers in running a multinational military headquarters and managing intelligence.

Regular contacts

NATO's Secretary General reports regularly to the UN Secretary General on progress in NATO-led operations and on other key decisions of the North Atlantic Council in the area of crisis management and in the fight against terrorism.

Staff-level meetings have become more frequent and a number of high-level visits take place between the United Nations and NATO each year. For instance, a NATO-UN Round Table meeting was held in March 2004 in New York. In April 2004, UN Deputy Secretary General Louise Fréchette visited NATO and, in November 2004, NATO Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer addressed the UN Security Council. In September 2005, Jaap de Hoop Scheffer returned to New York to meet the UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, for discussions on current operations and to launch ideas for a more structured relationship with the United Nations.

Staff-level meetings also take place with other UN organisations, such as the UN Office on Drugs and Crime, and NATO experts participate in events organised by other UN bodies. In the area of civil emergency planning, contacts are well established between the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Co-ordination Centre (EADRCC) and the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, which maintains a liaison officer at the EADRCC on a permanent basis.

NATO also contributes actively to the work of the UN Counter-Terrorism Committee (UN CTC) – established in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution 1373 adopted in the aftermath of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States – and participates in special meetings of the Committee that bring together international, regional and sub-regional organisations involved in this process.

CHAPTER 30

NATO AND THE ORGANIZATION FOR SECURITY AND CO-OPERATION IN EUROPE

NATO and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) have complementary roles and functions in promoting peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic region in areas such as conflict prevention and crisis management. The NATO-OSCE relationship is manifested at both the political and the operational level. The two organisations have cooperated actively in the field in the western Balkans since the 1990s, and regularly exchange views and seek to complement each other's activities on issues of common interest, such as crisis management, border security, disarmament, terrorism and initiatives towards specific regions.

The political basis for cooperation

The NATO-OSCE relationship reflects the Alliance's commitment to a broad approach to security and the desire of NATO member countries, expressed in the Alliance's 1999 Strategic Concept, to establish cooperative relationships with other complementary and mutually reinforcing organisations.

Political relations between the two organisations are governed by the "Platform for Cooperative Security" launched at the OSCE Istanbul Summit in 1999. The Platform calls for reinforced cooperation between international organisations, drawing on the resources of the international community to drive for democracy, prosperity and stability in Europe and beyond. It provides for meetings between the organisations to discuss operational and political issues of common interest.

At the Prague Summit in November 2002, NATO leaders expressed their desire to extend cooperation with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in the areas of conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation operations. They also highlighted the need to exploit the complementarity of international efforts aimed at reinforcing stability in the Mediterranean region. Following this statement, the two organisations began developing closer contacts affecting their respective dialogues with countries in the region.

In light of changes in the security environment, both organisations have also extended their dialogue to other areas of common interest, including terrorism. In December 2003, the OSCE Ministerial Council, meeting at Maastricht, the Netherlands, adopted a new "Strategy to Address Threats to Security and

Stability in the 21st Century". This document recalls the need, in a constantly changing security environment, to interact with other organisations and institutions cooperating in the context of the Platform for Cooperative Security, and to take advantage of the assets and strengths of each.

With regard to the fight against terrorism, NATO's efforts, particularly within the framework of partnerships with non-member countries, complement those of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. A number of OSCE initiatives have been launched since the September 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, including the Charter on Preventing and Combating Terrorism adopted in Porto in 2002.

Practical cooperation

Practical NATO-OSCE cooperation is best exemplified by the complementary missions undertaken by the two organisations in the western Balkans. In 1996, after the signing of the Dayton Peace Accord they developed a joint action programme in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) established to implement the military aspects of the peace agreements, and the Stabilisation Force (SFOR) which succeeded it (see Part IV on NATO operations), provided vital support for implementation of the civilian aspects of the agreements. By ensuring the security of OSCE personnel and humanitarian assistance, NATO contributed, among others, to the smooth organisation of elections in Bosnia and Herzegovina under OSCE auspices.

In October 1998, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe established a Kosovo Verification Mission to monitor compliance on the ground with cease-fire agreements concluded after the deterioration of the situation in Kosovo and the efforts of the international community to avert further conflict. NATO conducted a parallel aerial surveillance mission. Following a further deterioration in security conditions, the OSCE Verification Mission was forced to withdraw in March 1999.

Following the NATO air campaign in Kosovo, in July 1999, a new OSCE Mission to Kosovo was established as part of the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo. The role of the OSCE Mission, among other things, is to oversee the progress of democratisation, the creation of institutions and the protection of human rights. The Mission maintains close relations with the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR), which has a mandate from the United Nations to guarantee a safe environment for the work of the international community.

NATO has also cooperated closely with the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.*

A NATO task force was set up in September 2001 to provide additional security for EU and OSCE observers monitoring the implementation of a framework peace agreement, which had been reached in the summer after a period of internal ethnic unrest in the spring. The European Union officially took over this operation, renamed Concordia, from March 2003 until its conclusion in December 2003.

NATO-OSCE cooperation has also contributed to promoting better management and securing of borders in the western Balkans. At a high-level conference held in Ohrid in May 2003, five Balkan countries endorsed a Common Platform developed by the European Union, NATO, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe and the Stability Pact,¹ aimed at enhancing border security in the region. Each organisation supports the countries involved in the areas within its jurisdiction.

NATO and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe also seek to coordinate their efforts in other areas. Initiatives taken by NATO in areas such as arms control, mine clearance, elimination of ammunition stocks and efforts to control the spread of small arms and light weapons dovetail with OSCE efforts aimed at preventing conflict and restoring stability after a conflict. Moreover, in the regional context, both organisations place special emphasis on southeastern Europe, the Caucasus and Central Asia. Each has also developed parallel initiatives directed towards the countries of the Mediterranean region.

Regular contacts

Contacts between NATO and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe take place at different levels and in different contexts, including high-level meetings between the NATO Secretary General and the OSCE Chairman-in-Office. Periodically, NATO's Secretary General is invited to address the OSCE Permanent Council. Similarly, the North Atlantic Council may from time to time invite the OSCE Chairman-in-Office to address one of its meetings.

Exchanges of views on issues of common interest such as crisis management, border security, disarmament and terrorism regularly take place between

1 The Stability Pact was initiated by the European Union in May 1999. It was subsequently formally adopted at an international conference held in Cologne on 10 June 1999 and placed under the auspices of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. The Stability Pact is designed to contribute to lasting peace, prosperity and stability in southeastern Europe through coherent, coordinated action, by bringing together the countries of the region and other interested countries and organisations with capabilities to contribute. It establishes specific mechanisms to coordinate joint actions.

officials from both organisations. Their respective representatives in the field meet regularly to share information and discuss various aspects of their cooperation.

CHAPTER 31

COOPERATION WITH OTHER INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

NATO is keen to deepen its relations with other international organisations to share information and promote appropriate and effective action in areas of common interest. The primary focus of its relations with other international organisations concerns cooperation with the European Union, the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, as described in the previous chapters. NATO also holds consultations and engages in differing forms of cooperation with a number of other important international institutions.

The Council of Europe

The Council of Europe was established on 5 May 1949, “to achieve a greater unity between its members for the purpose of safeguarding and realising the ideals and principles which are their common heritage and facilitating their social and economic progress”. The Council’s overall aim is to maintain the basic principles of humanitarian rights, pluralist democracy and the rule of law, and to enhance the quality of life of European citizens.

NATO regularly receives documents, reports and records from the Council of Europe and is kept informed of different parliamentary sessions or upcoming events. The outcome of various sessions and reports on issues of common interest is monitored by NATO’s International Staff and this information is distributed to relevant divisions within the organisation.

The International Organisation for Migration

The International Organisation for Migration is the leading international organisation working with migrant populations and governments on issues relating to migration challenges. It is committed to the principle that humane and orderly migration benefits both migrants and the societies in which they live. Established in 1951 and tasked with the resettlement of European displaced persons, refugees and migrants, the organisation now encompasses a variety of migration-management issues and other activities throughout the world.

With offices and operations on every continent, the organisation helps governments and civil societies, for example, in responding to sudden migration

flows, post-emergency returns and reintegration programmes, and providing assistance to migrants on their way to new homes. It also promotes the training of officials and measures to counter trafficking in human beings.

Cooperation with NATO takes place in several fields such as combating trafficking in human beings, border security and reconstruction in post-conflict regions. Regions where there is great potential for cooperation include the Caucasus and Central Asia. The first formal and structured contacts between the two organisations took place in staff-level meetings in September 2004.

The Assembly of the Western European Union

NATO also has contacts with the Assembly of the Western European Union (WEU). Although not an international organisation in the strict sense of the term, the Assembly was created in 1954 under the modified Brussels Treaty of 1948, which is the founding document of the Western European Union. Called upon in 1984 to contribute to the process of establishing a stronger European security and defence identity, the Western European Union was later relieved of these responsibilities, which were transferred to the European Union at the end of 1999 in the context of the latter's evolving European Security and Defence Policy (see Part VIII). The Western European Union itself remains extant with a small secretariat located in Brussels with residual responsibilities.

The WEU Assembly remains active as an interparliamentary forum for general strategic reflection and contributes to intergovernmental and public debate on security and defence matters. National parliamentarians from 28 European countries send delegations to the Assembly, which currently has 370 members. Its work is allocated to four principal committees dealing respectively with defence matters, political issues, matters relating to technology and aerospace, and parliamentary and public relations. The WEU Assembly meets at least twice a year for plenary sessions and throughout the year in committee meetings, conferences and colloquia.

The Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons

Another of the organisations with which NATO cooperates in the field of civil emergency planning is the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons. The Organisation, established in 1997 by the countries that joined the Chemical Weapons Convention, seeks to ensure that the Convention works effectively and achieves its purpose. All NATO Allies are members of the Organisation, which currently totals 174 member states.

One of the Organisation's responsibilities is to provide assistance and protection to countries if they are attacked or threatened with chemical weapons, including by terrorists. It is in this area in particular that the Organisation can be helpful to NATO's civil protection efforts which, following the September 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States, have increasingly focused on protecting populations against the potential consequences of attacks using chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear agents.

CHAPTER 32

COOPERATION WITH PARLIAMENTARY AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL ORGANISATIONS

NATO cooperates with parliamentarians and non-governmental organisations, which contributes to understanding and support for NATO's policies and objectives beyond the arena of international organisations.

The International Committee of the Red Cross

One of the most significant non-governmental organisations with which NATO cooperates is the International Committee of the Red Cross – an impartial, neutral and independent organisation exclusively concerned with humanitarian action to protect the lives and dignity of victims of war and internal violence and to provide them with necessary assistance.

The International Committee of the Red Cross directs and coordinates international relief activities conducted in situations of conflict. In addition, the Committee endeavours to prevent suffering by promoting the strengthening of international humanitarian law and of universal humanitarian principles. It is in this context that its contacts with NATO have developed. In their operational planning, NATO authorities take account of the provisions of international humanitarian law; the operational plans embody references to implementation of and respect for international humanitarian law. While the dissemination of information on international humanitarian law is, in principle, a matter for the member states themselves, NATO may consider appropriate action to stimulate this process with the assistance of the International Committee of the Red Cross.

Relations between the two organisations have focused on *ad hoc* cooperation, with occasional informal exchanges of views between staff and high-level meetings when required. Cooperation has taken place in the context of a number of issues in different countries and regions, for example in the Balkans, in Afghanistan and in Iraq.

The principal concerns of the International Committee of the Red Cross in the context of its relations with NATO relate to the application of international humanitarian law in armed conflicts, the complementarity of the military, political and humanitarian approaches to a crisis situation and respect for the differences between them, and NATO's responsibility regarding the implementation of international humanitarian law.

At the practical level, the International Committee of the Red Cross has provided support for training courses on peacekeeping and civil emergency planning at the NATO School in Oberammergau, organised in the framework of the Partnership for Peace programme. Cooperation has also taken place in the context of NATO's role with respect to Kosovo, and the Committee has provided input in the framework of some of the "lessons learned" evaluations undertaken by NATO.

In the context of civil emergency planning activities and exercises, NATO also often cooperates with the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies.

The NATO Parliamentary Assembly

The NATO Parliamentary Assembly (NATO PA) is an interparliamentary organisation which, since its creation in 1955, has acted as a forum for legislators from the North American and western European member countries of the Alliance to meet together to consider issues of common interest and concern. While its principal objective is to foster mutual understanding among Alliance parliamentarians of the key security challenges facing the transatlantic partnership, its discussions also contribute to the development of the consensus among member countries that underpins the decision-making process in the Alliance.

The specific aims of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly include the following:

- to foster dialogue among parliamentarians on major security issues;
- to facilitate parliamentary awareness and understanding of key security issues and Alliance policies;
- to provide NATO and its member governments with an indication of collective parliamentary opinion;
- to provide greater transparency in NATO policies as well as collective accountability;
- to strengthen the transatlantic relationship.

In keeping with the major political changes which have occurred since the late 1980s, the Assembly has significantly broadened both its membership and its mandate. Several Partner countries of the Alliance have associate delegation status in the Assembly, enabling them to participate in its work and in its debates. Increasingly these focus on the security of Europe as a whole and on the specific economic, political, environmental and cultural problems of central

and eastern Europe. The Assembly therefore provides an extensive network for addressing cooperation in relation to security issues and a forum for international parliamentary dialogue on security, political and economic matters, over a wide spectrum embracing interests well beyond those that only concern NATO member countries. Since 1989, the Assembly has had the following additional objectives:

- to assist in the development of parliamentary democracy throughout the Euro-Atlantic area by integrating parliamentarians from non-member countries into the Assembly's work;
- to assist directly those parliaments of countries actively seeking Alliance membership;
- to increase cooperation with countries who seek cooperation with NATO rather than membership, including those of the Caucasus and the Mediterranean regions;
- to assist in the development of parliamentary mechanisms, practices and know-how essential for the effective democratic control of armed forces.

In fulfilling these goals, the Assembly provides a central source of information and point of contact for member legislators and their respective national parliaments. Its activities also enable it to contribute to making the workings and policies of the Alliance more transparent and comprehensible to parliaments and to their publics.

The Assembly is completely independent of NATO but constitutes a link between national parliaments and the Alliance which encourages governments to take Alliance concerns into account when framing national legislation. It also acts as a permanent reminder that intergovernmental decisions reached within NATO are ultimately dependent on political endorsement in accordance with the due constitutional process of democratically elected parliaments.

The Assembly was directly concerned with assisting in the process of ratification of the Protocols of Accession signed at the end of 1997, which culminated in the accession of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to the Alliance in March 1999, and played the same role with respect to the ratification process leading to the accession of Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia in March 2004.

Delegates to the Assembly are nominated by their parliaments according to their national procedures, on the basis of party representation in the parliaments. The Assembly therefore represents a broad spectrum of political opinion and constitutes an important touchstone for assessing parliamentary and public

opinion on Alliance issues, in this sense playing an indirect but important role in policy formation.

The Assembly functions through five committees (Political; Defence and Security; Economics and Security; Science and Technology; and the Civilian Dimension of Security) as well as a Mediterranean Special Group. These are study groups as well as major fora for discussion which meet regularly throughout the year. Biannually the Assembly meets in plenary session.

The International Secretariat of the Assembly conducts much of the research and analysis necessary for the substantive output of the Assembly's Committees and provides the administrative support for meetings and other Assembly activities. It comprises the Secretary General of the Assembly and approximately 30 staff. The Secretariat maintains a close working relationship with NATO and other international organisations and gives briefings on NATO PA activities and concerns to visiting parliamentary groups, journalists and academics. In recent years, the Secretariat has also organised and hosted training programmes for parliamentary staff from countries with associate member status of the Assembly. Typically the Assembly holds nearly forty events each year, including two plenary sessions – one in spring, usually towards the end of May, and one in autumn (either October or November) – held in member or associate member countries.

For the first time in the Assembly's history, the Permanent Representatives of NATO member countries participated in a special joint meeting of the North Atlantic Council with the full Assembly, co-chaired by the NATO Secretary General, which took place during the 50th annual session of the NATO PA, held in Venice from 12 to 16 November 2004.

The Assembly's role in developing relations with central and eastern European parliaments (through the so-called Rose-Roth Initiative) is recognised in both the NATO-Russia Founding Act and the NATO-Ukraine Charter signed in 1997. These documents call for expanded dialogue and cooperation between the NATO PA and the Federal Assembly of the Russian Federation and the Ukrainian Verkhovna Rada (parliament) respectively.

The Assembly's outreach programme is separate from but reinforces the work of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace initiative. Particular emphasis is placed on helping to achieve a key objective of the Partnership for Peace programme, namely the establishment of democratic control of armed forces. Assembly activities aim to provide the expertise, experience and information needed to help parliamentarians from Partner countries to become more effective in influencing the development of national defence policies and in ensuring that the control of their national armed forces is fully democratic.

Much of the Assembly's outreach work is organised in close cooperation with the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), which also contributes financial support for a number of the Assembly's activities.

The changing nature of security and NATO's transformation have given a new salience to the role of parliaments in defence and security. Traditional parliamentary tasks in this field include oversight of defence budgets and of the armed forces, authorisation of expenditure and deployments abroad, building consensus, ensuring transparency, and generating and sustaining public support. The more demanding environment in which these tasks have to be carried out today embraces new roles and missions for armed forces, defence reform and restructuring and the revolution in information technology, particularly with regard to the role and influence of the media. The scope and significance of parliamentary involvement has increased proportionately.

Further information on the NATO Parliamentary Assembly can be found on its website (www.nato-pa.int).

The Atlantic Treaty Association

The Atlantic Treaty Association, created on 18 June 1954, brings together, as members, national voluntary and non-governmental organisations in Alliance member states to support the activities of NATO and promote the objectives of the North Atlantic Treaty.

Since the beginning of the 1990s, the ATA has regularly admitted as associate members national voluntary and non-governmental organisations established in NATO's Partner countries. There are currently 18 associations which are associate members. In accordance with the constitution of the ATA, associate members may become full members of the Association when their countries become members of NATO and when their new position has been recognised by the ATA Assembly upon the proposal of the ATA Council.

Since 1999, following the amendment of the constitution, the ATA Assembly may also, on proposal by the Council, grant observer member status to non-governmental organisations created in the countries participating in NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue or in those which are directly or geographically concerned with Euro-Atlantic security problems, even if they have not signed Partnership for Peace agreements.

The objectives of the ATA and of its affiliated national organisations are:

- to inform the public about the missions and responsibilities of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation;

- to conduct research into the various purposes and activities of NATO and their extension to countries of central and eastern Europe as well as the furtherance of NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue;
- to promote the solidarity of the people of the North Atlantic area and of those countries participate in NATO's Partnership for Peace programme;
- to promote democracy;
- to develop cooperation between all its member organisations in order to promote the above objectives.

An **Atlantic Education Committee** (AEC) and an **Atlantic Association of Young Political Leaders** (AAYPL) are active in their own fields. A **Youth Atlantic Treaty Association** (YATA) was formed within the ATA in 1996.

The names and addresses of the different national member, associate and observer associations affiliated with the Atlantic Treaty Association as well as further information concerning ATA activities are available from the ATA secretariat at the following address:

Club Prince Albert
Rue des Petits Carmes, 20
1000 Brussels
Belgium

Tel: +32 2 502 31 60
Fax: +32 2 502 48 77
Email: info@ata-sec.org
Website: www.ata-sec.org

PART X

PROGRAMMES, ACTIVITIES, ORGANISATIONS AND AGENCIES

CHAPTER 33	Air defence
CHAPTER 34	Airborne early warning
CHAPTER 35	Airspace and air traffic management
CHAPTER 36	Armaments cooperation and planning
CHAPTER 37	Arms control and disarmament
CHAPTER 38	Civil emergency planning
CHAPTER 39	Communication and information systems
CHAPTER 40	Education and training
CHAPTER 41	Electronic warfare
CHAPTER 42	Logistics
CHAPTER 43	Meteorology
CHAPTER 44	Military oceanography
CHAPTER 45	Public Diplomacy communications and information programmes
CHAPTER 46	Public Diplomacy scientific and environmental programmes
CHAPTER 47	Research and technology
CHAPTER 48	Standardization

CHAPTER 33

AIR DEFENCE

NATO air defence comprises all means and measures organised to react to potential air threats and to counter hostile air actions. It is a continuous mission in peacetime, crisis and conflict that contributes to the preservation of the integrity of NATO airspace and provides freedom of action for the full spectrum of operations. It encompasses a network of interconnected systems to detect, track and identify airborne objects and intercept them with appropriate means such as maritime or ground-based weapons systems and interceptor aircraft, if necessary.

The command and control structure for air defence comprises the NATO Air Defence Ground Environment (NADGE), which includes sites stretching from northern Norway to eastern Turkey, the Improved United Kingdom Air Defence Ground Environment (IUKADGE), the Portuguese Air Command and Control System (POACCS) and systems in countries which joined NATO more recently. These systems integrate sites equipped with radars, data processing and display systems and linked by modern digital communications, as well as weapons systems and command and control structures in a NATO Integrated Air Defence System.

Much of the existing air defence structure has been commonly financed through the NATO Security Investment Programme (NSIP); a significant part of the Air Command and Control System (ACCS), which is currently being established, is similarly funded. ACCS is designed to combine and automate the tactical planning, tasking and execution of all air operations with a view to providing a unified air command and control system for the whole Alliance. It is being implemented under the supervision of the NATO ACCS Management Organisation (NACMO). The programme entered the software development phase at the end of 2003. Testing of software components began in 2005, with system testing scheduled to take place between 2006 and 2008. The system will be ready for operational use thereafter, although some capabilities could be provided earlier.

The integrated system will provide a capability against the full range of threats, including ballistic and cruise missiles. This includes the development of an Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence (ALTBMD) system for protection of deployed forces, as well as the broader issue of missile defence for the protection of NATO territory, population and forces. Relevant studies and consultations in this field have been undertaken and a programme for

implementation is under consideration in line with ministerial guidance from the Istanbul Summit.

NATO's air defence system also comprises a fleet of 17 Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft, which are presented in the next chapter.

Since March 2004, when the Alliance extended membership to seven new countries, policing of the airspace of the countries without their own air defence capabilities has been undertaken by a number of other NATO member countries on a three-month rotational basis.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

The NATO Air Defence Committee (NADC)

The Committee is responsible for advising the North Atlantic Council and Defence Planning Committee on all aspects of air defence, including theatre missile defence, and relevant air power aspects. Furthermore, the NADC is developing an Air Defence Programme that enables member countries to harmonise their national efforts with international planning related to air command and control and air defence weapons. The air defence of Canada and the United States is coordinated within the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD).

In 1994, the NADC began a dialogue with NATO Partner countries in order to foster mutual understanding, transparency and confidence in air defence matters of common interest. Developments under the Partnership for Peace initiative have further enhanced cooperation in this area and now include fact-finding meetings of air defence experts, air defence seminars, visits to air defence facilities and installations, joint analytical studies and a programme for the exchange of air situation data.

The Air Defence Study Working Group

The Air Defence Study Working Group is a multinational body working in support of the Military Committee. It is tasked with reviewing, advising and making recommendations on air defence issues which affect the NATO Integrated Air Defence System.

NATO Air Command and Control System (ACCS) Management Organisation (NACMO)

The NATO Air Command and Control System (ACCS) Management Organisation provides the structure for the planning and implementation of the command and control system supporting NATO air operations. It will, in due course, replace the Air Defence Ground Environment System (NADGE) (see also the Section on Air Defence). Its headquarters is in Brussels, Belgium.

Further information:

NATO Air Command Control System (ACCS)
Management Agency (NACMA)
Avenue du Bourget 140
1110 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: +32 2 707 8313
Fax: +32 2 707 8777

CHAPTER 34

AIRBORNE EARLY WARNING

The fleet of E-3A NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control (NAEW&C) aircraft forms a central element of the Alliance's early warning capability. The aircraft provide airborne surveillance, warning and control capability over large distances and at low altitude. They enable data to be transmitted directly from the aircraft to ground-, sea- and air-based command and control centres. The system also provides an all-altitude warning and detection capability which improves the Alliance's maritime surface picture, essential for surveillance operations.

The aircraft are NATO-owned and operated and, together with E-3D aircraft owned and operated by the United Kingdom, comprise the NATO Airborne Early Warning Force. The French and United States Air Forces also have E-3 aircraft which can interoperate with the NATO air defence structure.

The initial AEW programme involved the acquisition by the then 12 programme countries (Spain joined the NAEW&C programme in 1998) of this NATO-owned, operated and maintained aircraft fleet as well as the modification and upgrading of 40 existing NATO Air Defence Ground Environment (NADGE) sites to enable them to interoperate with the airborne early warning system. The sites are located in nine different countries stretching from northern Norway to eastern Turkey.

The largest element of the programme consists of 17 NATO-owned E-3A aircraft operating from Geilenkirchen, Germany. The British-owned E-3D component is based at RAF Waddington in the United Kingdom. The NATO E-3A aircraft is based on the US Air Force (USAF) Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft in service since 1977. The E-3As are modified Boeing 707-320B airframes distinguished by the 30-foot diameter rotodome mounted on top of the fuselage which houses the surveillance and identification friend or foe radars. Subsequently three 707 Trainer Cargo Aircraft (TCA) were also acquired.

Both near-term and mid-term modernisation programmes have been undertaken, the mid-term programme covering NATO's airborne early warning requirements from 1998 to 2008/9.

From August 1990 to March 1991, in response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, aircraft of the NATO E-3A Component were deployed to eastern Turkey to reinforce NATO's southern flank in order to monitor air and sea traffic in the

eastern Mediterranean and to provide continuous airborne surveillance along the Turkey-Iraq border.

Since July 1992, the NAEW Force, comprising both the E-3A Component and the UK E-3D Component, has been extensively deployed in the area of the former Yugoslavia. It has supported NATO's actions relating to the monitoring and implementation of United Nations Security Council resolutions, and has subsequently supported the Implementation Force (IFOR), Stabilisation Force (SFOR) and Kosovo Force (KFOR) operations. Aircraft of the French E-3F force have also taken part in these operations.

From mid-October 2001 to mid-May 2002, NATO AWACS aircraft were sent to help protect the United States following the September 11 attacks on Washington, DC and New York. These surveillance aircraft were again deployed from February to April 2003 to help protect Turkey in the event of a threat to its territory or population arising as a result of the war in Iraq. The fleet has also been deployed from time to time to provide surveillance during high-profile events such as the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Programme Management Organisation (NAPMO)

NAPMO is responsible for all aspects of the management and implementation of the NAEW&C Programme and reports directly to the North Atlantic Council. The Organisation consists of a Board of Directors, supported by a Programme Management Agency (NAPMA) located in Brunssum, the Netherlands, as well as by a Legal, Contracts and Finance Committee, an Operations, Technical and Support Committee and a Depot Level Maintenance Steering Group.

Each of the 13 participating countries is represented on the Board of Directors and its committees. Representatives of the NATO Secretary General, the NATO Strategic Commanders, the NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control (AEW&C) Force Commander and other NATO bodies also attend committee meetings and meetings of the Board of Directors, which normally take place twice a year.

The day-to-day management of the acquisition programme is the responsibility of the NAPMA General Manager. The NATO AEW&C Force Command Headquarters is co-located with Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe

(SHAPE) in Mons, Belgium. Both NAPMA and the Force Command are manned by personnel from the participating countries.

The Main Operating Base is in Geilenkirchen, Germany, and is also manned by personnel from the participating NAPMO countries. Air bases in Italy, Greece and Turkey and a Forward Operating Location in Norway have been extensively modified to provide support for NATO E-3 aircraft operations.

NAPMO's current member countries are Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Turkey and the United States. The United Kingdom provides seven E-3D aircraft to the NATO AEW Force. France attends NAPMO meetings in an observer role, based on its acquisition of four national E-3F aircraft.

Further information:

NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Programme
Management Agency (NAPMA)

Akerstraat 7

6445 CL Brunssum

The Netherlands

Tel: +31 45 526 2759

Fax: +31 45 525 4373

CHAPTER 35

AIRSPACE AND AIR TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The continuous growth of civil air traffic and the introduction of new military operational concepts and weapon systems create an increased demand for airspace by both civil and military users. It is therefore essential to ensure effective coordination at the international level between civil and military authorities in order to facilitate the accommodation of the needs of all users on an equitable basis. In particular, NATO's role in civil-military air traffic management coordination is to safeguard, in cooperation with relevant international organisations, the airspace requirements that enable the Alliance to accomplish its security tasks and missions, while minimising disruptions to civil aviation already constrained by the limited capacity of air traffic control systems and airport structures.

The 2001 terrorist attacks in the United States dramatically focused attention on the new threat posed by civil aircraft transformed into deadly weapons. Increased awareness of such new forms of aggression has intensified the international struggle against terrorism and the parallel effort of the Alliance to strengthen air security.

NATO's new global perspective has increasingly highlighted the crucial requirement for efficient airports within its areas of operations. The availability of deployable air traffic management assets and of mechanisms to lead the coordination of international efforts for the rehabilitation of airports is fundamental to ensuring the Alliance's continuing effectiveness.

There is also a need to ensure that NATO air assets are able to maintain the required degree of compatibility with the different elements of the air traffic management infrastructure. Consequently, and in particular in view of current efforts to achieve pan-European and Euro-Atlantic harmonisation of air traffic management systems and procedures, NATO is represented in a number of international forums concerned with airspace and air traffic management.

Normalisation of civil aviation after a crisis requires the full involvement of all the relevant actors. NATO's ability to delineate the pace of transition towards the final handover of airspace control, in coordination with the local authorities concerned and the international civil aviation organisations, is key to the success of NATO operations.

Airspace use and air traffic management coordination were among the first areas in which cooperation was developed with NATO's Partner countries. The Alliance remains actively engaged in providing assistance to Partner,

Mediterranean Dialogue and other countries in the development of civil-military air traffic management systems and air security structures that are interoperable with NATO and compliant with international standards. Cooperative airspace initiatives are also conducted in the framework of the NATO-Russia Council and the NATO-Ukraine Distinctive Partnership.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

The NATO Air Traffic Management Committee (NATMC)

The NATMC is the senior civil-military advisory body of the North Atlantic Council for airspace use and air traffic management. The Committee's mission is to develop, represent and promote NATO's view on matters related to safe and expeditious air operations in the airspace of NATO areas of responsibility and interest. The NATMC is engaged in enhancing aviation security and is responsible for ensuring that NATO airspace requirements are fully coordinated with the aim of safeguarding the Alliance's effectiveness. This includes the conduct of air operations and major exercises and the harmonisation of systems and procedures. The Committee monitors and evaluates developments in communications, navigation and surveillance to assess their impact on NATO's operational capability.

Representatives of the International Civil Aviation Organisation, the International Air Transport Association, the European Commission, the European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation (EUROCONTROL) and other civil aviation organisations assist the Committee. NATMC is therefore able to provide a unique interface between the NATO military authorities responsible for the coordination of large-scale military aircraft movements and national and international civil aviation bodies and organisations.

CHAPTER 36

ARMAMENTS COOPERATION AND PLANNING

Armaments cooperation within NATO aims at supporting the Alliance's strategic objectives through the cost-effective development and acquisition of military capabilities, by enhancing and encouraging interoperability and promoting technological and industrial cooperation among Allies and, where appropriate, Partner countries. The objective of armaments cooperation is to pool resources and knowledge, share risks and create economies of scale. Attention is paid to addressing the most urgent capability shortfalls of the Alliance, for example meeting the equipment requirements of the NATO Response Force or developing capabilities for defence against terrorism, and to catering for national operational requirements.

NATO's armaments community seeks to create synergy among its procurement, technology and industrial communities. Through a network of committees, information is exchanged on new military requirements and emerging technologies. Possibilities for harmonising national requirements and undertaking collaborative programmes are explored.

Armaments planning, as one of the main components of NATO defence planning, translates military force goals into armaments objectives. Given the long in-service periods of most military equipment, particular attention is paid to the long-term elements of the NATO force planning system. Planning for armaments activities takes place in a variety of ways: yearly management plans are formulated for the Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD) and its main subordinate groups to address operational, economic and technological aspects of NATO objectives. Another important planning tool is the set of Long Term Capability Requirements (LTCRs) identified by Allied Command Transformation (ACT). LTCRs describe the most important capability shortfalls for the various military functions of the Alliance. They serve as guidance for focusing the work of the armaments community.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD)

The major work within NATO to identify opportunities for collaborative research, development and production of military equipment takes place under

the auspices of the Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD). The CNAD is the senior advisory committee to the North Atlantic Council on armaments issues. It sets priorities and gives guidance to its substructure, which consists of military and civilian experts from member and Partnership for Peace countries. It meets twice a year at the level of National Armaments Directors (NADs), and more frequently at the level of their permanent representatives in Brussels (NADREPs).

Through meetings of expert groups from armed services and defence ministries, information is exchanged about evolving military requirements, possibilities for harmonisation, the establishment of standards and interoperability, and emerging technologies. Cooperation takes place between these CNAD groups and expert groups from the Research and Technology Organisation, the Consultation, Command and Control (C3) Organisation, Allied Command Transformation (ACT), industry and end users represented by the NATO military authorities. The CNAD structure enables member countries to select those research and technology and equipment projects in which they wish to participate. At the same time, it facilitates the exchange of information on national programmes, where cooperation could be beneficial to individual countries and to NATO as a whole. Overall guidance for these activities is provided through the formulation of yearly CNAD management plans identifying key objectives and priority areas of work.

The CNAD organisation

The CNAD substructure consists of:

- Three **Main Armaments Groups**: NATO Naval Armaments Group (NNAG), NATO Air Force Armaments Group (NAFAG) and NATO Army Armaments Group (NAAG), with various subgroups and working groups.
- The **NATO Industrial Advisory Group** (NIAG), which provides defence industrial expertise to CNAD.
- The **Group of National Directors on Codification**, the **Life Cycle Management Group** and the **Ammunition Safety Group**, also with various subgroups.
- The **Alliance Ground Surveillance Steering Committee** (AGS SC).
- The **Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence Steering Committee** (ALTBMD SC).

NATO Research and Technology Board (RTB)

The Research and Technology Board (RTB), an integrated NATO body responsible for defence research and technological development, provides advice and assistance to the CNAD, as well as to the Military Committee. The Board coordinates research and technology policy in different NATO bodies and is supported by a specialised NATO Research and Technology Agency (RTA).

Further information:

Research and Technology Agency (RTA)

BP 25

F-92201 Neuilly-sur-Seine

France

Tel: +33 1 55 61 22 00

Fax: +33 1 55 61 22 98/99

Email: mailbox@rta.nato.int

Website: www.rta.nato.int

The management of major collaborative projects as they move from development to the production phase is carried out by specialised NATO agencies acting on behalf of the participating member countries.

NATO Medium Extended Air Defence System Design and Development, Production and Logistics Management Agency (NAMEADSMA)

NAMEADSMA oversees development of the Medium Extended Air Defence System (MEADS).

Further information:

NAMEADSMA

Building 1

620 Discovery Drive, Suite 300

Huntsville

AL 35806

USA

Tel: +1 205 922 3972

Fax: +1 205 922 3900

NATO EF 2000 and Tornado Development Production and Logistics Management Agency (NETMA)

NETMA was created by merging the former NATO Multirole Combat Aircraft Development and Production Management Agency (NAMMA) with the NATO EFA Development, Production and Logistics Management Agency (NEFMA). It is responsible for the joint development and production of the NATO European Fighter Aircraft (Eurofighter), and for providing in-service support for the NATO multirole combat aircraft (Tornado).

Further information:

NETMA
PO Box 1302
82003 Unterhaching
Germany

NATO Helicopter Design and Development, Production and Logistics Management Agency (NAHEMA)

NAHEMA controls the execution of the NATO NH90 helicopter programme.

Further information:

NAHEMA
Le Quatuor, Bâtiment A
42 Route de Galice
13082 Aix-en-Provence Cedex 2
France
Tel: +33 42 95 92 00
Fax: +33 42 64 30 50

NATO Hawk Management Office (NHMO)

NHMO is responsible for improvement programmes for the Hawk surface-to-air missile system.

Further information:

NHMO
26 rue Galliéni
92500 Rueil-Malmaison
France
Tel: +33 147 08 75 00
Fax: +33 147 52 10 99

CHAPTER 37

ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT

NATO countries seek to maintain security and stability at the lowest possible level of forces consistent with their ability to undertake the full range of Alliance missions and meet whatever security challenges may arise. The pursuit and implementation of effective and verifiable arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation agreements are therefore an important part of the broad approach to security adopted by the members of the Alliance and form an integral part of NATO strategy.

Three NATO members possess nuclear weapons, namely the United States, the United Kingdom and France. Each of these countries has reduced the size of the nuclear forces it possesses both through internationally negotiated treaties and agreements and through unilateral decisions. NATO as a whole has reduced its reliance on nuclear weapons, attributing to them an essentially political role as part of its overall policy of deterrence against aggression. By contrast, however, the increased terrorist threat and the potential use of weapons of mass destruction have raised the profile of arms control and measures to prevent proliferation and of new initiatives in this sphere.

The Alliance also attaches great importance to reductions in conventional weapons. The most significant achievement in this sphere and a major factor in ensuring the stability of the Euro-Atlantic area has been the 1990 Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty and its adaptation to the new situation prevailing in Europe following the end of the Cold War. The treaty has led to the destruction of large quantities of military equipment and involves regular exchanges of information among participating countries on the remaining forces as well as stringent verification measures. NATO also coordinates activities among Allies in the context of a negotiating process concerning confidence and security-building measures enshrined in an agreement known as the Vienna Document, and supports the 1992 Open Skies Treaty, which permits overflights of national territory on a reciprocal basis.

NATO has also launched a number of projects relating both to the destruction of excess stockpiles of weapons and ammunition, including anti-personnel landmines, and to addressing other consequences of defence reform. It has been instrumental in initiating and helping to implement such projects in the context of the Partnership for Peace. The mechanism introduced to channel financial support from donor countries for the safe disposal of these dangerous and unwanted legacies is the Partnership for Peace Trust Fund (see Part VII).

NATO policies with regard to non-proliferation stem from the fact that one of the most significant areas of concern for world peace arises from the proliferation of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons and their means of delivery. NATO countries have agreed that preventing the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction is one of the most important tasks facing today's Alliance. In 1999, new initiatives were taken in this field. A far-reaching Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Initiative was launched and a Weapons of Mass Destruction Centre was established at NATO Headquarters in May 2000. This initiative builds upon earlier work to improve overall Alliance political and military efforts in this area and has been further developed since the terrorist attacks against the United States.

NATO member countries consider confidence-building, arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation to be important components of conflict prevention and recognise that the Alliance can play a vital role in this field by promoting a broader, more comprehensive and more verifiable international arms control and disarmament process. In this way, NATO contributes to the work of other international organisations whose core business is to focus on these issues. The Alliance's overall policy in this field, formulated in the Strategic Concept published in 1999, includes a commitment to contribute actively to this process.

The Alliance provides a consultative forum for its members on all aspects of arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. Consultation on these issues takes place in a number of NATO bodies established specifically for the purpose of identifying ways of bringing about advances in each of these areas. These topics are also discussed with Partner countries in the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), the NATO-Russia Council, the NATO-Ukraine Commission and the Mediterranean Dialogue.

NATO bodies regularly meet with experts on disarmament, notably prior to significant international meetings such as the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference, the UN First Committee and the Conference on Disarmament. NATO also provides a forum for consultations on the implications for Alliance security and global strategic stability of theatre missile defence options.

A summary of the main developments, negotiating processes and areas of cooperation in this field is given below.

Developments relating to nuclear, biological and chemical weapons

NATO member countries remain subject to a wide variety of military and non-military risks that are both multi-directional and difficult to predict.

The proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) weapons and their means of delivery remains a matter of serious concern. NATO recognises that proliferation can occur despite efforts to prevent it and can pose a direct military threat to Allied populations, territory and forces. NATO's support for non-proliferation regimes, both conventional and nuclear, therefore constitutes an integral part of its security policy. The member countries have adopted a two-pronged political and defence-related approach to fighting the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. However, major challenges remain, despite progress in strengthening international non-proliferation regimes. The intensification of the threat from terrorism has served to accentuate the importance of concerted international action in this sphere.

The existence of significant nuclear forces outside the Alliance also has to be taken into account. However, the circumstances in which the use of nuclear weapons by NATO might have to be contemplated are extremely remote and the role of nuclear forces within the Alliance's overall security strategy has been greatly reduced. Major reductions have also been made in the forces themselves by the member countries that maintain nuclear forces, namely the United States, France and the United Kingdom.

- *The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)*

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) has been the cornerstone of international agreements on global non-proliferation and of the process of bringing about nuclear disarmament. The treaty was extended indefinitely at the NPT Review and Extension Conference in 1995. It was also decided to strengthen the review process and to adopt a set of "Principles and Objectives for Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament" in order to promote effective implementation of the treaty.

The conclusions of the 2000 NPT Review Conference held in New York from 24 April to 19 May 2000 reflected continued support for universal NPT adherence, strict compliance with the NPT's provisions, strengthened International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, and further steps toward the ultimate objective of nuclear disarmament.

The final document contains a plan for systematic and progressive implementation of the NPT Article VI commitment relating to nuclear disarmament. In addition, the five nuclear-weapon states recognised by the NPT issued a joint statement in which they welcomed the indefinite extension of the treaty and reaffirmed their commitment to the 1995 decisions.

- *Biological and chemical weapons*

Biological and chemical weapon capabilities are not part of Alliance strategy and play no part in NATO force structures. Alliance policy relating to these weapons supports universal adherence to the relevant disarmament regimes. However, the proliferation of these weapons is widely recognised as a growing international security problem, particularly in the context of terrorism.

The use of chemical and biological weapons is banned by the 1925 Geneva Protocol. Other relevant agreements in this sphere include the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention, which entered into force in 1975, under which the signatories agree not to develop, produce, stockpile or acquire biological agents and related equipment used for hostile purposes. In 1994, an *Ad Hoc* Group of States Parties to the Convention was established to examine possible verification measures and proposals to strengthen the convention. Subsequent review conferences have marked further steps in this direction.

A Chemical Weapons Convention banning chemical weapons was negotiated at the Conference on Disarmament between 1980 and 1992 and entered into force in 1997. It included undertakings not to develop, produce, acquire, stockpile or retain chemical weapons, not to use or prepare to use chemical weapons and not to assist others in acting against the provisions of the convention. The convention also required signatories to destroy chemical weapons in their possession and to destroy their chemical weapon production facilities.

- *Missiles and other means of delivery*

The Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) established in 1987 brings together 32 states that seek to limit the proliferation of missiles and missile technology. The MTCR partners control exports of a common list of controlled items in accordance with a common export control policy.

Developments relating to conventional arms control and disarmament

- *Adaptation of the CFE Treaty*

The Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty of 19 November 1990 imposed legally binding limits on five categories of Treaty-Limited Equipment (TLE) and included provisions for exceptionally comprehensive information exchange and notifications, as well as intrusive on-site inspection and verification arrangements. The treaty brought about unprecedented transparency in relation to arms holdings as well as dramatic reductions in TLE in Europe.

Negotiations on the adaptation of the treaty to the new circumstances prevailing after the end of the Cold War began in 1996, reflecting the fact that fundamental changes had occurred since its signature in 1990 including the reunification of Germany, the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the USSR, the emergence of successor states, raising the number of countries subordinated to the treaty from 22 to 30, and the process of democratisation in Central and Eastern Europe. Subsequent developments affecting the application of the treaty have included the accession to NATO of new member countries in 1999 and 2004 and the prospect of further accessions in the future.

An “Agreement on Adaptation” of the CFE Treaty was signed at the Istanbul OSCE Summit in November 1999 which requires ratification by all 30 states parties to the Treaty before it can enter into force. A “Final Act” of the summit was also adopted that stipulates politically binding commitments relating to restraint, withdrawals and progressive additional reductions towards equipment entitlements offered by states parties in the context of the Treaty’s adaptation.

During NATO’s Istanbul Summit in June 2004, Allied leaders reiterated their commitment to the CFE Treaty as a cornerstone of European security and reaffirmed their attachment to the early entry into force of the Adapted Treaty. They also emphasised that fulfilment of the remaining Istanbul Commitments relating to the presence of Russian forces in the Republics of Moldova and Georgia would create the conditions for Allies and other states parties to move forward on ratification of the Adapted CFE Treaty. The entry into force of the Treaty will pave the way for accession to it by non-CFE countries which have stated this as their intention, and will make an additional contribution to European security and stability.

The Alliance’s High Level Task Force (HLTF) is responsible for the development of policy in the area of conventional disarmament, arms control and confidence and security-building measures. The NATO Verification Coordinating Committee (VCC) focuses on the implementation and the coordination of arms control monitoring activities. The VCC hosts an annual seminar for the 30 states parties to the CFE Treaty and for other EAPC countries on implementation aspects of the CFE Treaty.

The Vienna Document

At the Istanbul Summit in November 1999, the member states of the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) also adopted the 1999 Vienna Document, which enhances the confidence and security-building measures (CSBMs) introduced by the Vienna Documents of 1990, 1992 and 1994. The 1999 Document introduced improvements in existing CSBMs and placed an emphasis on the importance of regional cooperation in this field.

Open Skies

The March 1992 “Open Skies” Treaty represented another important element in creating greater openness in relation to military activities and structures. The Treaty enhances the confidence-building process by facilitating the monitoring of compliance with existing or future arms control agreements and strengthening capacity for the early recognition and management of crises by permitting reciprocal overflights of national territory on a reciprocal basis. The Treaty was ratified in 2001, allowing a number of trial flights to take place prior to its entry into force on 1 January 2002.

Small arms and light weapons

Growing international awareness of the need to prevent and reduce destabilising accumulations and illicit trafficking of small arms and light weapons in all its aspects has led to a number of initiatives at the global, regional and local levels.

An *Ad Hoc* Working Group created within the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council in January 1999 has focused on practical work on this issue. Following the conclusions of the international conference on the illicit arms trade, convened by the UN General Assembly in July 2001, member states endorsed an international Programme of Action to which NATO and its Partner countries are contributing. NATO has also launched a number of Partnership for Peace Trust Funds focused specifically on the disposal of arms and ammunition stocks in countries such as Azerbaijan, Georgia and Ukraine.

Anti-personnel mines

Active efforts are being undertaken to counter the humanitarian problems and suffering caused by anti-personnel mines. NATO member countries have demonstrated their commitment to tackling this issue through Partnership for Peace Trust Fund projects. For instance, large quantities of anti-personnel mines have been destroyed in Albania. A similar initiative was introduced in Moldova involving mines, munitions and corrosive rocket fuel, and an initiative to destroy several million mines stockpiled during the Soviet era has been launched in Ukraine.

The Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby Traps and Other Devices adopted by the states parties to the 1980 Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects was signed in 1996. A Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on Their

Destruction was signed in Ottawa on 3 December 1997 and came into force on 1 March 1999. The EAPC *Ad Hoc* Working Group, to which reference is made above, has also been tasked to support the full spectrum of mine action and enabling activities.

WMD proliferation

The threat to international security represented by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction resulted in the decision by NATO leaders in 1994 to intensify and expand the Alliance's efforts in this field. The Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) published in 1994 states that the principal goal of the Alliance and its member states is to prevent proliferation from occurring or, should it occur, to reverse it through diplomatic means. However, the document recognised that proliferation might nevertheless occur despite international non-proliferation norms and agreements, and that weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means can pose a direct military threat to NATO territory, populations and forces. Accordingly, the Alliance has increasingly focused on the range of defence capabilities needed to devalue WMD proliferation and use and on improvements in NATO's defence posture against WMD risks. These efforts are aimed at reducing the operational vulnerability of NATO military forces as well as maintaining their flexibility and effectiveness in potential situations involving the presence, threat or use of NBC weapons.

A far-reaching WMD Initiative was launched at the April 1999 Washington Summit and a WMD Centre was established at NATO Headquarters in May 2000. The Centre works to strengthen dialogue and common understanding of WMD issues among member countries, to strengthen consultations on non-proliferation, arms control and disarmament issues, to assess risks, and to support defence efforts that serve to improve the Alliance's preparedness to respond to the risks of WMD and their means of delivery. The Centre includes personnel drawn from NATO's International Staff as well as national experts.

This Initiative builds upon earlier work to improve overall Alliance political and military efforts in this area. It has been further developed since the terrorist attacks against the United States in September 2001 in order to focus more systematically on the protection of forces and populations against nuclear, biological and chemical weapons, on the dangers of proliferation and on ballistic missile defence.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

The Joint Committee on Proliferation (JCP) is a senior advisory body providing coordinated reports to the North Atlantic Council on politico-military

and defence aspects of the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Under the chairmanship of the Deputy Secretary General, it brings together members of the Senior Politico-Military Group on Proliferation (SGP) and the Senior Defence Group on Proliferation (DGP) in joint session to coordinate the political and defence dimensions of NATO's response to the WMD threat.

The Senior Politico-Military Group on Proliferation (SGP) is composed of senior national officials responsible for political and security issues related to non-proliferation that meets under the chairmanship of the Assistant Secretary General for Political Affairs and Security Policy. The SGP considers a range of factors in the political, security and economic fields that may cause or influence proliferation and considers political and economic means to prevent or respond to proliferation.

The Senior Defence Group on Proliferation (DGP) is the senior advisory body to the North Atlantic Council on proliferation of WMD and their associated delivery systems. It brings together experts and officials with responsibilities in this field under joint North American and European chairmanship. The DGP addresses the military capabilities needed to discourage WMD proliferation, to deter threats and use of such weapons, and to protect NATO populations, territory and forces.

The High Level Task Force on Conventional Arms Control (HLTF) is a consultative and advisory body bringing together government experts under the chairmanship of the Deputy Secretary General to channel advice on conventional arms control issues to Ministers of Foreign Affairs and of Defence. It also meets at the level of political advisers to national delegations at NATO.

The Verification Coordinating Committee (VCC) is the principal body within NATO for decisions relating to matters of conventional arms control implementation and verification activities. It meets at a number of different levels and in different working group, expert group and workshop formats.

The Weapons of Mass Destruction Centre established at NATO Headquarters in May 2000 works to strengthen common understanding of WMD issues, assess risks, and improve the readiness of military forces to operate in a WMD environment and to counter WMD threats.

The EAPC Ad Hoc Working Group on Small Arms and Light Weapons and the EAPC Ad Hoc Working Group on Global Humanitarian Mine Action provide fora to facilitate the exchange of information and ideas among NATO and Partner countries on how best to exercise controls and to promote common goals in each of these areas.

CHAPTER 38

CIVIL EMERGENCY PLANNING

Civil emergency planning has long been one of the mainstream activities of NATO. Its main roles are to provide civil support for military operations and support for national authorities in civil emergencies, particularly in the protection of civilian populations.

Following the terrorist attacks on the United States, a large part of NATO's civil protection efforts have focused on assisting member and Partner countries in protecting their populations against the potential consequences of attacks with chemical, biological and nuclear agents. In the context of support for military planning and operations, civil emergency planning activities contribute by ensuring that jointly developed plans and procedures are effective and that the necessary assets are available. These may include commercial ships, civil aircraft, trains and rail networks, medical facilities, communications, disaster response capabilities and other civil resources.

However, the characteristics of NATO civil emergency planning activities have fundamentally changed since the end of the Cold War. No longer focused primarily on managing civil resources and protecting the population in the context of large-scale war, they are oriented towards providing support for military crisis response operations and dealing with the consequences of natural disasters or terrorist attacks.

Another feature of today's civil emergency planning activities is the extensive cooperation that takes place with Partner countries in the framework of the Partnership for Peace programme and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the NATO-Russia Council, the NATO-Ukraine Commission, the Mediterranean Dialogue and, more recently, the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative. The largest non-military component of Partnership for Peace activities, civil emergency planning now embraces regular consultations and discussions among all NATO and Partner countries as well as joint operations and exercises in which an important role is played by the on-call Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre established at NATO Headquarters in Brussels.

As a consequence of these arrangements, NATO and Partner countries have been able to channel coordinated assistance to Ukraine, the Czech Republic and the United States in the wake of major flooding, to Greece, Turkey and Pakistan following serious earthquakes, to Portugal during major forest fires, and to the Balkans where an urgent need for humanitarian relief was the inevitable result of regional conflicts and wars. NATO civil emergency planning capabilities have also been instrumental in providing consequence

management assistance to member countries in dealing with special contingencies such as the potential risks to Turkey in the context of the Iraq conflict in spring 2003 and the preparation and conduct of the 2004 Summer Olympic Games in Greece.

A large number of other international organisations cooperate with NATO in the field of civil emergency planning. These include the European Union, the International Atomic Energy Agency, the International Committee of the Red Cross, the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe.

Civil emergency planning activities in the Partnership for Peace context

Civil emergency planning activities within the framework of the EAPC and the Partnership for Peace programme include seminars, workshops, exercises, training courses and exchanges of information involving civil and military personnel from different levels of local, regional and national governments as well as from non-governmental organisations.

Common to many of the activities is a strong focus on disaster preparedness and protection of the civilian population in emergency situations resulting from disasters or terrorist attack. This area of activity is often referred to as consequence management. Cooperation with the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, in the context of its project on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Assistance, plays an important part in many of the activities.

Based on a Russian proposal put forward in November 1997 aimed at more concrete forms of cooperation in the field of disaster relief, a Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Capability comprising a Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) and a Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit (EADRU) was established in 1998. The EADRCC has since played an important role in a variety of relief operations and has been instrumental in assisting countries in improving their preparedness for special events and crises. Shortly after its inauguration, it also played a role in the 1999 Kosovo conflict by coordinating EAPC assistance in support of relief operations in Albania by the Office of the UN High Commission for Refugees. Subsequently the EADRCC was involved in monitoring the humanitarian situation in and around Kosovo and, in April 1999, took further action to coordinate humanitarian assistance to alleviate the plight of Kosovar refugees.

The EADRU is a combination of multinational and national civilian or military units volunteered by EAPC countries, the composition of which is determined according to the actual requirements at the time the intervention of the unit is requested. It can consist of search and rescue units, medical units, transport and logistics, communication and other facilities. The EADRCC maintains a confidential inventory of national capabilities to enable NATO and Partner countries, on a voluntary basis, to register assets that they might be willing to make available to a stricken country. This inventory has been used to good effect on a number of occasions, most recently in support of Greece during the 2004 Olympic Games.

Procedures for the deployment of the EADRU have been tested in a number of multinational exercises involving large-scale international participation. These exercises also serve to improve interoperability among national first response units as well as civil-military cooperation. Scenarios have included simulated flooding in western Ukraine, wildfires in Croatia, explosions involving the use of a dirty bomb near a football stadium in Romania, an attack on a chemical production facility in Russia, and fire-fighting and search and rescue work in Uzbekistan.

NATO-Russia cooperation

NATO-Russia cooperation in civil emergency planning has its origins in December 1991, when the North Atlantic Council tasked NATO's Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee to assist in coordinating the transportation of humanitarian assistance to the then Soviet Union. A Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on Civil Emergency Planning was signed on 20 March 1996 and, with the signing of the Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russian Federation in 1997, an Expert Group on Civil Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Relief was created to oversee the implementation of the MOU. Since then, cooperation with Russia in the area of civil emergency planning has been progressively enhanced. In the framework of the NATO-Russia Council, NATO member countries and Russia now carry out a wide-ranging programme of cooperative activities, including work on rapid response capabilities and joint exercises.

NATO-Ukraine cooperation

Extensive cooperation in civil emergency planning takes place between NATO and Ukraine. It began in 1995, when NATO's Civil Emergency Planning Directorate coordinated assistance from NATO and Partner countries following the heavy rains and the flooding of the Ouda and Donets Rivers in eastern Ukraine. Cooperation in this area is a key component of the NATO-Ukraine

Charter signed in July 1997. A memorandum of understanding followed on 16 December 1997 between NATO and the Ukrainian Ministry of Emergencies and Protection of the Population from the Consequences of the Chernobyl Catastrophe, focusing on areas where practical cooperation is feasible and possible, as well as on specific expertise and resources. Many practical activities have resulted from this agreement, including a pilot project on flood prevention and response in the Carpathian region and a large-scale EADRCC field exercise in Ukraine. Ukraine continues to participate actively in NATO civil emergency planning activities, and further exercises are planned for the future.

The Mediterranean Dialogue

Participants from Mediterranean Dialogue countries have taken part in a number of civil emergency planning activities, including civil-military cooperation (CIMIC) courses at the NATO School in Oberammergau and activities organised by civil emergency planning boards and committees.

Seminars designed to facilitate the exchange of information and experience in relevant areas and increase contacts among civil emergency planning experts have taken place in Greece and Turkey, focusing on natural disaster reduction and on search and rescue in disaster situations, respectively. Other topics addressed include regional cooperation and the role of non-governmental organisations in disaster situations. In the context of the enhancement of the Mediterranean Dialogue, these contacts are being further strengthened; increased participation by Mediterranean Dialogue countries in civil emergency planning activities is foreseen.

Civil-military cooperation

To ensure the coherence and effectiveness of activities in the field of civil emergency planning and enable NATO military capabilities and assets to be used if required to support national authorities in dealing with civil emergencies, strong links have been established between NATO's military authorities and civilian civil emergency planning structures. Assistance can involve making logistic, transport, security, communications, information and other forms of support services available.

Conversely, one of the roles of civil emergency structures within NATO, to which reference is made above, is to provide support for military operations if required. In these circumstances, relevant expertise in civilian technical fields may be provided by the civil emergency planning boards and committees described below, in fields such as communications, transport, medical

matters, food and agriculture, protection of the civilian population and industrial preparedness.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC)

Responsibility for bringing together NATO policies in the civil emergency planning sphere and measures to implement them lies with the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC), which meets at least twice a year in plenary session and every two weeks in permanent session. The SCEPC reports to the North Atlantic Council. Representatives of interior ministries or emergency management agencies on the staffs of a number of national delegations at NATO Headquarters support the work of the Committee. National representation at meetings held at plenary level consists of the heads of national civil emergency planning organisations in capitals. Meetings of the SCEPC are chaired by the Assistant Secretary General of the Operations Division of the International Staff.

Civil emergency planning boards and committees

Under the direction of the SCEPC, a number of technical planning boards and committees bring together national government and industrial experts and military representatives to coordinate planning in relevant areas of civil activity. These include inland surface transport, ocean shipping, civil aviation, food and agriculture, industrial production and supply, post and telecommunications, medical matters, and civil protection. There are currently eight such planning boards and committees, namely the Planning Board for Ocean Shipping, the Planning Board for Inland Surface Transport, the Civil Aviation Planning Committee, the Food and Agriculture Planning Committee, the Industrial Planning Committee, the Civil Communications Planning Committee, the Joint Medical Committee and the Civil Protection Committee.

These bodies meet regularly and provide the vital link between NATO policy with regard to civil emergency planning and the means to carry it out. They are supported in their work by smaller, flexible working groups and specialised technical committees.

Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC)

The EADRCC coordinates responses to disasters in the EAPC area and acts as a focal point for information-sharing among EAPC countries. It works closely with the relevant United Nations and other international organisations that play a leading role in responding to disaster situations. A permanent liaison officer from the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs is assigned to the Centre's staff.

The Centre has developed standing operating procedures to help ensure rapid responses in cases of emergency and encourages participating countries to develop bilateral or multilateral arrangements to address issues such as visa regulations, border crossing requirements, transit agreements and customs clearance procedures that can delay the channelling of emergency aid to a disaster location. The EADRCC organises regular major disaster exercises in different participating countries designed to practise procedures, provide training for local and international participants, build up interoperability skills and capabilities and harness the experience and lessons learned for future operations.

CHAPTER 39

COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Consultation, command and control matters are known within NATO under the collective name of “C3”. The objectives of cooperation in this area are to provide NATO-wide, cost-effective, interoperable and secure capabilities to ensure high-level political consultation and command and control of military forces.

A number of communications and information systems (CIS) interface with national fixed and mobile networks to cover the whole NATO area, linking NATO Headquarters in Brussels, all the headquarters of the Integrated Military Command Structure, national capitals and national military commands. The systems also provide for secure connections to facilitate consultation with NATO's Partner countries.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

The **NATO C3 Organisation (NC3O)** was created in 1996 to provide the required C3 capabilities for the whole of NATO, drawing on common funded multinational and national assets. The organisation brings together the planning, scientific and development and acquisition functions of NATO's CIS in order to enhance the Alliance's capability to carry out its new crisis management tasks as well as preserving its collective defence capabilities.

The organisation comprises the NATO C3 Board (NC3B), which acts as the board of directors of the NC3O, the Group of National C3 Representatives (NC3REPS), which acts as the NC3B in permanent session, a NATO C3 Agency (NC3A), and a NATO CIS Services Agency (NCSA).

The **NC3B** is the senior multinational body acting on behalf of and responsible for advising the North Atlantic Council and Defence Planning Committee on all C3 policy matters including the interoperability of NATO and national C3 systems, and for advising the Conference of National Armaments Directors on C3 cooperation programmes. The Board oversees the work of the NC3A and NCSA.

The NC3B is composed of senior national representatives from capitals, representatives of the Military Committee and Strategic Commanders and NATO committees with an interest in C3, the General Manager of the NATO C3 Agency (NC3A), and the Director of the NCSA. It is chaired by the Deputy

Secretary General and has a Permanent Chairman (the Assistant Secretary General for Defence Investment) and two Co-Vice Chairmen (Director of the NATO Headquarters C3 Staff and a Co-Vice Chairman elected from national nominees).

The NC3B is supported by a subordinate structure of multinational bodies composed of eight subcommittees (Joint C3 Requirements and Concepts, Interoperability, Frequency Management, Information Systems, Information Security Systems, Communications Network, Identification and Navigation). Each of these has its own substructure. The organisation is supported by the NATO Headquarters C3 Staff (NHQC3S), which combines the former C3 elements of both the International Staff and the International Military Staff in a single integrated staff.

The main task of the NHQC3S is to develop policies and guidance for planning, implementation, operation and maintenance of NATO CIS and to monitor their application. The NHQC3S provides support to the NATO C3 Board and to its substructure. It also provides support to the North Atlantic Council, the Military Committee, the Conference of National Armaments Directors, the Senior Resource Board and other committees with responsibilities relating to C3 matters.

The NHQC3S is organised in five branches: the Architecture and Interoperability Branch, the Information Systems and Exchange Branch, the Information Security Branch, the Spectrum Management Branch, and the Communication, Identification and Navigation Networks Branch, plus a Planning and Resources Office. It operates under the coordinated management of the Assistant Secretary General for Defence Investment and the Director of the International Military Staff. The Director of the NHQC3S is a Co-Vice Chairman of the NATO C3 Board.

Further information:

NATO Headquarters C3 Staff (NHQC3S): www.nc3a.nato.int/

The **Group of National C3 Representatives (NC3REPS)**, normally composed of members of national delegations or military representations to NATO, assists the NC3 Board and acts on its behalf as the NC3B in permanent session.

The **NATO C3 Agency (NC3A)** was formed as part of NATO's strategy to restructure its C3 activities. The Agency provides central planning, architecture, systems integration, design, systems engineering, technical support and configuration control for NATO C3 systems and installations. The agency procures and implements projects assigned to it and provides scientific and technical advice and support to the Strategic Commanders and others on matters

pertaining to operational research, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, air command and control (including theatre missile defence, electronic warfare and airborne early warning and control) and CIS. The NC3A is headquartered in Brussels, Belgium, but operates from dual locations in Brussels (Planning and Acquisition) and The Hague, the Netherlands (Scientific Support).

The **NATO CIS Services Agency (NCSA)** is responsible for ensuring the provision of secure information exchange services required for NATO C3, using systems assigned to it by the NATO C3 Board. The NCSA was formed in August 2004 from the former NATO CIS Operating and Support Agency (NACOSA).

The NCSA provides operational support in the form of hardware and software maintenance, technical advice, configuration management, personnel training, installation and associated services. This includes assuring the security of CIS assigned to it and of its users. In cooperation with other NATO bodies, commercial firms and national agencies, NCSA is required to deliver cost effective CIS services, in accordance with agreements with the user community and as laid down in its Catalogue of Services.

NCSA is composed of a Central Staff located at SHAPE in Mons, Belgium, ten NCSA sectors which support their affiliated headquarters, two deployable NATO Signal Battalions and the NATO CIS School in Latina, Italy.

Further information: NATO CIS Services Agency: www.ncsa.nato.int

Further information can also be obtained from:

NATO HQ C3 Staff	NC3A Brussels	NC3A The Hague
NATO Headquarters	(HQ, Planning &	(Scientific &
1110 Brussels	Acquisition)	Technical matters)
Belgium	Z Building	P.O. Box 174
Tel: +32 2 707 4358	NATO Headquarters	Oude Waalsdorperweg 61
Fax: +32 2 707 5834	1110 Brussels	2501 CD The Hague
	Belgium	The Netherlands
	Tel: +32 2 707 8213	Tel: +31 70 374 3002
	Fax: +32 2 708 8770	Fax: +31 70 374 3239

The **NATO Headquarters Information and Systems Management Service (ISMS)** forms part of the Executive Management Division. Although managerially an International Staff body, the ISMS is staffed by both International Staff and International Military Staff personnel. It provides information systems support to the North Atlantic Council, the Defence Planning Committee and the Military Committee, as well as to subordinate committees and supporting staff. In addition, the ISMS supplies systems design, development and maintenance support to the International Staff and the NATO Standardization Agency.

It provides support for tasks such as crisis management, as well as registry and document control services, financial and personnel management information systems, and force planning. It has responsibility for the operation of centralised computer facilities at NATO Headquarters and for developing and maintaining software for specific user applications, providing training and user assistance, maintaining NATO Headquarters information systems, and advising staff officials on information systems matters.

CHAPTER 40

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Although NATO member countries remain responsible for the education and training of their military forces, programmes and courses offered at the national level are complemented at the international level by the work undertaken by a small number of colleges and schools established by the North Atlantic Council, the Military Committee and the strategic commands.

Education and training also play a key role in the context of the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme. In addition to the regular participation of Partner and Mediterranean Dialogue countries in the NATO education and training institutions described below, which are an integral part of the NATO structure, the Alliance has established an expanding network of officially recognised PfP Training Centres located in different member and Partner countries. There are currently 11 such centres, located in Austria, Finland, Greece, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine and the United States.

Education and training are also integral components of the mandate of Allied Command Transformation (ACT), created in 2003 following the reorganisation of the NATO command structure.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

NATO's principal educational facilities, used to train and educate leaders and specialists from member and Partner countries, are the NATO Defense College, the NATO School in Oberammergau, and the NATO Communications and Information Systems (CIS) School. NATO also has a number of other educational establishments, namely the NATO Training Group, the NATO Maritime Interdiction Operational Training Centre, Centres of Excellence, the Joint Advanced Distributed Learning and Simulation Programme and the NATO/PfP Education Network.

NATO Defense College

The mission of the NATO Defense College (NDC) is to contribute to the effectiveness and cohesion of the Alliance by developing its role as a major centre of education, study and research on transatlantic security issues. It offers courses and seminars each year on issues relevant to the Euro-Atlantic

security situation, catering to a variety of senior officers from the armed forces, senior government officials, academics and parliamentarians. In addition to participation by NATO countries, virtually all the College's activities are open to participants from Partnership for Peace (PfP) and Mediterranean Dialogue countries, and may also include participation by other countries in the broader Middle East region in the framework of the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative.

The NATO Defense College was established in Paris in 1951 and was transferred to Rome in 1966. It comes under the direction of the Military Committee, which appoints the commandant of the College for a period of three years. The commandant is an officer of at least lieutenant general rank or equivalent, who is assisted by a civilian dean and a military director of management provided by the host country. The Chairman of the Military Committee chairs the College's Academic Advisory Board. The College faculty is composed of military officers and civilian officials, normally from the foreign and defence ministries of member countries.

In response to guidance issued to the College by the North Atlantic Council and the Military Committee in 2002, the College focuses its efforts on the three core areas of education, outreach and research. The education and research activities of the College are being coordinated with Allied Command Transformation (ACT), which will be represented, at the appropriate senior level, in the NDC's Academic Advisory Board in order to better contribute to the overall NATO education and research goals.

In terms of its educational programmes, the College provides strategic-level courses on politico-military issues designed to prepare selected personnel for NATO and NATO-related appointments. The main educational activity of the College is the Senior Course, attended by up to 90 course members selected by their own governments on a national quota basis. Its members are either military officers holding the rank of colonel or lieutenant colonel, or civilian officials of equivalent status from relevant government departments or national institutions. Most course members go on to staff appointments in NATO commands or national NATO-related posts in their own countries. Since 2002, changes have been introduced to the course curriculum, making it a more academically demanding strategic-level forum for critical thinking and risk analysis.

Daily lectures are given by visiting academics, politicians, high-ranking military and civil servants. Great importance is attached to the achievement of consensus among the course members during their preparatory work and discussions, reflecting the importance of the principle of consensus throughout NATO structures.

Parts of the Senior Course are designed to be taken as modular short courses which allow selected officers and officials from NATO Headquarters and from the strategic commands to join the Senior Course for one week to study a particular strategic theme.

In 1991, the College introduced a two-week course for senior officers and civilians from the members of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, now the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). The following year, the course became an Integrated PfP/OSCE Course within the framework of the Senior Course. As an integral part of NATO's PfP programme, this two-week course aims to develop a common perception of the Euro-Atlantic region among the college's regular Senior Course members and representatives from PfP/OSCE and NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue countries.

Two General and Flag Officers' and Ambassadors' Courses are organised each year in the spring and autumn. They are designed to contribute to the strengthening of regional stability by promoting dialogue, understanding and confidence-building.

As part of the College's outreach programme, a Conference of Commandants is held every year, bringing together the commandants of senior national defence colleges of NATO, PfP and Mediterranean Dialogue countries to exchange views on academic philosophies and educational methods. The College also participates fully in the Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes, a non-NATO cooperative educational body. In this capacity, the College serves as the focal point of contact within NATO to this consortium. Every year in February, the college runs an international course at the Ukrainian National Defence Academy in Kiev. Lastly, the College offers online courses as part of its outreach activities.

The College has significantly upgraded its work in the field of research and aims to provide senior NATO officials with fresh perspectives drawing on the ideas of top academics, experts and practitioners, through reports based on conferences and workshops focusing on the major issues challenging the Alliance. In addition, the College organises an International Research Seminar on Euro-Atlantic Security every year, in cooperation with an academic institution from one of the PfP countries. A similar International Research Seminar with Mediterranean Dialogue Countries is also held annually.

Each year the College also offers research fellowships in the field of security studies to two nationals of PfP countries and two from Mediterranean Dialogue countries to promote individual scholarly research on topics relating to Euro-Atlantic, Eurasian and Mediterranean security issues.

Through the activities of national associations of graduates of the College and an annual seminar each September for alumni, the College generates a strong corporate spirit among its graduates, many of whom hold positions of responsibility within the Alliance.

Further information:

NATO Defense College

Via Giorgio Pelosi 1

00143 Roma

Italy

Tel: +39 06 505 259 (switchboard)

Fax: +39 06 505 25799

Website: www.ndc.nato.int

The NATO School, Oberammergau, Germany

The NATO School in Oberammergau serves as a centre for individual education and training for military and civilian personnel from Alliance, Partnership for Peace (PFP), Mediterranean Dialogue and contact countries. Its mission is to provide education and training in support of current and developing NATO strategy, policy, doctrine and procedures. Its courses reflect current Alliance operational developments and the priorities of Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) and Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT).

Each year a wide range of courses are taught on various topics. While primarily focused on individual education, the school also supports all aspects of collective training, exercises, and operations, when required. Education and training is centred on combined joint operational art, using educational methods such as courses, seminars, advanced distributed learning, modelling and simulation. As part of the School's outreach programme, Mobile Education Training Teams provide tailored courses which assist the processes of transformation, interoperability and cooperation.

The School falls under the operational control of SACT but operates as a NATO educational facility for both NATO Strategic Commands. A Board of Advisers provides assistance and guidance. Germany and the United States contribute facilities and logistic support and provide more than 60 per cent of the manpower, but the School relies on tuition fees from students to offset its operating costs and is essentially self-supporting.

The NATO School has its origins in the early years of Alliance history but received its charter and present name in 1975. For many years, its principal focus was on issues relating to NATO collective defence. More recently, following the revision of the NATO Strategic Concept in 1999, the role of the School

was fundamentally altered to include courses, training and seminars in support of NATO's current and developing strategy and policies for collective security, including cooperation and dialogue with military and civilian personnel from non-NATO countries. In addition, since the beginning of NATO operations in the Balkans, the School has provided indirect support to current NATO military operations.

Courses are organised in four fundamental NATO operational areas: joint operations, policy, operations and plans, and weapons of mass destruction. The School faculty includes staff from NATO countries supplemented by guest speakers from NATO commands and headquarters, NATO and PfP countries and non-governmental organisations. The focus of all the courses is to develop NATO and non-NATO combined joint operational staff officers who can work together more effectively.

Non-military participation in courses has increased significantly during recent years, as have the School's contacts with international organisations. The largest growth area in the School's curricula activity has been in support of PfP, Mediterranean Dialogue and Istanbul Cooperation Initiative programmes.

Further developments of the NATO School curriculum are being introduced to take account of lessons learned from NATO-led operations in the Balkans and Afghanistan and to prepare forces for participation in the NATO Response Force. Most recently, the School has conducted training in support of the NATO Training Implementation Mission in Iraq. The NATO School is also at the forefront in developing programmes of instruction in combating human trafficking and defence against terrorism.

Through its education and training programmes, the School contributes to the development of current and future operational capabilities. In all these contexts, the NATO School remains engaged in meeting Alliance priorities as well as in promoting the transformation of military capabilities for NATO and its Partner countries.

Further information:

NATO School

Am Rainenbichl 54

82487 Oberammergau

Germany

Tel: +49 8822 9481 1304 (Student Administration)

Fax: +49 8822 3680

Email: star@natoschool.nato.int

Website: www.natoschool.nato.int

NATO Communications and Information Systems School (NCISS)

The NATO Communications and Information Systems (CIS) School (NCISS) provides advanced training for civilian and military personnel in the operation and maintenance of NATO CIS. The school also provides orientation courses and management training on NATO CIS and, in addition, offers CIS orientation courses for Partner countries.

Originally established in 1959, the School has undergone a number of transformations since that time and has existed under its present name since 1989. In 1994, new courses were introduced in the context of Partnership for Peace. Since 1995, with the beginning of NATO's deployments in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the School has also provided courses to support NATO forces in operational roles. It currently offers over 50 courses lasting from one to ten weeks and receives approximately 2700 students per year.

The School is divided into two branches, Training and Support. The Training Branch is itself divided into a Network Domain Section responsible for courses concerned with transmission systems, switching systems and network control; a User Domain Section responsible for courses concerned with command and control information systems, software engineering project management and programming; and an Infosec Domain Section responsible for courses on the operation, maintenance and repair of cryptographic equipment. The Training Branch also offers CIS officer and orientation courses, courses on frequency management and a CIS course for Partner countries. The Support Branch is responsible for the logistical and administrative support of the Training Branch.

The commandant of the School is an Italian serving officer with the rank of colonel or equivalent. A principal telecommunications engineer acts as his technical adviser. The School's Training Management Office is responsible for management aspects such as developing the annual course schedule and training documentation and for monitoring statistics.

The School operates as an educational and training establishment for both NATO Strategic Commands. It receives administrative support from Allied Joint Force Command Headquarters Naples and falls under the operational responsibility of the NATO CIS Services Agency, in close coordination with Allied Command Transformation. The NCSA is supported in its supervisory role by the NATO CIS Joint Training Planning Group. Allied Command Transformation is primarily responsible for coordination of the curricula, supported by an NCISS Board of Advisors. The School receives support from the Italian Ministry of Defence through the Italian Air Force Training Brigade at Latina with which it is co-located.

Further information:

NATO CIS School
04010 Borgo Piave

Latina

Italy

Tel: +39 0773 6771

Fax: +39 0773 662467

NATO Training Group (NTG)

The overall aim of the NATO Training Group is to enhance interoperability among Alliance forces, and between the forces of Partner countries, through improved coordination and standardisation of individual and collective training. Being subordinate to Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT), the NTG is part of NATO's military structure and maintains close contacts with the NATO Standardization Agency (NSA). *Inter alia*, the NTG facilitates the exchange of information between NATO members, Partnership for Peace and Mediterranean Dialogue countries and NATO's military authorities on national training capabilities and provides a forum for discussion and exchanges of views on individual and collective training matters.

By identifying and encouraging the use of training projects that lend themselves to bilateral or multilateral cooperation, the NTG promotes qualitative improvements in training as well as cost and manpower savings, standardisation and interoperability. It also develops procedures, documents and manuals in support of and as advice for training in NATO and Partner countries and supports NATO's transformation efforts, for example through the development of new training concepts and policy documents for Allied Command Transformation. Participation in shared training projects by individual countries is on a case-by-case basis and does not duplicate or replace national training programmes. The NTG encourages individual countries to assume responsibility for specific training projects on behalf of the Alliance as a whole or for the benefit of a group of NATO member countries with common requirements. The NTG's activities have been extended to include common training projects for Partnership for Peace and Mediterranean Dialogue countries.

Work is conducted by five subgroups (Joint, Navy, Army, Air Force and Financial) and subordinate specialist working groups, in which NATO and Partner countries are represented. The activities of the NTG are coordinated by the NTG Section of the Design and Development Branch, Joint Education and Training Sub-Division, HQ SACT, located in Norfolk, Virginia, United States.

Further information:

NATO Training Group Staff Element
IMS Operations Division
NATO Headquarters
1110 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: +32 2 707 5750
Fax: +32 2 707 5988
Email: ntg@hq.nato.int
Website: www.nato.int/structur/ntg

NTG Section
Joint Education and Training (JET) Sub-Division
Headquarters Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (HQ SACT)
7857 Blandy Road, Suite 100
Norfolk, Virginia 23551-2490
USA
Tel: +1 757 747 3219
Fax: +1 757 747 3863
Email: NTGsection@act.nato.int

NATO Maritime Interdiction Operational Training Centre

This centre, based in Souda Bay, Greece, is a multinationally manned NATO training centre. Although outside the NATO command structure, it is associated with Allied Command Transformation in a similar way, as are the educational facilities described above. It conducts combined training to enable NATO forces to better execute surface, sub-surface, aerial surveillance and special operations activities in support of maritime interdiction operations.

Centres of Excellence

Centres of Excellence are recognised, nationally or multinationally sponsored and funded entities offering expertise and experience for the benefit of the Alliance, especially in support of its transformation process. These centres provide opportunities for leaders or units from NATO and Partner countries to enhance their education and training, improve interoperability and capabilities, assist in doctrine development and test and validate concepts through experimentation. They are not part of the NATO command structure but form part of the wider educational and training framework supporting NATO. Specific relationships between Centres of Excellence and the Strategic Commands are based on memoranda of understanding drawn up with the country or countries involved and on technical agreements and accreditation criteria.

The Joint Advanced Distributed Learning and Simulation Programme

A joint advanced distributed learning and simulation capability is under development which encompasses improvements in learning technologies in order to exploit emerging computer and communication technologies and to provide “anywhere, anytime” learning. The introduction of the distance learning approach has the potential to harmonise and greatly enhance education and training of both NATO and Partner country military personnel at all levels, making courses available to a much larger training audience with significant savings in resources. It will increase readiness for a wide range of missions, especially for multinational crisis response operations, and will provide Partner countries with access to more in-depth training with NATO, thereby also promoting interoperability.

Management and oversight of the programme is provided by Allied Command Transformation. It will feature accessibility, interoperability, reusability, durability, adaptability, and cost-effectiveness in military education and training. It is expected to evolve rapidly, drawing on commercially available Internet technologies and services, and will make it possible to take advantage of the work of all the relevant NATO and national educational institutions, enabling them to share in the development of distributed learning courseware and learning management systems that are able to track and assess the education and training possibilities that they provide. It is a comprehensive programme that not only includes dynamic interactive courseware products and the use of simulation but will also provide a knowledge management system integrating relevant databases, collaboration tools and search engines. This will provide a capability that meets the needs of commanders and multinational staffs involved in the transformation process by providing timely education and training relevant to their evolving exercise and operational roles.

Further information:

HQ SACT

Joint Education and Training (JET) Sub-Division

7857 Blandy Road, Suite 100

Norfolk, Virginia 23551-2490

USA

Tel: +1 757 747 3386

Fax: +757 747 3863

Email: adl@act.nato.int

Website: www.act.nato.int/adl

NATO/PfP Education Network

In addition to the educational facilities, Partnership for Peace (PfP) Training Centres and Centres of Excellence described above, a NATO/PfP Education Network also forms part of the educational dimension of the transformation process. By bringing together the NATO educational facilities, PfP Training Centres and Centres of Excellence described above, as well as relevant national educational facilities and centres, within a coherent network centred on the objectives of Allied Command Transformation, the NATO/PfP Education Network will improve the use made of resources and expertise, harmonise curricula and avoid duplication of effort.

CHAPTER 41

ELECTRONIC WARFARE

Electronic warfare capabilities are a key factor in the protection of military forces and in monitoring compliance with international agreements, and are essential for peacekeeping and other tasks undertaken by the Alliance. Structures were introduced in 1966 to support the Military Committee, the NATO Strategic Commanders and the member countries in this sphere and to promote an effective NATO electronic warfare (EW) capability.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

The **NATO Electronic Warfare Advisory Committee (NEWAC)** is a joint, multinational body established for the purpose of fulfilling these objectives and for monitoring progress achieved nationally and within the integrated military command structure in implementing agreed EW measures. It is responsible for the development of NATO's electronic warfare policy, doctrine, operations and educational requirements and contributes to the development of command and control concepts. NEWAC also assists in introducing NATO's EW concepts to Partner countries within the framework of Partnership for Peace.

The Committee is composed of representatives of each NATO country and of the NATO Strategic Commanders. Members are senior military officials in national EW organisations. The chairman and secretary of the Committee are permanently assigned to the Operations Division of the International Military Staff. There are a number of subordinate groups dealing with electronic warfare database support, training and doctrine.

Further information:

NATO Electronic Warfare Advisory Committee (NEWAC)
Operations Division
International Military Staff, NATO Headquarters
1110 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: +32 2 707 5627

CHAPTER 42

LOGISTICS

The term “logistics” can mean different things in different countries and in different contexts. The NATO definition refers to “the science of planning and carrying out the movement and maintenance of forces”. The term refers to aspects of military operations, which deal with the following:

- design and development, acquisition, storage, transport, distribution, maintenance, evacuation and disposal of materiel;
- transport of personnel;
- acquisition, construction, maintenance, operation and disposition of facilities;
- acquisition or provision of services;
- medical and health service support.

The above categories involve a wide range of services and responsibilities which can be subdivided into the following sectors:

- production or acquisition aspects of logistics (planning, design development and procurement of equipment). These matters are primarily a national responsibility and are handled nationally. However, cooperation and coordination take place within NATO in numerous spheres, largely under the auspices of the Conference of National Armament Directors (CNAD) and its subordinate bodies.
- consumer or operational aspects of logistics concerned with the supply and support functions of forces, falling mainly under the responsibility of the Senior NATO Logisticians’ Conference and the NATO Pipeline Committee. Other bodies, such as the Committee of the Chiefs of Military Medical Services in NATO, advise the Military Committee on logistical matters in their specific areas of responsibility.

Many of the programmes and activities referred to in this section are implemented by organisations and agencies established by the North Atlantic Council or the NATO Military Committee to undertake specific tasks.

Logistic support for the Alliance’s Strategic Concept

The Alliance’s 1999 Strategic Concept emphasises the mobile and multinational character of NATO forces and the need for flexible logistics to

support them. Although fundamentally a national responsibility, the basic principle guiding the provision of logistic support for NATO's military operations is that of collective responsibility shared between the participating countries themselves and the structures developed within NATO to promote cooperation in this sphere. These include the Senior NATO Logisticians' Conference and multinational logistic structures such as the Multinational Joint Logistic Centre and Multinational Integrated Logistic Units.

Logistics principles and policies

New logistics principles and policies were initially endorsed in 1992 and have since been periodically reviewed in the light of the practical experience gained from NATO-led peacekeeping operations. Principles and policies approved by the Military Committee in 2003 and by the North Atlantic Council in 2004, summarised below, serve as the basis for more specific guidelines relating to functional areas of logistics such as medical support, host nation support, and movement and transportation.

Collective responsibility. Alliance member countries and NATO authorities have collective responsibility for the logistic support of NATO's multinational operations. This underlying principle encourages member countries and NATO's international structures to share the burden of providing and exploiting the logistic capabilities and resources needed to support multinational force operations effectively and efficiently. Standardisation, cooperation and multinationality with regard to logistics requirements form the basis for flexible and efficient use of logistic support and contribute to operational effectiveness.

Authority. Responsibility and authority are interdependent. The responsibility assigned to a NATO commander by the member countries and by NATO bodies must be complemented by delegation of the authority he needs to adequately discharge his responsibilities. This means that each commander, at the appropriate level, must have sufficient authority over the logistic resources necessary to enable him to receive, employ, sustain and redeploy the forces assigned to him by countries in the most effective manner. The same applies with respect to non-NATO commanders of multinational forces participating in NATO-led operations.

Primacy of operational requirements. All logistic support efforts provided by both the military and civil sector should be directed towards meeting the operational requirements needed to guarantee the success of the mission.

Cooperation. Cooperation between member countries and NATO bodies is essential across the full spectrum of logistics – including cooperation

between the civilian and military sector within and between member countries – and contributes to the best use of limited resources. For non-Article 5 crisis response operations, this cooperation must be extended to non-NATO countries and other relevant organisations as required.

Coordination. Logistics support must be coordinated among member countries and between member countries and NATO bodies at all levels as a matter of course. It must include coordination with non-NATO countries and other relevant organisations as required. The process is facilitated by pre-arranged logistic coordination and cooperation agreements. The appropriate NATO bodies have overall responsibility for such coordination.

All these principles relate to the development of policy and doctrine for all functional areas of logistics, including movement, transportation and medical support (except in the case of Germany, where medical support is not treated as a logistics function). There is an element of essential overlap between these principles, in order to ensure that any Alliance mission can rely on effective and coherent logistic support across the board, and they may be supplemented by other principles relating specifically to particular functional areas.

Cooperative logistics

The aim of cooperation in logistics is to enhance the effectiveness of NATO-led multinational operations by improving efficiency and achieving cost savings, for example through economies of scale and elimination of duplication. Modern methods for the management and procurement of materiel are used, such as the SHARE (Stock Holding and Asset Requirements Exchange) scheme developed by the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA), which facilitates the sharing or exchange of stock holdings among users by providing an effective link between specific needs and available assets.

Multinational logistics

The tasks facing NATO today and the missions and support operations it has undertaken in the Balkans, in Afghanistan and in Iraq underscore the necessity of increased cooperation and multinationality in logistics support (for instance transportation, engineering and supply, and medical capabilities). The need to carry out operations in locations where the logistics support provided by the normal national infrastructure is not available and to integrate non-NATO military forces and their logistic support makes multinational joint logistics structures essential.

Multinational logistics also optimises individual national logistic support efforts, enhancing both the cost-effectiveness and the efficiency of those individual activities. A number of concepts and initiatives are being used to bring about increased multinationality, including role specialisation and lead nation concept. Such arrangements can contribute significantly to the success of both the planning and the implementation aspects of logistic operations.

Movement and transportation

Efficient and timely movement of forces, including the deployment, staging and onward movement of large amounts of materiel and equipment, is a prerequisite for all military operations. NATO must be able to ensure the strategic mobility of troops and materiel by providing adequate lift, transportation facilities, equipment and infrastructure. This includes the possible use of civilian resources through multinational initiatives leading to commercial charter agreements for strategic airlift and sealift.

Civilian and military staff officers responsible for logistics within the International Staff and the International Military Staff coordinate policy and doctrinal issues within the staffs, the Strategic Commands, and the relevant military and civilian agencies.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

Senior NATO Logisticians' Conference (SNLC)

The principal committee dealing with logistics, the SNLC, meets under the chairmanship of the NATO Secretary General twice a year, in joint civil and military sessions. It has two permanent co-chairmen, namely the Assistant Secretary General of the division responsible for defence policy and planning issues and the Deputy Chairman of the Military Committee. The SNLC reports jointly to both the North Atlantic Council and the Military Committee, reflecting the dependence of logistics on both civil and military factors.

Membership of the SNLC is drawn from senior national civil and military representatives of ministries of defence or equivalent bodies with responsibility for consumer aspects of logistics in member countries. Representatives of the Strategic Commands, the NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency, the NATO Standardization Agency, the Committee of the Chiefs of Military Medical Services in NATO and other sectors of the NATO Headquarters Staff also participate in the work of the SNLC. The overall mandate of the SNLC is to

address logistics matters with a view to enhancing the performance, efficiency, sustainability and combat effectiveness of Alliance forces and to exercise, on behalf of the North Atlantic Council, an overarching coordinating authority across the whole spectrum of logistics functions within NATO.

SNLC Movement and Transportation Group (M&TG)

The focal point for questions relating to strategic mobility in NATO is the Movement and Transportation Group (M&TG), a subgroup of the SNLC created to foster cooperative approaches to the management side of movement, transportation and mobility matters between military and civilian agencies and between NATO and member country forces. The M&TG plans and evaluates transport capacity and capabilities and prepares recommendations on how best to meet political and military requirements. It takes advice from civil planning boards and committees: the Civil Aviation Planning Committee, the Planning Board for Ocean Shipping and the Planning Board for Inland Surface Transport.

NATO Maintenance and Supply Organisation (NAMSO)

The NATO Maintenance and Supply Organisation provides the structure for the logistics support of selected weapons systems in the national inventories of two or more NATO member countries, through the common procurement and supply of spare parts and the provision of maintenance and repair facilities.

NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA)

The NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency is the executive arm of NAMSO. Its task is to provide logistic services in support of weapon and equipment systems held in common by NATO member countries, in order to promote materiel readiness, improve the efficiency of logistic operations and effect savings through consolidated procurement in the areas of supply, maintenance, calibration, procurement, transportation, technical support, engineering services and configuration management. Modern materiel management and procurement techniques developed by NAMSA include the Stock Holding and Assets Requirements Exchange scheme, known as SHARE, and Common Item Materiel Management (COMMIT). NAMSA also provides support for the Group of National Directors on Codification, which manages the NATO Codification System on behalf of the Conference of National Armaments Directors, and logistics support for deployed NATO forces.

NAMSA has played a fundamental role as NATO's executive agency for the implementation of projects for the safe destruction of stocks of anti-personnel mines and other arms and munitions under NATO's Partnership for Peace Trust Fund Policy.

Further information can be obtained from:

NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA)

8302 Capellen

Luxembourg

Tel: +352 30 631

Fax: +352 30 87 21

NATO Pipeline Committee (NPC)

The NPC, which is chaired by the Head of Logistics of the International Staff, is the senior advisory body in NATO on consumer logistics relating to petroleum. It acts on behalf of the North Atlantic Council, in full consultation with the NATO Military Authorities and other bodies, on all matters of NATO-wide concern in connection with military fuels, lubricants and associated products and equipment, the NATO Pipeline System and other petroleum installations.

NATO Pipeline System (NPS)

Although collectively referred to as one system, the NPS consists of ten separate, distinct military storage and distribution systems: Iceland, Italy, Greece, Turkey (two separate systems – west and east), Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, the North European Pipeline System (NEPS) located in both Denmark and Germany, and the largest system, the Central Europe Pipeline System (CEPS) in Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

In total the NPS consists of some 11 500 kilometres of pipeline running through 13 NATO countries with the associated depots, connected air bases, civil airports, pump stations, refineries and entry points. Bulk distribution is achieved using facilities provided from the common-funded NATO Security Investment Programme (see Part II, Chapter 4). The networks are controlled by national organisations, with the exception of CEPS, which is a multinational system.

In addition to the above elements of the NPS, there are also fuel systems in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Spain. While those in the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland are national systems, NATO military requirements have been incorporated into approved Capability Packages and

the related projects are being implemented. The Spanish system is purely national.

Central European Pipeline Management Organisation (CEPMO)

CEPMO is the management organisation for the Central Europe Pipeline System (CEPS) and is one of the NATO Production and Logistics Organisations (NPLO). CEPS encompasses NATO assets for the movement, storage and delivery of fuel in Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg and the Netherlands. These are known as the host nations, with Canada and the United States designated as user nations. Collectively, the host and user nations comprise the member countries participating in CEPMO. The system is designed and managed to meet operational requirements in central Europe in peace, crisis and conflict, but is also used commercially under strict safeguards. The day-to-day operation of CEPS is the task of the Central Europe Pipeline Management Agency (CEPMA) located in Versailles, France.

The CEPMO Board of Directors is the governing body acting with regard to the collective interests of all CEPMO member countries. It is composed of a representative of each member country of CEPMO, who represents their country's political, military, economic, financial and technical interests. Representatives of the National Military Authorities, the General Manager of CEPMA and the designated Secretary General's Liaison Officer also participate in meetings of the CEPMO Board of Directors.

CEPMA is organised in such a way as to cover the core functions of operations, marketing and economic development, technical, financial and administrative support.

Further information:

Central Europe Pipeline Management Agency (CEPMA)
11bis rue du Général Pershing
B.P. 552
78005 Versailles Cedex
France
Tel: +33 1 3924 4900
Fax: +33 1 3955 6539
Email: registry@cepma.nato.int

The Committee of the Chiefs of Military Medical Services in NATO (COMEDS)

The Committee of the Chiefs of Military Medical Services in NATO (COMEDS) is composed of the senior military medical authorities of member

countries. It acts as the central point for the development and coordination of military medical matters and for providing medical advice to the NATO Military Committee.

Historically, medical matters within NATO were regarded strictly as a national responsibility. For the greatest part of the Alliance's existence, there was therefore no requirement for the establishment of a high-level military medical authority within NATO.

New NATO missions and concepts of operations place increased emphasis on joint military operations, enhancing the importance of coordination of medical support in peacekeeping, disaster relief and humanitarian operations. COMEDS was established in 1994 for that purpose. The chairman and the secretary of the Committee are provided by Belgium, and the Secretariat is located within the Belgian Surgeon General's Office in Brussels. A COMEDS liaison staff officer has been appointed within the Logistics, Armaments and Resources Division of the International Military Staff.

Comprised of the surgeons general of the Alliance member countries plus the medical advisers of the NATO Strategic Commands, a representative of the NATO Standardization Agency, the chairman of the Joint Medical Committee, a representative of the Military Committee, and a representative of the International Military Staff, COMEDS meets biannually in plenary session and reports annually to the Military Committee. From 2001, the surgeons general of Partner countries have been invited to participate in the COMEDS Plenary Meeting in Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council format.

COMEDS' objectives include improving and expanding arrangements between member countries for coordination, standardisation and interoperability in the medical field and improving the exchange of information relating to organisational, operational and procedural aspects of military medical services in NATO and Partner countries. Since 1997, Partnership for Peace (PfP) countries have been invited to participate fully in the work of most COMEDS working groups, and since 1996, in the annual COMEDS/PfP medical seminar which has been incorporated into COMEDS plenary meetings. In 2001, COMEDS set up a Standing Group of Partner Medical Experts to address medical assets and capabilities, PfP goals and medical pre-arrangements in cooperation with the Strategic Commanders. The work of COMEDS is coordinated with other NATO bodies with responsibilities in the medical field, including the NATO Standardization Agency, the Joint Medical Committee, the Medical Advisers of the NATO Strategic Commanders, the Human Factors and Medicine Panel of the Research and Technology Organisation and the Weapons of Mass Destruction Centre.

To assist in carrying out its tasks and in addition to the bodies referred to above, COMEDS has a number of subordinate working groups which meet at least annually and address the following topics: military medical structures, operations and procedures; military preventive medicine; emergency medicine; military psychiatry; dental services; medical materiel and military pharmacy; food hygiene, food technology, and veterinary medicine; medical training; and medical information management systems.

An *Ad Hoc* Steering Group on Weapons of Mass Destruction has also been established to review existing medical capabilities and shortfalls in relation to threats from biological weapons.

Further information:

COMEDS Liaison Staff Officer
NATO Headquarters
Logistics Resources Division
International Military Staff
1110 Brussels
Belgium
Tel. +32 2 707 9862
Fax: +32 2 707 9869

COMEDS Secretariat
Etat-major du Service Médical
Quartier Reine Elisabeth
Rue d'Evere
1140 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: +32 2701 3067/8/9
Fax: +32 2 701 3071

CHAPTER 43

METEOROLOGY

The objective of NATO cooperation in the meteorological field is to ensure the most efficient and effective use of national and NATO assets in providing accurate and timely meteorological information to NATO forces. The work is the responsibility of the Military Committee Meteorological Group described below.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

Military Committee Meteorological Group (MCMG)

The Military Committee Meteorology Group (MCMG) is a specialist forum, composed of national representatives and representatives of NATO Strategic Commanders that provides meteorological policy guidance to the Military Committee, the Strategic Commanders and the NATO member countries. The MCMG is supported by two permanent working groups, namely the Working Group on Operations, Plans and Communications and the Working Group on Battle-area Meteorological Systems and Support.

The **Working Group on Operations, Plans and Communication** addresses planning and operational issues relating to meteorological support for NATO exercises and operations. It also develops meteorological communications capabilities and standard procedures for communications and the exchange of meteorological data. With the reorganisation of NATO's integrated command structure, the functions of this group are being transferred to Allied Command Operations.

The **Working Group on Battle-area Meteorological Systems and Support** encourages cooperation in research, development and transition of new meteorological equipment, techniques, and software to operational capability. It provides technical advice on meteorological matters to other NATO groups and undertakes studies of issues such as flood forecasting and artificial fog dissipation. Basic weather forecasts are often inadequate for tactical planning or mission execution. The working group therefore maintains an inventory of meteorological Tactical Decision Aids (TDAs) developed by the member countries. To further standardise the use of TDAs and enhance operability,

the working group has developed a library of approved TDAs that are available to all NATO countries.

The MCMG holds annual meetings with Partner countries in the framework of the Partnership for Peace and Mediterranean Dialogue programmes, and has developed a Meteorological Support Manual for Partner countries. Partner countries also participate in the Working Group on Battle-area Meteorological Systems and Support.

Further information:

MCMG Operations Division (IMS)

NATO Headquarters

1110 Brussels

Belgium

Tel: +32 2 707 5538

Fax: +32 2 707 5988

Email: imssmo@hq.nato.int

CHAPTER 44

MILITARY OCEANOGRAPHY

Military oceanography is the study of oceanographic conditions, ranging from temperature and salinity to tidal movements and coastal features, which can have a bearing on maritime operations. The subject is relevant to many aspects of maritime operations and is particularly relevant to anti-submarine warfare, mine warfare and amphibious warfare operations. Work undertaken in this sphere focuses on obtaining the maximum military advantage for NATO forces from oceanographic effects.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

The Military Oceanography (MILOC) Group

The MILOC Group is composed of national representatives, representatives of those NATO commanders with a particularly maritime focus and representatives from the Allied Command Transformation Undersea Research Centre. It provides advice to the NATO Strategic Commands and is supported by a permanent MILOC Subgroup.

The MILOC Group ensures that military oceanographic activity is consistent with Alliance strategy. Routine activities of the group include supporting NATO operations and exercises, developing plans and policies applicable to the field of military oceanography, promoting research and development in the oceanographic field and liaising with other NATO and national groups, including those with responsibilities in the meteorological and geographic spheres.

The MILOC Group actively encourages new concepts in the field of environmental support and is responsible for originating NATO's concept of maritime rapid environmental assessment. This methodology uses developing technologies such as computer modelling, state-of-the-art sensors, tactical decision aids and network systems to provide timely forms of support adapted to the needs of the military user.

The work of the group also takes into account requirements stemming from NATO's strategic partnership with the European Union, the enhancement of the Partnership for Peace and NATO's enlargement process, and helps to strengthen transatlantic cooperation as a whole.

The MILOC Subgroup examines issues as tasked by the MILOC Groups and formulates recommendations and reports as appropriate. The MILOC Group meets annually and Partner countries are encouraged to participate in its work within the framework of the Partnership for Peace programme.

Further information:

MILOC Group
Strategy Division
HQ SACLANT
7857 Blandy Road, Suite 1000
Norfolk, Virginia 23551-2490
USA
Tel: +1 757 445 3431
Fax: +1 757 445 3271
Website: www.saclant.nato.int

CHAPTER 45

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY COMMUNICATIONS AND INFORMATION PROGRAMMES

Responsibility for explaining their national defence and security policies and their role as member countries of the Alliance to their publics rests with individual member governments. The choice of methods to be adopted and resources to be devoted to the task of informing their publics about the policies and objectives of NATO is also a matter for each member country to decide. All NATO governments recognise both their citizens' democratic right to be informed about the international structures which provide the basis for their security, and the importance of maintaining public understanding and support for their countries' security policies.

The role of NATO's activities in the field of public diplomacy is to complement the public information activities undertaken within each country. Their aim is to explain the Organisation's policies and objectives to the public and promote dialogue and understanding, thereby contributing to public knowledge of security issues and promoting public involvement in a well-informed, constructive debate on security. NATO does this by disseminating information and organising programmes directed towards opinion leaders, journalists, academic and parliamentary groups, youth and educational circles and other target groups. It also aims to stimulate a continuous process of debate and policy development on international security issues.

The programmes administered under the NATO Public Diplomacy budget consist of activities which take place within NATO Headquarters itself, external events administered by NATO staff, activities which take place under the auspices of governmental or non-governmental organisations outside the confines of the Headquarters which may be supported by conceptual, practical or financial contributions from NATO, and events which are organised by other external agencies with direct or indirect assistance from NATO.

Communications and information activities on the civilian side can be broken down into three main areas: press and media, external relations and electronic and hard-copy dissemination of information. There is also a military public information adviser who serves as the spokesman for the Chairman of the Military Committee and is the daily point of contact for the press and media on matters relating to the Military Committee and the International Military Staff. The officer appointed to this task maintains liaison with the network of chief public information officers acting as official spokespersons for their respective commands and, through NATO's Committee on Public Diplomacy, with the

national authorities of NATO member countries. The military public information adviser's office is administratively part of the structure of the International Military Staff but is also attached to the International Staff for the purposes of coordination and liaison.

- *Press and media activities*

Press briefings and interviews with senior officials, background briefings, access to photographs, sound and video facilities and electronic transmission services all form part of the arrangements required to meet the needs of the world's media throughout the year. Major events such as summit meetings or developments in the Alliance may attract over a thousand journalists to NATO Headquarters, for whom adequate resources are required. Similar resources are needed at major events taking place away from the Headquarters, for example during ministerial or summit meetings held abroad.

The press spokesman and press officers work in close daily contact with the Private Office of the Secretary General and support the Secretary General in his media and press contacts. They maintain regular contact with journalists in order to answer their questions and explain NATO's policies and operations and organise press tours and visits. Contacts are also arranged between other senior officials and the media and for the official accreditation of journalists attending NATO press events.

Summaries and reviews of the international press and press agency reports are prepared on a daily basis for the benefit of the international staffs, national delegations of member countries and diplomatic missions of Partner countries. Information officers and press officers also assist in the preparation of the Secretary General's official visits to these countries.

- *External relations*

Information officers help to disseminate information in many countries by acting as programme officers both in NATO and Partner countries. Their programmes consist of visits to NATO for briefings and discussions on topical issues, organising conferences and seminars at different locations throughout NATO and Partner countries, support for simulation games and youth activities, and assisting parliamentarians, academics, journalists and other relevant target audiences in their countries of responsibility in obtaining access to the publicly available information on NATO they require. The visits programme can bring up to 20 000 opinion formers annually to the political headquarters of the Alliance in Brussels for briefings and discussions with experts from NATO's

International Staff, International Military Staff and national delegations on all aspects of the Alliance's work and policies.

In addition, special flagship events are developed and organised in member countries, involving the NATO Secretary General and other senior Alliance officials in a variety of conferences, lectures, debates and other speaking engagements.

Many NATO information activities have an interactive, two-way character, enabling the Organisation to learn from the experience of the audiences it addresses, identify their concerns and fields of interest and respond to their questions. High value is attached to the access thus gained to the views and evaluations of the general public and of specialised groups within it. Periodic conferences are held under the auspices of the NATO Secretary General and Public Diplomacy, bringing together experts from international think tanks and comparable national institutions for this purpose.

A number of information activities are specifically tailored for academic audiences and include conferences, seminars and visits for university students, teachers and think-tank experts, as well as the organisation of essay awards for the Manfred Wörner Fellowship, an annual competition set up in 2005. These activities help to seek out new contacts and enhance traditional contacts in academic communities in member and Partner countries at large. The programme also contributes to the coordination and implementation of multinational programmes that help to animate the debate on NATO issues, project Alliance policies and contribute to strengthening knowledge of its goals and objectives in academic circles.

- *Electronic and hard-copy dissemination of information*

Official texts issued by the Alliance, normally in the form of communiqués and press statements, are formally negotiated documents articulating the agreed policy orientation of member countries on specific subjects or on the collectivity of policy issues reviewed periodically throughout the year. They constitute the Alliance's public archive and allow the process of policy-making and the evolution of decisions to be traced to the political events or circumstances to which they relate. All such texts are published in the two official languages of the Alliance, English and French, and often in other languages as well.

In addition to these documents, it is the role of Public Diplomacy to disseminate statements issued by the NATO Secretary General, who is the Organisation's principal spokesman, and texts of speeches by the Secretary General and other senior officials. These documents assist in explaining policy and lending insight into the underlying objectives and rationale.

Under the authority of the Secretary General, a number of printed and electronic publications are produced ranging from compilations of official texts and declarations to periodical and non-periodical publications. They are aimed at different target groups including opinion formers and youth audiences and seek to raise public awareness and contribute to an informed public debate on relevant aspects of security policy. They include a web-based periodical (the NATO Review) and a range of handbooks, brochures, briefing papers, newsletters and other materials such as CD-ROMS and DVDs, all of which contribute to public knowledge and understanding. These items are published on the NATO website and printed in the Organisation's two official languages. In addition, according to resources and requirements, they may also be produced in the languages used in NATO countries and are frequently made available in many Partner-country languages. NATO also provides support for the publishing activities of non-governmental organisations in member and Partner countries.

The NATO website hosts all publicly releasable information on the Alliance. As well as including official documents (treaties, communiqués, agreements and statements), the above-mentioned publications, which can be ordered directly from the website, and speeches and opinions (articles and interviews), the NATO website also offers the latest news for the media and interested audiences, as well as educational material. Multimedia products are also available (video conferences, images and audio files) and Internet users can submit their various queries on NATO and related issues via e-mail. The NATO website also serves as a line of communication with journalists for press briefings and activities of interest to them (press tours, trips and visits).

NATO also has a library that primarily serves the national and international staffs working within the Headquarters. It holds a collection of some 20 000 volumes and 200 journals covering political and military science, strategic issues, arms production and disarmament, international organisations, economics, law, computer science and current affairs. Visitors may use the inter-library loan system by accessing the online NATO library catalogue (<http://207.67.203.60/N10314UK/Index.asp>).

Associated policy committees, and other bodies

The **Committee on Public Diplomacy** is responsible for information policy matters and for advising the North Atlantic Council on relevant issues. The committee is chaired by the Assistant Secretary General for Public Diplomacy and is composed of representatives from national delegations to NATO. It also meets regularly in Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) format with the participation of representatives from Partner countries and periodically with representatives from contact point embassies in Partner country capitals.

Embassies of NATO member countries in these Partner countries serve as contact point embassies, on a rotational basis.

NATO maintains a small **Regional Information Office** in Reykjavik, Iceland. With this exception, there are no regional information offices in NATO member countries.

An information officer was posted to Moscow in 1995 and in February 2001 a **NATO Moscow Information Office** opened in the city centre, that is managed, staffed and financed by the Public Diplomacy Division. The office organises programmes throughout the country, providing information, research assistance and project support to Russian citizens and organisations on NATO- and security-related topics, as well as access to NATO documents and publications. Many of these are published in Russian, together with comment and analytical articles on joint projects undertaken by NATO and Russia and on NATO-Russian relations as a whole.

In January 1998, an independent **NATO Documentation Centre**, housed within the premises of the Russian Institute for Scientific Information for the Social Sciences (INION), was opened in Moscow. Supported by NATO, the centre provides access to publications and documents relating to security issues and publishes a bulletin addressed to academic and other interested audiences.

A **NATO Information and Documentation Centre** opened in Kyiv in 1996. Like the information office in Moscow, it comes under Public Diplomacy and also organises information programmes throughout Ukraine, including similar forms of project and research assistance as well as access to documentation and publications. The centre plays a key role in ensuring that documentation is also made available in Ukrainian and that its activities and published materials address cooperative activities as well as the rationale and status of the distinctive partnership between Ukraine and NATO. The centre is housed within the Ukrainian Institute of International Affairs and provides access to documentation and to other information activities such as visits to NATO and seminars.

In addition to NATO itself, a number of other organisations and agencies play an important role in providing access to information about Alliance-related topics, disseminating written materials, exploiting the advantages of electronic communications through the Internet, and responding to public inquiries. These include public information offices in NATO and Partner countries, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly (see Part IX, Chapter 32), non-governmental organisations, and institutes and foundations.

CHAPTER 46

PUBLIC DIPLOMACY SCIENTIFIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMMES

Civil science has proved to be a highly effective vehicle for international dialogue due to its universality, its ability to create new international networks, and the means it provides of finding answers to critical questions and of connecting countries. The focus of the NATO Programme for Security through Science has been directed increasingly towards the application of science to security issues and, in particular, the potential offered by scientific cooperation among the member and Partner countries for addressing specific challenges to peace and security arising from new threats.

- *The NATO Programme for Security through Science*

The aim of the NATO Programme for Security through Science is to contribute to security, stability and solidarity by applying science to problem-solving. Collaboration, networking and capacity-building are means used to accomplish this end. A further aim is to catalyse democratic reform and support economic development in NATO's Partner countries in transition. The programme is also structured to reach out to the young generation of scientists and provide opportunities for them to gain experience and take part in training.

The programme offers grants to scientists to collaborate on priority research topics and funds to assist the academic community in Partner countries to set up basic computer infrastructure. Applications for support on topics in priority areas are prepared jointly by working scientists in NATO, Partner or Mediterranean Dialogue countries. Specific application forms for each support mechanism are hosted on the programme website (www.nato.int/science) and applications may be submitted at any time, but three deadlines are set each year corresponding to the three review sessions of the scientific advisory panels.

The aims of the programme are therefore pursued through collaborative grants and computer networking:

- Collaborative grants in priority research areas:
 - Collaborative Linkage Grants: grants to assist in pooling ideas and resources on research projects and creating specialist networks;
 - Expert Visits: grants to allow the transfer of expertise in an area of research;

- Advanced Study Institutes: grants to organise high-level tutorial courses to convey the latest developments in a subject to an advanced-level audience;

- Advanced Research Workshops: grants to organise expert workshops where an intense but informal exchange of views at the frontiers of a subject aims at identifying directions for future action;

- Science for Peace projects: grants to collaborate on multi-year applied research and development projects in Partner or Mediterranean Dialogue countries;

- Reintegration Grants: to allow young scientists working abroad in NATO countries to return to and reintegrate the research communities of their home countries.

Collaborative grants are offered for topics in priority research areas of Defence Against Terrorism or Countering Other Threats to Security and/or in Partner Country Priorities. Projects may also be specially commissioned. Known as “top-down” projects, these are often Science for Peace projects or activities generated by the work of short-term expert groups.

- Computer networking support for Partner countries:

- Networking Infrastructure Grants: to assist Partner country research institutions to improve the level and quality of their telecommunication facilities;

- Advanced Networking Workshops: grants to organise either policy workshops to increase harmonisation of network policy at national and international level, or training workshops to extend the knowledge of qualified network managers.

NATO’s civil science programme has provided a number of research and educational institutions in Partner countries with the necessary networking infrastructure to access the Internet. Metropolitan networks have been set up to improve Internet access for academic communities in eastern regions of Russia and in Ukraine, as well as national networks in Moldova and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia.* The largest and most ambitious NATO-sponsored project in this area is the Virtual Silk Highway project, which provides satellite-based Internet access for the academic and scientific communities in the Southern Caucasus and Central Asia. The network has recently also been extended to Afghanistan.

Computer networking grants have a different objective from collaborative grants and are therefore not in the priority research areas. They are concerned

with the development of basic networking infrastructure in Partner countries which are particularly lacking in computer networking capabilities.

➤ NATO-Russia scientific cooperation

A special programme of support for cooperation between scientists in Russia and scientists in NATO countries has also been established within the NATO Programme for Security through Science. The NATO-Russia Council (NRC) Science Committee has drawn up an Action Plan which provides for collaboration in the following six security-related priority areas: explosives detection, psychological and sociological consequences of terrorism, forecasting and prevention of catastrophes, CBRN protection, cyber security, and transport security.

Applications for support for activities on these topics by Russian scientists working in collaboration with scientists from NATO countries may be submitted to NATO. The support mechanisms are Science for Peace projects, Collaborative Linkage Grants, Expert Visits, Advanced Study Institutes (ASIs) and Advanced Research Workshops (ARWs). The ASIs and ARWs normally take place in Russia.

Russian scientists may also participate in the core collaboration programme in the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council.

➤ Funds, awards and the NATO Science Partnership prize

The co-directors of NATO ASIs and ARWs have NATO funds at their disposal which may be used to support the costs of qualified participants from NATO, Partner or Mediterranean Dialogue countries. An updated calendar of meetings can be accessed through the programme website, and requests for participation must be addressed to the co-directors.

For the most part, the results of awards made under the Security through Science Programme are published and made available to the scientific community, either through scientific journals, or in the volumes of the NATO Science Series which cover the results of ASIs and ARWs. Publication catalogues for the NATO Science Series are available online through the programme website.

An annual prize is awarded in recognition of excellence in scientific collaboration between NATO and Partner country scientists in activities supported by the programme. The NATO Science Partnership Prize was established in 2002, and is presented ceremonially to the winners by the NATO Secretary General.

➤ Programme operations

The programme is managed by members of the NATO International Staff at NATO Headquarters in Brussels. Programme responsibility extends over two areas: cooperative programmes, and threats and challenges. The Assistant Secretary General for Public Diplomacy is the chairman of the Science Committee. The science cooperation activities are the responsibility of a Deputy Assistant Secretary General.

The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) provides the overarching framework for political and security-related consultations in NATO involving EAPC member countries, including collaboration within the NATO Security through Science Programme. The NATO-Russia Council Science Committee, established by the NRC, promotes, encourages and coordinates joint cooperative projects between scientists and experts from NATO countries and Russia.

Scientists from the Mediterranean Dialogue countries may participate in the following collaborative activities in priority research areas: Science for Peace projects, Collaborative Linkage Grants, Expert Visits, Advanced Study Institutes, Advanced Research Workshops, Networking Infrastructure Grants and Networking Workshops. Applications should be drawn up in cooperation with scientists from one or more of the 26 NATO countries.

➤ Evolution of the programme

The origins of the programme go back to 1956, with the adoption by the North Atlantic Council of a report on non-military cooperation in NATO by the foreign ministers of Canada, Italy and Norway (known as the Three Wise Men's Report). The report asserted that progress in science and technology can be decisive in determining the security of countries and their positions in world affairs. It stated that science and technology was an area of special importance to the Atlantic community and the NATO Science Programme was therefore established to promote scientific collaboration.

Over the next 40 years, different forms of collaboration were supported between scientists in NATO countries, setting high standards of scientific excellence. From the early 1990s, after the end of the Cold War, the programme was gradually opened up to participation from non-NATO countries. Since 1999, it has been dedicated almost entirely to providing support for collaboration between scientists in NATO countries and those in Partner countries or countries participating in the Mediterranean Dialogue. A further fundamental change, concentrating support on security-related collaborative projects, was introduced in 2004, in response to the threat from international terrorism and other threats to the security of the modern world. The programme, formerly known as the NATO

Science Programme, was also renamed the NATO Programme for Security through Science to reflect this new mission. Since 2004, NATO has also been associated, through that programme and the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (see next section), with the Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC) involving the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). NATO is also involved in joint cooperative activities with the European Science Foundation (ESF) and the International Association for the Promotion of Cooperation with Scientists from the New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union (INTAS).

Further information:

Programme for Security through Science
Public Diplomacy Division
NATO Headquarters
1110 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: +32 2 707 4111
Fax: +32 2 707 4232
Email: science@hq.nato.int
Website: www.nato.int/science

- *Challenges of Modern Society*

The aim of NATO activities under the programme known as the Challenges of Modern Society is to address issues such as non-traditional threats to security, new and emerging risks that could cause economic, social and political instability, and conflict prevention in relation to resource scarcity, among others. The programme is distinct from the Programme for Security through Science described above and has different objectives, funding principles and working methods.

The programme was initiated by the North Atlantic Council in 1969 with the initial aim of addressing problems affecting the environment of the member countries and the quality of life of their peoples. Activities have been expanded over the years to include NATO's Partner countries and experts from Mediterranean Dialogue countries and, more recently, to take into account emerging issues affecting security. The Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS) provides a unique forum for sharing knowledge and experience on technical, scientific and policy aspects of social and environmental matters in both the civilian and military sectors of modern society.

The programme tackles environmental security and societal problems already under study at the national level and, by combining the expertise and

technology available in NATO and Partner countries, aims to arrive fairly rapidly at valid conclusions and make recommendations for action to benefit all. Its key objectives include reducing the environmental impact of military activities, conducting regional studies including on cross-border activities, preventing conflicts in relation to scarcity of resources, addressing emerging risks to the environment and society that could cause economic, cultural and political instability, and addressing non-traditional threats to security.

The principal criterion for initiating activities is evidence of the interest of a sufficient number of countries to work collectively on topics related to challenges of modern society and their willingness to commit resources. Work is carried out on a decentralised basis, mainly through pilot studies lasting three to five years and short-term *ad hoc* projects lasting 12-18 months, both of which are nationally funded. Activities also include the organisation of topical workshops and the co-sponsoring of international conferences and seminars. Technical reports published in the framework of CCMS are destined for wide circulation and are available free of charge.

Examples of projects undertaken in recent years include environmental management systems in the military sector, cleaning and re-use of former military sites, risk assessment of the consequences of the Chernobyl accident, environmental challenges in the Caspian Sea, environmental decision-making for sustainable development in Central Asia, and food chain security. Increasingly, the focus of the committee's work is directed towards security-related aspects of scientific and technological developments in areas identified as relevant to the wider security concerns of the international community.

Since 1995, an Internet-based CCMS Clearing House System has been in operation to facilitate access to environmental databases and to enable participants to acquire, organise, retrieve and disseminate environmental information of common interest. Technical reports on CCMS pilot studies and projects are published and information relating to CCMS activities is disseminated via a dedicated website.

Further information:

NATO - CCMS
Public Diplomacy Division
NATO Headquarters
1110 Brussels
Belgium
Tel: +32 2 707 4850
Fax: +32 2 707 4232
Email: ccms@hq.nato.int
Website: www.nato.int/ccms

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

Overall policy guidance for the NATO Programme for Security through Science is provided by the **NATO Science Committee**, which is composed of member country representatives with expertise in science policy matters appointed from government or independent national scientific institutions. The committee is chaired by the Assistant Secretary General for Public Diplomacy, and normally meets three times a year. One of the meetings is in Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) format, when the NATO country representatives are joined by colleagues representing Partner countries. The committee also meets twice a year in the format of the NATO-Russia Council (NRC), when joint concerns in the scientific arena are discussed.

The Science Committee is assisted in its work of assessing and selecting applications for support by advisory panels whose members are selected by the committee from among the international scientific community. Associate members from Partner countries and Mediterranean Dialogue countries also serve on the advisory panels.

The **Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society** meets twice a year in plenary session and annually with Partner countries in Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) format, under the chairmanship of the Assistant Secretary General for Public Diplomacy. In general, it is composed of national representatives with expertise and responsibilities for national environmental programmes. The committee provides a unique forum for the sharing of knowledge and experience on technical, scientific and policy aspects of social and environmental matters in both the civilian and military sectors among NATO and EAPC Partner countries. The terms of reference for the CCMS were updated in 2000 to reflect the programme's adaptation to NATO's new missions.

The CCMS also meets twice a year in the format of the NRC to review policy issues and the implementation of its Action Plan. Within this NRC Action Plan, 12 topics for cooperation have been identified, which include defence-related environmental issues. The Science Committee and the CCMS have also established a special NATO-Ukraine Joint Working Group on scientific and environmental cooperation to review possible means of further enhancing the participation of Ukrainian experts in CCMS activities and the Programme for Security through Science.

CHAPTER 47

RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Promoting and conducting cooperative research and information exchange to support the effective use of national defence research and technology is an essential element in meeting the military needs of the Alliance, maintaining technological development and providing advice to NATO and national decision makers. These tasks call for an extensive network of national experts and for the coordination of activities among the NATO bodies involved in various aspects of research and technology in different fields of expertise.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

The **NATO Research and Technology Organisation (RTO)** is responsible for integrating the direction and coordination of NATO defence research and technology, conducting and promoting cooperative research and technical information exchange among national institutions, developing a long-term NATO research and technology strategy, and providing general advice on research and technology issues.

The RTO builds upon earlier cooperation in defence research and technology under the former Advisory Group for Aerospace Research and Development and the Defence Research Group, both of which have been brought together to form the new organisation. The RTO reports to both the Military Committee and to the Conference of National Armament Directors. It comprises a Research and Technology Board which is responsible for defining NATO policy on research and technology, supported by a Research and Technology Agency, with headquarters in Neuilly, France. The full range of research and technology activities is covered by seven panels, dealing with the following subjects:

- studies, analysis and simulation
- systems concepts and integration
- sensors and electronics technology
- information systems technology
- applied vehicle technology
- human factors and medicine
- NATO Modelling and Simulation Group

Each panel is made up of national representatives, including highly qualified scientific experts. The panels maintain links with military users and other NATO bodies. The scientific and technological work of the RTO is carried out by technical teams created for specific activities and with a specific duration. The technical teams organise workshops, symposia, field trials, laboratory experiments, lecture series and training courses, and ensure the continuity of the expert networks. They also play an important role in formulating longer-term plans.

In order to facilitate contacts with the military users and other NATO activities, part of the RTA staff is located in the Research, Technology and Industrial Outreach Section at NATO Headquarters in Brussels. This staff liaises with the International Military Staff and the Defence Investment Division of the International Staff. The coordination of efforts directed towards Partner countries is also mainly undertaken from Brussels.

The coordination of research and technology activities with other parts of the NATO structure is facilitated by the participation of RTO representatives on relevant boards and in the meetings of directing bodies such as the NATO Consultation, Command and Control (C3) Board and the NATO Science Committee. A Technology Advisory Board has also been established to provide Allied Command Transformation with independent advice on technology matters relating to the transformation of NATO's military capabilities. The General Manager of the NATO C3 Agency and the Director of the NATO Undersea Research Centre are *ex-officio* members of the Research and Technology Board. Coordination of research and technology activities with the member countries is handled through national coordinators, who also assist in the organisation of activities such as symposia, board meetings, lecture series and consultant missions.

Further information:

Research and Technology Agency (RTA)

BP 25

F-92201 Neuilly sur Seine

France

Tel: +33 1 55 61 22 00

Fax: +33 1 55 61 22 98/99

Email: mailbox@rta.nato.int

Website: www.rta.nato.int

CHAPTER 48

STANDARDIZATION

Standardisation makes a vital contribution to the combined operational effectiveness of the military forces of the Alliance and enables opportunities to be exploited for making better use of economic resources. Extensive efforts are made to improve cooperation and to eliminate duplication in the research, development, production, procurement and logistic support of defence systems, primarily through the promulgation of NATO Standardisation Agreements, known as STANAGs. Implementation of STANAGs helps countries to achieve the required levels of interoperability and to better accomplish their common strategic, operational and tactical tasks, to understand and execute command procedures, and to employ techniques, materiel and equipment more efficiently.

Associated policy committees, organisations and agencies

The principal forum for the elaboration of standardisation policy is the **NATO Standardization Organisation (NSO)**, which aims to incorporate standardisation as an integral part of Alliance planning and acts as a coordinator between senior NATO bodies addressing standardisation requirements. The NSO comprises the NATO Committee for Standardization, the NATO Standardization Staff Group and the NATO Standardization Agency.

The emergence of new threats and measures taken by NATO to adapt its capabilities accordingly have led to changes in operational requirements for armed forces. These changes have significantly enhanced the importance of interoperability with respect to materiel, doctrine, tactics, training, communication and many other areas in which the interoperability of military forces and of the systems that support them is a major factor. The objective of standardisation is to achieve the required critical level of interoperability with regard to all these aspects.

The role of the NSO is to enhance interoperability in order to contribute to the ability of Alliance forces to train, exercise and operate effectively both together and with the forces of Partner countries and other non-NATO countries, in the execution of their assigned tasks. It undertakes this by initiating, harmonising and coordinating standardisation efforts throughout the Alliance and by providing support for standardisation activities. It also acts on behalf

of the NATO Military Committee in developing, coordinating and assessing operational standardisation matters.

In accordance with Alliance policy, national and NATO authorities are encouraged to develop, agree and implement concepts, doctrines, procedures and designs which will enable them to achieve and maintain interoperability. This requires the establishment of the necessary levels of compatibility, interchangeability or commonality in operational, procedural, materiel, technical and administrative fields.

The NSO, established by the North Atlantic Council in January 1995, was restructured in 2000 as a result of a Standardization Review carried out to meet the requirements arising from the decisions on NATO's transformation taken at the 1999 Washington Summit.

The **NATO Committee for Standardization (NCS)** is the senior NATO authority on overall standardisation matters and reports to the Council.

It is supported by NCS Representatives (NCSREPs), who provide harmonisation and guidance at delegate level under the overall direction and management of the Committee. The focus of the work undertaken by the NCSREPs is the harmonisation of standardisation between NATO and national bodies and promoting interaction between them in the standardisation field.

The NCS is chaired by the Secretary General, normally represented by two permanent co-chairmen, namely the Assistant Secretary General for Defence Investment and the Director of the International Military Staff. Since September 2000, NATO's Partner countries have been actively involved in NCS activities.

The **NATO Standardization Staff Group (NSSG)** is subordinate to the NATO Committee for Standardization. Its principal task is to harmonise standardisation policies and procedures and to coordinate standardisation activities with NATO bodies. It is responsible for staff liaison and for the preparation of related documentation, contributing, *inter alia*, to the formulation of Military Standardization Requirements by the Strategic Commands and the drafting of Standardization Objectives for the NATO Standardization Programme. It includes representatives from the Strategic Commands and staff representatives from the International Military Staff and the International Staff supporting the Standardization Tasking Authorities. These are senior NATO bodies with the authority to task their subordinate groups to produce Standardization Agreements (STANAGs) and Allied Publications (APs), namely the Military Committee, the Conference of National Armaments Directors, the Senior NATO Logisticians Conference and the NATO Consultation, Command and Control Board. Staff representatives of other bodies and organisations also participate in the work of the NSSG.

The **NATO Standardization Agency (NSA)** is a single, integrated body set up by the North Atlantic Council and composed of military and civilian staff. It is responsible to the NCS for the coordination of issues between all fields of standardisation. It sets out procedures, planning and execution functions related to standardisation for application throughout the Alliance. It is responsible for the preparation of the work for meetings of the NCS, the NCSREPs and the NSSG and for the overall administration of all STANAGs and APs.

The NSA supports Joint, Maritime, Land, Air and Medical Standardization Boards, each of which acts as a tasking authority for operational standardisation, including doctrine, as delegated by the Military Committee. The Standardization Boards are responsible for the development of operational and procedural standardisation among member countries. Like other tasking authorities, they do this by developing applicable STANAGs and APs with the member countries and NATO military commands. The NSA also supports the Office of NATO Terminology Coordination. Established under the authority of the NCS, this office manages the NATO Terminology Programme and oversees a NATO Policy for Standardization of Terminology which outlines overarching principles and main responsibilities, as well as the process of terminology standardisation within NATO as a whole.

The Director of the NSA is responsible for the day-to-day work of five branches of the agency, namely a Policy and Coordination Branch and the Joint, Naval, Army and Air Branches. The service branches provide staff support to their related boards and their associated working groups and panels and are responsible for monitoring and harmonising standardisation activities in their areas of responsibility.

The boards, with one member per country, are in permanent session and meet formally eight to twelve times a year. Decisions are normally reached on the basis of unanimity. However, as standardisation is a voluntary process, agreements may also be based on majority decisions among the countries participating in any particular STANAG. The Strategic Commanders have a staff representative on each board.

Further information:

NATO Standardization Agency

NATO Headquarters

1110 Brussels

Belgium

Tel: +32 2 707 5576

Fax: +32 2 707 5718

Email: nsa@hq.nato.int

Website: <http://nsa.nato.int>

APPENDIX 1

ABBREVIATIONS

APPENDIX 1

ABBREVIATIONS¹

AAP Allied Administrative Publication	AGARD Advisory Group for Aerospace Research and Development (re-organised under the NATO Research and Technology Organisation (RTO) as the Research & Technology Agency)
AAYP Atlantic Association of Young Political Leaders	
ABM Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM Treaty of 1972)	AGS Alliance Ground Surveillance
AC Alliance Committee	AGS SC AGS Steering Committee
ACCIS Automated Command and Control Information System	AHWG Ad Hoc Working Group
ACCS Air Command and Control System	AJP Allied Joint Publication
ACO Allied Command Operations	ALCM Air-Launched Cruise Missile
ACT Allied Command Transformation	ALP Allied Logistic Publication
ADP Automated Data Processing	ALTBMD SC Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence Steering Committee
ADREP Air Defence Representative	AOR Area of Responsibility
AEC Atlantic Education Committee	AP Allied Publication
AEW&CS Airborne Early Warning and Control System	APAG Atlantic Policy Advisory Group
	AQAP Allied Quality Assurance Publication

¹ This list includes most of the acronyms that appear in the Handbook as well as others in current use. It is not intended as an exhaustive list of all the acronyms in use at NATO.

ARW Advanced Research Workshop (NATO Science Programme)	C3 Consultation, Command and Control
ASG Assistant Secretary General	CALS Continuous Acquisition and Life- cycle Support
ASI Advanced Study Institute (NATO Science Programme)	CAPC Civil Aviation Planning Committee
ASR Alliance Standardization Requirements	CAPS Conventional Armaments Planning System
ASW Anti-Submarine Warfare	CAS Close Air Support
ASZ Air Safety Zone	CASG CNAD Ammunition Safety Group
ATA Atlantic Treaty Association	CBC Civil Budget Committee
ATMG Air Traffic Management Group	CBM Confidence-Building Measure
AWACS Airborne Warning and Control System	CBRN Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (weapons)
BICES Battlefield Information Collection and Exploitation System	CCC Capabilities Coordination Cell
BMEWS Ballistic Missile Early Warning System	CCMS Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society
BoD Board of Directors	CCPC Civil Communications Planning Committee
BTWC Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention	CDE Conference on Confidence- and Security-Building Measures and Disarmament in Europe
C&EE Central and Eastern Europe	CEP Civil Emergency Planning

CEPMA	C-M
Central Europe Pipeline Management Agency	Council Memorandum
CEPMO	CMC
Central Europe Pipeline Management Organisation	Chairman of the Military Committee
CEPS	CMTF
Central Europe Pipeline System	Civil-Military Task Force
CESDP	CMX
Common European Security and Defence Policy	Crisis Management Exercise
CFE	CNAD
Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE Treaty of 1990)	Conference of National Armaments Directors
CFSP	CNIS
Common Foreign and Security Policy	Communication, Navigation and Identification Systems
CHOD	CNS
Chief of Defence	Communications, Navigation and Surveillance Group
CIMIC	COEC
Civil-Military Cooperation	Council Operations and Exercise Committee
CIOMR	COMCEN
Interallied Confederation of Medical Reserve Officers	Communication Centre
CIOR	COMEDS
Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers	Committee of the Chiefs of Military Medical Services in NATO
CIS	CP
Commonwealth of Independent States	Capability Package
CIS	CPC
Communication and Information Systems	Civil Protection Committee
CJTF	CPC
Combined Joint Task Force	Conflict Prevention Centre
CLG	CPD
Collaborative Linkage Grant	Committee on Public Diplomacy
	CPX
	Command Post Exercise

CSBM
Confidence- and Security-Building
Measure

CSCE
Conference on Security and Co-ope-
ration in Europe (from January 1995,
Organization on Security and
Co-operation in Europe, or OSCE)

CST
Conventional Stability Talks

CTBT
Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban
Treaty

C3
Consultation, Command and Control

CUSRPG
Canada–United States Regional
Planning Group

CWC
Chemical Weapons Convention
(1993)

DCA
Dual-Capable Aircraft

DCI
Defence Capabilities Initiative

DCMC
Deputy Chairman of the Military
Committee

DGP
Senior Defence Group on
Proliferation

DI
Defence Investment Division

DIMS
Director, International Military Staff
(IMS)

DPC
Defence Planning Committee

DPP
Defence Policy and Planning
Division

DPQ
Defence Planning Questionnaire

DRC
Defence Review Committee

DRG
Defence Research Group (absor-
bed into the NATO Research and
Technology Organisation (RTO))

DSACEUR
Deputy Supreme Allied Commander
Europe

EADRCC
Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response
Coordination Centre

EADRU
Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit

EAF
Entity Armed Forces

EAPC
Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council

EAPWP
Euro-Atlantic Partnership Work Plan

EM
Executive Management Division

EPC
European Political Cooperation

ESA
European Space Agency

ESDI
European Security and Defence
Identity

ESDP
European Security and Defence
Policy

EU
European Union

EW
Electronic Warfare

EWG
Executive Working Group

FORACS
NATO Naval Forces Sensors and
Weapons Accuracy Check Sites

FRP
Financial Rules and Procedures

GLCM
Ground-Launched Cruise Missile

GNW
Group on Nuclear Weapons

GSZ
Ground Safety Zone

HLG
High-Level Group

HLSG
High-Level Steering Group

HLTF
High-Level Task Force

HNS
Host Nation Support

IATA
International Air Transport
Association

ICAO
International Civil Aviation
Organisation

ICB
International Competitive Bidding

ICBM
Intercontinental Ballistic Missile

ICIG
Istanbul Cooperation Initiative Group

ICRC
International Committee of the Red
Cross

ICTY
International Criminal Tribunal for the
former Yugoslavia

IFOR
Implementation Force

IFRC
International Federation of the Red
Cross and Red Crescent Societies

IGC
Intergovernmental Conference

IISS
International Institute for Strategic
Studies

IMS
International Military Staff

INF
Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces
(INF Treaty of 1987)

INFOSEC
Information Security Branch

IO
Interoperability Objective

IPAP
Individual Partnership Action Plan

IPP
Individual Partnership Programme
(PfP)

IPTF
International Police Task Force
(United Nations)

IRBM
Intermediate-Range Ballistic Missile

IRF
Immediate Reaction Force(s)

IS
International Staff

ISAF
International Security Assistance
Force

ISTB
Information Systems and Technology
Branch

JCP
Joint Committee on Proliferation

JMC
Joint Medical Committee

JWGDR
(NATO-Ukraine) Joint Working Group
on Defence Reform

KFOR
Kosovo Force

KLA
Kosovo Liberation Army

KPS
Kosovo Police Service

KVM
Kosovo Verification Mission

LCC
Logistics Coordination Centre

LCMG
Life Cycle Management Group

LTDP
Long-Term Defence Programme

LTS
Long-Term Study

M&TG
Movement and Transportation Group

MAP
Membership Action Plan

MAPE
Multinational Advisory Police
Element

MARAIMED
Maritime Air Forces Mediterranean

MAREQ
Military Assistance Requirement

MBC
Military Budget Committee

MC
Military Committee

MCDA
Military and Civil Defence Assets

MCG
Mediterranean Cooperation Group

MCJSB
Military Committee Joint
Standardization Board

MCM
Mine Countermeasures

MCWG
Military Committee Working Group

MDF
Main Defence Force(s)

MDFS	MSU
Missile Defence Feasibility Study	Multinational Specialized Unit
MEADS	MTCR
Medium Extended Air Defence System	Missile Technology Control Regime
MEP	MTRP
Member of the European Parliament	Medium-Term Resource Plan
MILREP	NAADC
Military Representative (to the MC)	NATO Analytical Air Defence Cell
MLM	NAAG
Military Liaison Mission	NATO Army Armaments Group
MLRS	NAC
Multiple Launch Rocket System	North Atlantic Council
MNC	NACC
Major NATO Command/Commander (renamed NATO Strategic Command/Commander)	North Atlantic Cooperation Council
MND	NACCIS
Multinational Division	NATO Automated Command, Control and Information System
MOB	NACMA
Main Operating Base	NATO ACCS Management Agency
MoD	NACMO
Ministry of Defence	NATO ACCS Management Organisation
MOU	NADC
Memorandum of Understanding	NATO Air Defence Committee
MPA	NADEFCOL
Maritime Patrol Aircraft	NATO Defense College (also NDC)
MRCA	NADGE
Multi-Role Combat Aircraft (Tornado)	NATO Air Defence Ground Environment
MSC	NADREPS
Major Subordinate Command/Commander	National Armaments Director's Representatives
MSIAC	NAEW&C
Munitions Safety Information Analysis Centre	NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control

NAFAG
NATO Air Force Armaments Group

NAHEMA
NATO Helicopter Design and
Development, Production and
Logistics Management Agency

NAMEADSMA
NATO Medium Extended Air Defence
System Design and Development,
Production and Logistics
Management Agency

NAMFI
NATO Missile Firing Installation

NAMMA
NATO Multi-Role Combat Aircraft
Development and Production
Management Agency

NAMMO
NATO Multi-Role Combat Aircraft
Development and Production
Management Organisation

NAMP
NATO Annual Manpower Plan

NAMSA
NATO Maintenance and Supply
Agency

NAMSO
NATO Maintenance and Supply
Organisation

NAPMA
NATO Airborne Early Warning and
Control (AEW&C) Programme
Management Agency

NAPMO
NATO Airborne Early Warning and
Control Programme Management
Organisation

NAPR
NATO Armaments Planning Review

NATINADS
NATO Integrated Air Defence
System

NATMC
NATO Air Traffic Management
Committee

NATO
North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NATO PA
NATO Parliamentary Assembly (also
NPA)

NAU
NATO Accounting Unit

NBC
Nuclear, Biological and Chemical
(weapons)

NC3A
NATO Consultation, Command and
Control Agency

NC3B
NATO Consultation, Command and
Control Board

NC3O
NATO Consultation, Command and
Control Organisation

NC3REPs
Group of National C3
Representatives

NCARC
NATO Conventional Armaments
Review Committee

NCISS
NATO Communications and
Information Systems School

NCS	NGO
NATO Committee for Standardization	Non-Governmental Organisation
NCSA	NHMO
NATO CIS Services Agency	NATO HAWK Management Office
NCSREPs	NHPLO
NCS Representatives	NATO HAWK Production and Logistics Organisation
NDC	NHQC3S
NATO Defense College (also NADEFKO)	NATO Headquarters Consultation, Command and Control Staff
NDMAA	NIAG
NATO Defence Manpower Audit Authority	NATO Industrial Advisory Group
NDMP	NICS
NATO Defence Manpower Plan	NATO Integrated Communications System
NEASCOG	NIDS
NATO/EUROCONTROL ATM Security Coordinating Group	NATO Integrated Data Service
NEFMA	NIG
NATO European Fighter Aircraft (EFA) Development, Production and Logistics Management Agency	Networking Infrastructure Grant (NATO Science Programme)
NEFMO	NIMIC
NATO European Fighter Aircraft (EFA) Development, Production and Logistics Management Organisation	NATO Insensitive Munitions Information Centre
NEPS	NMA
North European Pipeline System	NATO Military Authority
NETMA	NMR
NATO Eurofighter 2000 and Tornado Development, Production and Logistics Management Agency	National Military Representative (to SHAPE)
NETMO	NNAG
NATO Eurofighter 2000 and Tornado Development, Production and Logistics Management Organisation	NATO Naval Armaments Group
NFR	NORAD
NATO Financial Regulations	North American Air Defence System
	NOS
	NATO Office of Security

NPA	NSSG
North Parliamentary Assembly (also NATO PA)	NATO Standardization Staff Group
NPC	NTG
NATO Pipeline Committee	NATO Training Group
NPG	NUC
Nuclear Planning Group	NATO-Ukraine Commission
NPLO	OCC
NATO Production and Logistics Organisation	Operational Capabilities Concept
NPS	ODIHR
NATO Pipeline System	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights
NPSC	OECD
NATO Project Steering Committee	Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development
NPT	OHR
Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (1968)	Office of the High Representative (Bosnia)
NRC	OMIK
NATO-Russia Council	OSCE Mission in Kosovo
NRF	ONS
NATO Response Force	Office of NATO Standardization
NSA	OPEC
NATO Standardization Agency	Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries
NSC	OPLAN
NATO Security Committee	Operational Plan
NSC	OPS
NATO Supply Centre	Operations Division
NSIP	OSCE
NATO Security Investment Programme	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (formerly CSCE)
NSLB	PAD
NATO Standardization Liaison Board	Panel on Air Defence
NSN	PARP
NATO Stock Number	(PfP) Planning and Review Process
NSO	
NATO Standardization Organisation	

PASP Political Affairs and Security Policy Division	PNET Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty (1976)
PBEIST Planning Board for European Inland Surface Transport	PO Private Office of the Secretary General
PBOS Planning Board for Ocean Shipping	PPCG Provisional Policy Coordination Group
PC Political Committee	PRT Provincial Reconstruction Team
PCC Partnership Coordination Cell	PSC Principal Subordinate Command/ Commander
PCG Policy Coordination Group	PSE PfP Staff Element
PDD Public Diplomacy Division	PSI Proliferation Security Initiative (United States)
PERM REP Permanent Representative (to the NAC)	PSO Peace Support Operations
PfP Partnership for Peace	PST Advisory Panel on Physical and Engineering Sciences and Technology
PfP/SC Political-Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace	PTBT Partial Test Ban Treaty
PIA Public Information Adviser	PWP Partnership Work Programme (PfP)
PIC Peace Implementation Council	R&D Research and Development
PMF Political-Military Framework	R&T Research and Technology
PMSC/AHG Political-Military Steering Committee/ Ad Hoc Group on Cooperation in Peacekeeping	REA Rapid Environmental Assessment

REACT
Rapid Expert Assistance and
Cooperation Team

RPC
Regional Planning Committee

RPC WT
Regional Planning Committee
Working Team

RRF
Rapid Reaction Force

RTA
Research and Technology Agency

RTB
Research and Technology Board

RTO
Research and Technology
Organisation

SAC
Strategic Air Command

SACEUR
Supreme Allied Commander Europe

SACT
Supreme Allied Commander
Transformation

SALT
Strategic Arms Limitation Talks

SALW
Small Arms and Light Weapons

SAM
Sanctions Assistance Missions

SAM
Surface-to-Air Missile

SAR
Search and Rescue

SATCOM
Satellite Communications

SC
Science Committee

SC
Strategic Commander

SCEPC
Senior Civil Emergency Planning
Committee

SCG
Special Consultative Group

SCMM
Standing Committee on Military
Matters (Bosnian Peace Agreement)

SCP
Security Cooperation Programme

SCR
Senior Civilian Representative

SDI
Strategic Defence Initiative

SEECAP
South East Europe Common
Assessment Paper on Regional
Security Challenges and
Opportunities

SEEGROUP
South East Europe Security
Cooperation Steering Group

SEEI
South East Europe Initiative

SFOR
Stabilisation Force

SG
Secretary General

SGP
Senior Politico-Military Group on
Proliferation

SG PLE Standing Group of Partner Logistic Experts	STANAG Standardization Agreement
SHAPE Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe	START Strategic Arms Reduction Talks
SHARE Stock Holding and Asset Requirements Exchange	TDA Tactical Decision Aid
SITCEN Situation Centre	TEEP Training and Education Enhancement Programme
SLBM Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missile	TMD Theatre Missile Defence
SLCM Sea-Launched Cruise Missile	UN United Nations
SLWPG Senior-Level Weapons Protection Group	UNAMA United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan
SNF Short-Range Nuclear Force(s)	UNESCO United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
SNLC Senior NATO Logisticians Conference	UNHCR United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
SO Standardization Objective	UNMAC United Nations Mine Action Centre
SOFA Status of Forces Agreement	UNMIK United Nations Mission in Kosovo
SPC Senior Political Committee	UNOCHA United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
SPC(R) Senior Political Committee (Reinforced)	UNPROFOR United Nations Protection Force
SRB Senior Resource Board	UNSC United Nations Security Council
	VCC Verification Coordinating Committee

VERITY
NATO Verification database

WCO
Western Consultation Office

WEAG
Western European Armaments
Group

WEU
Western European Union

WG
Working Group

WHO
World Health Organization

WMD
Weapons of Mass Destruction

WMDC
Weapons of Mass Destruction
Centre

WP
Working Party

YATA
Youth Atlantic Treaty Association

APPENDIX 2

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

APPENDIX 2

THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY

Washington D.C., 4 April 1949

The Parties to this Treaty reaffirm their faith in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and their desire to live in peace with all peoples and all governments.

They are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.

They seek to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area.

They are resolved to unite their efforts for collective defense and for the preservation of peace and security. They therefore agree to this North Atlantic Treaty:

ARTICLE 1

The Parties undertake, as set forth in the Charter of the United Nations, to settle any international disputes in which they may be involved by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace and security, and justice, are not endangered, and to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations.

ARTICLE 2

The Parties will contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being. They will seek to eliminate conflict in their international economic policies and will encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

ARTICLE 3

In order more effectively to achieve the objectives of this Treaty, the Parties, separately and jointly, by means of continuous and effective self-help and mutual aid, will maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack.

ARTICLE 4

The Parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the Parties is threatened.

ARTICLE 5

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all; and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security .

ARTICLE 6¹

For the purpose of Article 5 an armed attack on one or more of the Parties is deemed to include an armed attack on the territory of any of the Parties in Europe or North America, on the Algerian departments of France², on the occupation forces of any Party in Europe, on the islands under the jurisdiction of any Party in the North Atlantic area north of the Tropic of Cancer or on the vessels or aircraft in this area of any of the Parties.

ARTICLE 7

This Treaty does not affect, and shall not be interpreted as affecting, in any way the rights and obligations under the Charter of the Parties which are members of the United Nations, or the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ARTICLE 8

Each Party declares that none of the international engagements now in force between it and any other of the Parties or any third state is in conflict with the provisions of this Treaty, and undertakes not to enter into any international engagement in conflict with this Treaty.

ARTICLE 9

The Parties hereby establish a council, on which each of them shall be represented, to consider matters concerning the implementation of this Treaty. The council shall be so organized as to be able to meet promptly at any time.

1 Article 6 has been modified by Article 2 of the Protocol to the North Atlantic Treaty on the Accession of Greece and Turkey.

2 On January 16, 1963, the North Atlantic Council modified this Treaty in its decision C-R(63)2, point V, on the independence of the Algerian departments of France.

The council shall set up such subsidiary bodies as may be necessary; in particular it shall establish immediately a defense committee which shall recommend measures for the implementation of Articles 3 and 5.

ARTICLE 10

The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. Any state so invited may become a party to the Treaty by depositing its instrument of accession with the Government of the United States of America. The Government of the United States of America will inform each of the Parties of the deposit of each such instrument of accession.

ARTICLE 11

This Treaty shall be ratified and its provisions carried out by the Parties in accordance with their respective constitutional processes. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited as soon as possible with the Government of the United States of America, which will notify all the other signatories of each deposit. The Treaty shall enter into force between the states which have ratified it as soon as the ratifications of the majority of the signatories, including the ratifications of Belgium, Canada, France, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and the United States, have been deposited and shall come into effect with respect to other states on the date of the deposit of their ratifications.

ARTICLE 12

After the Treaty has been in force for ten years, or at any time thereafter, the Parties shall, if any of them so requests, consult together for the purpose of reviewing the Treaty, having regard for the factors then affecting peace and security in the North Atlantic area, including the development of universal as well as regional arrangements under the Charter of the United Nations for the maintenance of international peace and security.

ARTICLE 13

After the Treaty has been in force for twenty years, any Party may cease to be a Party one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United States of America, which will inform the Governments of the other Parties of the deposit of each notice of denunciation.

ARTICLE 14

This Treaty, of which the English and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited in the archives of the Government of the United States of America. Duly certified copies thereof will be transmitted by that Government to the Governments of the other signatories.

APPENDIX 3

INDEX

A

Abbreviations and acronyms table,	355–368		
Accession protocols			
NATO enlargement and, for new members,	183–187 17, 21		
Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence (ALTBMD)			
air defence component, establishment of,	275–277 180		
Ad Hoc Steering Group on Weapons of Mass Destruction,	327		
Ad Hoc Working Groups (AHWG)			
Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention,	292		
on Global Humanitarian Mine Action,	295–296		
NATO-Russia Council,	68–69		
Regional Cooperation in South-East Europe,	237–239		
on Small Arms and Light Weapons and Mine Action,	206, 294, 296		
Advanced Study Institutes/ Research Workshops, NATO Programme for Security through Science programmes,	340–343		
Afghanistan			
crisis management operations in,	44		
International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in,	23, 155–158, 167, 169–172, 203–204, 214, 223–224, 255–258		
Military Committee role in,	86, 97		
multinational logistics support in,	321–322		
NATO initiatives in,	143		
NATO peace-support operations in,	155–158		
Partner countries' involvement in,	199, 203–204, 206		
policy and planning consultations with,	41		
Russian cooperation on initiatives in,	210–214		
Soviet invasion of,	184		
UN-NATO cooperation in,	255–258		
Afghan National Army,	155–158		
Afghan National Police,	155–158		
Afghan Transitional Authority,	155–158		
African Union			
Darfur crisis and,	163		
Sudan crisis, NATO assistance to,	24, 44		
UN-NATO cooperation with,	255–258		
African Union Air Movement Cell,	163		
Airborne Early Warning and Control Systems (AWACS). See also NATO Airborne			
Early Warning and Control Programme Management Agency (NAPMA)			
air defence activities of,	275–277		
anti-terrorism operations of,	168, 172–174		
budget and financial management for,	59		
common-funded resources for,	57		
operations of,	24–25, 279–281		
structure and operations,	96–97		
Air Command and Control System (ACCS),	275–277		
Air defence			
assets and capabilities development,	80–81		
NATO operations for,	275–277		
Airlift operations, in Darfur,	163		
Air space and traffic management, NATO programme for,	283–284		
Airspace management, assets and capabilities management,	80–81		
Air strikes			
in Kosovo,	149–152, 210, 214, 216		
Sarajevo, Alliance support for,	143–147		
Albania			
antipersonnel mines in,	202, 294		
Kosovo refugees in,	149–152		
in Membership Action Plan, Membership Action Plan participation,	183 189–190		
NATO membership preparation,	196		
relief operations in,	298		
Albanians			
in Kosovo,	149–152		
in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*,	153–154		
violence against Serbs and KFOR by,	149–152		
Alliance ground surveillance (AGS) capability,	175		
Alliance Policy Framework on Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction,	295		
Allied Command Operations (ACO),	89–93, 95, 98		
crisis management activities,	48		
defence planning and,	54		
formation of,	21		
ISAF in Afghanistan, responsibility for,	155–158		
NATO Response Force and,	178		
Allied Command Transformation (ACT),	54, 89–98		
armaments cooperation and planning programme,	285–288		
education and training programmes,	307–308, 312–316		
formation of,	21		

Civil Emergency Action Plan for the Improvement of Civil Preparedness against Possible Attacks against Civilian Populations with Chemical, Biological and Radiological Agents,	168, 173–174	Command Post Exercise, Russian-NATO cooperation on,	213
Civil emergency planning		Committee of the Chiefs of Military Medical Services (COMEDS)	
anti-terrorism initiatives and,	168, 173–174	logistics programmes,	325–326
crisis management programmes for,	43, 47–50	Senior NATO Logisticians' Conference and,	322
EAPC initiatives for,	197–198, 206–207	Committee on Public Diplomacy (CPD)	
International Staff duties regarding,	79–80	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 131
NATO programmes for,	297–302	public diplomacy communications and information programmes,	333–334, 336–337
Russian-NATO cooperation on,	211, 213–214, 216–217	Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS)	
Ukrainian-NATO cooperation on,	220, 227–228	Clearing House System,	344
UN-NATO cooperation on,	255–258	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 128
Civil Emergency Planning Action Plan,	25, 206–207	NATO Programme for Security through Science and,	343
Civil Emergency Planning and Disaster Preparedness, Ukrainian-NATO cooperation on,	227–228	security, science and environmental initiatives of,	208, 343–344
Civilian aircraft, terrorist activities involving,	214	Committee on Women in the NATO Forces (CWINF), International Military Staff involvement in,	105–106
Civilian organisation and structures (NATO)		Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP), EU-NATO cooperation on,	245–246, 249
overview,	73–75	Common funding principle, in NATO budget and financial management,	57–64
reform of,	21	Common Item Materiel Management (COMMIT),	323
Civil-military cooperation, NATO initiatives for,	97, 300	Common Platform, OSCE-NATO cooperation on,	259–262
Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) Group North,	97	Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS)	
Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) Group South,	97	formation of,	209
Civil/Military Coordination (CIMIC) projects,	300	Ukrainian membership in,	219
Civil protection, anti-terrorist initiatives for,	168, 174	Communications and information systems. See also Press and media activities	
Civil Science Programme (NATO),	339–343	budget and financial management of,	57
Clearing House System (CCMS),	344	International Staff duties regarding,	79–81, 84
Cold War era, NATO-EU cooperation during,	244	NATO programmes for,	303–306
Collaborative grants and linkage grants, NATO Programme for Security through Science programmes,	339–343	public diplomacy communications and information programmes,	333–337
Collective defence, crisis management operations as,	43–44, 49	Component Commands, operational structure,	94
Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTFs)		Comprehensive Political Guidance, defence planning and,	53
operational structure,	94	Computer networking, NATO Programme for Security through Science,	341–343
Western European Union and,	245	Concept of Operations, NATO assistance in Iraq and,	159–161
Command arrangements, evolution of,	175, 177	Conference of Commandants,	309

Conference of National Armaments Directors (CNAD)		Cooperative logistics, NATO programmes for,	321
anti-terrorist measures endorsed by,	172	Council of Europe	
defence assets and capabilities development,	80	involvement in NATO decision-making,	40–41
logistics programmes,	319, 323	NATO relations with,	263–265
members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 124	Council Operations and Exercises Committee (COEC),	49
organisation and policies,	285–288	International Staff duties regarding members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 132
Research and Technology Organisation and,	347–348	Counter-Terrorism Technology Unit, defence assets and capabilities development,	80–81
scientific research collaboration activities and,	107–110	Country Chapters, defence planning and,	55–56
Ukrainian-NATO cooperation and,	227–228	Crisis management	
Conference on Disarmament (1997),	290, 292	common funding for,	58
Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)		EU-NATO cooperation on,	243, 245–251
arms control negotiations in,	184	International Staff duties regarding,	77–84
crisis management responsibilities of,	43	NATO initiatives for,	43–50
peacekeeping activities of,	143–147	response operations, classification of,	44–45, 48–49
Confidence and Security Building Measures (CSBMs), Vienna Document and,	289, 293	UN-NATO cooperation on,	255–258
Consensus decision-making in NATO,	33, 40–41	Crisis Management Exercise (CME/CMX 03), EU-NATO cooperation on,	251
Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies,	309	Crisis Management Organisation, International Military Staff implementation of,	101
Consultation, Command, and Control (C3) organisations,	285–288, 303–306	Croatia	
Consultative Forum on Security Issues in South East Europe,	237–239	accession to NATO,	183
Consultative process, in NATO decision-making,	37–41	Membership Action Plan participation,	189–190
“Contact countries”		Cyber defence, NATO initiatives on,	168, 173
enlargement of partnership with,	26–27	Cyber Defence Programme, protective security for,	84
policy and decision-making consultation with,	41	Czechoslovakia	
Conventional arms control and disarmament, NATO programmes for,	289–296	origins of North Atlantic Alliance and political reforms in,	17, 183–184, 187
Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE)		Czech Republic	
arms control and disarmament programmes,	289–296	accession to NATO,	17, 183
reduction of,	184	Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defence Battalion and,	179
Russia-NATO cooperation on Treaty on,	216	ISAF in Afghanistan, assistance to,	155–158, 170
Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) Treaty,	289, 292	Membership Action Plan and,	189–190
Convention on Prohibitions of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction,	294–295		
Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons,	294		
		D	
		Darfur, Sudan	
		NATO mission in,	143–147, 163
		UN-NATO cooperation on,	255–258
		Dayton Peace Accord (DPA)	
		crisis management provisions in,	44

NATO role in,	143–147	Deputy Supreme Allied Europe Commander (DSACEUR)	
OSCE cooperation on,	259–262	EUFOR operations in Bosnia/ Herzegovina and,	143–147
Russian support for,	209	EU-NATO cooperation on,	249–250
UN cooperation on,	255–258	Dialogue activities, key institutions for,	136
Dean of Council (NAC), powers and duties,	34	Director of the International Military Staff (DIMS), duties and qualifications of,	101–102
Decision-making consensus-based, in NATO,	33–41	Disaster relief operations crisis management aspects,	44–47, 49–50
consultation with partner countries, in crisis management,	40–41	Partner countries' role in,	197, 206–207
on financial management,	61–64	Russian-NATO cooperation on,	216
Defence and Security Economics Directorate,	67–69	Distinctive Partnership between NATO and the Ukraine,	219–221
Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI), Prague Capabilities Commitment as successor to,	175–176		
Defence Manpower Committee,	60–61		
Defence planning crisis management and,	43, 46		
International Staff duties regarding,	77–84		
NATO initiatives for,	51–56		
in Ukraine,	224		
Defence Planning Committee (DPC)			
budget and financial management activities of,	60		
duties of,	51–56		
International Military Staff intelligence reports to,	73–75, 104–105		
Military Committee and,	85–89, 91		
policy and decision-making by,	33, 36		
principal committees and policy bodies hierarchy,	111–114		
Secretary General's duties on,	73–75		
Defence Planning Questionnaire (DPQ),	55–56		
Defence reform Euro-Atlantic Partnership initiatives for,	193–208		
Russian participation in,	211–213, 215		
Defence Review Committee (DRC)			
members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 123		
policy and decision-making procedures and,	35		
review of defence planning by,	53–56		
Denmark NATO military dispositions, participation in,	39		
Operation Active Endeavour participation of,	169		
origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	17		
Deployed Integrated Task Force Headquarters, Darfur airlift and,	163		
Deputy Chairman of the Military Committee (DCMC), duties of,	87		
Deputy Secretary General, International Staff duties of,	73–75, 77		
		E	
		Eagle Assist operation,	167–168
		E-3A NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control (NAEW&C) aircraft,	279–281
		Earthquake disaster management civil emergency planning programmes,	297
		crisis management aspects,	45–47
		Eastern Europe, political changes in,	183–187
		Economic Committee (EC), members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 131
		Economic policies of NATO, in Ukraine,	67–69 226
		Economic sanctions (UN), in Bosnia/Herzegovina, Alliance support for,	143–147
		Education and training, NATO programmes for,	307–316
		Elections, in Afghanistan, ISAF role in,	155–158
		Electronic information systems, public diplomacy communications and information programmes,	335–337
		Electronic warfare, NATO programme for,	317
		Embargo (UN) in Bosnia/ Herzegovina, Alliance support for,	143–147
		Energy issues, in Mediterranean and Middle East,	231–235
		Enlargement process at NATO,	183–187

Environmental issues			
EAPC initiatives in,	207–208		
NATO public diplomacy programmes,	339–345		
Russia-NATO cooperation on,	217		
Ukrainian-NATO cooperation on,	220, 228		
Environment and Security Initiative (ENVSEC),	343		
Estonia, accession to NATO,	17, 183–187		
EU Battle Groups,	251		
EU Defence Agency,	251		
EUFOR, establishment of,	143–147		
EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy,	249–250		
Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Co-ordination Centre (EADRCC)			
anti-terrorist initiatives of,	173		
civil emergency planning programmes,	297–298, 302		
crisis management activities of,	47, 50		
establishment of,	207		
International Staff duties regarding,	80		
Kosovo conflict and,	149–152		
Mediterranean Dialogue and,	233–234		
Russia's role in,	216–217		
UN-NATO cooperation on,	255–258		
Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit (EADRU),	47, 298		
Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC)			
Ad Hoc Working Group on Global Humanitarian Mine Action,	295–296		
Ad Hoc Working Group on Small Arms and Light Weapons and Mine Action,	206, 294, 296		
anti-terrorism initiatives of,	171, 193		
arms control and disarmament programmes,	289–296		
Bosnia/Herzegovina participation in,	143–147		
civil emergency planning programmes,	297		
Committee on Public Diplomacy and,	336–337		
cooperation, partnership, and dialogue activities,	111–113, 134, 136		
crisis management partnership with NATO,	45		
disaster relief operations,	197, 206–207		
evolution of,	193–208		
International Military Staff duties concerning,	103		
Military Committee duties regarding,	86–87		
NATO economic initiatives with,	67–69		
NATO Parliamentary Assembly and,	270		
NATO Programme for Security through Science,	342–343		
Partnership for Peace and,	193–208		
policy and decision-making, participation by,	40–41		
replacement of NACC by,	185		
Russian participation in,	209		
scientific and environmental programmes and,	342–345		
Secretary General as chair of,	73–75		
Security Forum of,	196–197		
small arms and light weapons, initiatives concerning,	289–296		
South-East Europe initiatives,	237–239		
Ukrainian participation in,	219		
weapons of mass destruction workshops of,	197, 205–206		
Euro-Atlantic Partnership (EAP)			
defence reform proposals of,	198–208		
formation of,	193–208		
Euro-Atlantic Partnership Work Plan,	49		
EUROCONTROL, NATO cooperation with,	174		
Eurocorps, ISAF in Afghanistan, responsibility for,	155–158		
European Aeronautic Defence and Space Company (EADS),	179		
European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP),	176		
EU-NATO cooperation on,	251		
European Commission, air space and traffic management programmes,	283–284		
European Council, EU-NATO cooperation initiatives,	247		
European Organisation for the Safety of Air Navigation (EUROCONTROL),	283–284		
European Science Foundation,	343		
European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI)			
Assembly of the Western European Union (WEU) and,	263–265		
defence planning initiatives and,	52		
development of,	28		
WEU-NATO cooperation on,	243–245		
European Security and Defence Policy			
Assembly of the WEU and,	263–265		
EU-NATO cooperation on,	243–247		
European Union (EU)			
anti-terrorism initiatives of,	171, 174		
civil emergency planning, NATO cooperation with,	173		
civil emergency planning programmes of,	298		
crisis management partnership with NATO,	45, 49		
Darfur peacekeeping mission with NATO,	163		
defence planning cooperation with,	52, 54		
EAPC and,	204, 207		
European Capability Action Plan initiation of,	176		

ISAF in Afghanistan, support for,	155–158
Kosovo conflict and role of,	149–152
Military Committee and,	86, 88, 94
Military Oceanography Group (NATO) and,	331–332
NATO partnership with,	28, 243–251
NATO security partnership with,	20–21
NATO Strategic Partnership with,	78, 243–251
OSCE and,	259–262
peacekeeping operations in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*,	143–147
policy and decision-making consultation with,	40
role in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* of,	153–154
security operations in Bosnia/Herzegovina,	143–147
Executive Working Group (EWG)	
policy and decision-making procedures and,	35
principal committees and policy bodies hierarchy,	111–113
Expert Group on Civil Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Relief,	299
Expert Visits, NATO Programme for Security through Science programmes,	339–343
Explosive Ordnance Disposal Units, in Bosnia/Herzegovina,	143–147

F

Federal Republic of Germany	
origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	17
<i>Ostpolitik</i> adopted by,	183
Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, Kosovo conflict and. See also Serbia and Montenegro	149–152
KFOR attacked by,	149–152
Financial Controller	
budget and financial management activities of,	63
duties of,	83
for International Military Staff,	102
Financial management	
common-funded resources,	57–58
structure and duties involving,	61–64
Financial Regulations, establishment of,	62
Fire disaster management, NATO crisis management initiatives,	47
Flag Officers' Courses,	309
Flood disaster management	

civil emergency planning programmes,	297
NATO involvement in,	47
Force Goals (NATO), defence planning and,	54–55
Force Review Conference, on Iraq,	159–161
Forest fires, civil emergency planning programmes for,	297
Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation, and Security (1997),	209–211, 270
Framework Agreement, NATO–Russia,	215
Framework Document for Partnership for Peace,	198
France	
exemption from Defence Planning Committee,	36
ISAF in Afghanistan, responsibility for,	155–158
NATO nuclear policy and,	65–66
withdrawal from Alliance military structure,	39
Fréchette, Louise (UN Deputy Secretary General),	258

G

Galileo Avionica,	179
General Dynamics Canada,	179
General Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. See Dayton Peace Accord	
General Report, for defence planning,	56
Geneva Centre for Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF),	271
Geneva Protocol (1925), Biological and Chemical Weapons,	292
Georgia (Republic of)	
antipersonnel mines in,	202
Istanbul Commitments in,	293–294
in Partnership for Peace,	193, 200
Russian treaty issues in,	211, 216
German Democratic Republic	
origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	17
political reforms in,	183–184, 187
Germany. See also Federal Republic of Germany; German Democratic Republic	
ISAF in Afghanistan, leadership of,	155–158, 170

peacekeeping operation in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", leadership of,	153–154	civil emergency planning initiatives of,	217
Operation Active Endeavour participation of,	169	Membership Action Plan and,	189–190
unification of,	183–184, 187	political reforms in,	184
<i>Glasnost</i> policy, Soviet adoption of,	183–184	Hurricane Katrina, NATO Response Force assistance in,	178
Gorbachev, Mikhail,	184	Hussein, Saddam,	159
Greece			
civil emergency planning in,	297–298		
origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	17		
Group of National C3 Representatives (NC3REPS),	303–306		
Group of National Directors on Codification,	323		
Gulf Cooperation Council,	28, 234–235		
H		I	
Harmel Doctrine,	183	Iceland	
"Headline Goal", the European Council,	247	civilian representation in military forums for,	39
Helsinki Final Act (1975),	183	origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	17
Partnership for Peace obligations based on,	198	Implementation Force (IFOR)	
High Level Group (HLG)		crisis management by,	44
members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 130	establishment of,	143–147
policy and decision-making with NPG,	37	NATO airborne early warning system support,	279–281
High Level Task Force on Conventional Arms Control (HLTF)		OSCE cooperation with,	260–262
CFE Treaty provisions and,	293, 296	Partner countries support for,	204
principal committees and policy bodies hierarchy,	111–113, 116	SFOR as replacement for,	143–147
Holbrooke, Richard (Ambassador),	149–152	UN cooperation with,	255–258
Host Nation Support		Improved United Kingdom Air Defence Ground Environment (IUKADGE),	275–277
NATO Security Investment Programme,	62–63	Individual Partnership Action Plans (IPAPs)	
Russia-NATO MOU,	216	economic dimensions of,	67–68
Ukraine-NATO MOU,	226–227	launching of,	200
Human Factors and Medicine Panel,	326	Individual Partnership Programmes	
Humanitarian crises		components of,	193–208
civil emergency planning programmes for,	297–302	crisis management activities,	49–50
Kosovo conflict and,	149–152	in Ukraine,	225
Human resources at NATO, International Staff duties regarding,	82–83	Indra Corporation,	179
Hungary		Infrastructure Committee	
accession to NATO,	17, 183, 186	capability packages and,	60–61
assistance to Ukraine by,	225	International Staff duties regarding,	81
		members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 125
		NSIP budget and financial management by,	60, 62–63
		policy and decision-making procedures and,	36
		Intelligence activities	
		International Military Staff involvement in,	104–106
		International Staff duties regarding,	79, 84
		Intensified Dialogue on Ukraine,	27, 221–222, 226–227
		"Intensified dialogues" on aspirations to NATO membership	186

Interallied Confederation of Medical Reserve Officers (CIOMR), structure and operations,	99	International Staff cooperation with, key functions of,	77 101–106
Interallied Confederation of Reserve Officers (CIOR), structure and operations,	98–99	Logistics, Armaments and Resources Division,	326
Interim Iraqi Government, establishment of,	159–161	military operational structure and transformation,	85, 87, 95, 97–98
Intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF), NATO deployment of,	183–184	North Atlantic Council duties,	73–75
International Air Transport Association (IATA)		policy and decision-making participation by,	37
air space and traffic management programmes,	283–284	public diplomacy communications and information programmes,	333–335
NATO cooperation with,	174	Research and Technology Organisation and,	348
International Association for the Promotion of Cooperation with Scientists from New Independent States of the Former Soviet Union (INTAS),	343	Standardization activities of,	350–351
International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)		International Organisation for Migration, NATO relations with,	263–265
civil emergency planning programmes of,	298	International organisations, NATO cooperation with,	263–265
International Staff duties regarding,	80	International Police Task Force (IPTF)	
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and,	291	IFOR cooperation with,	143–147
Partnership for Peace cooperation with,	207–208	UN participation in,	255–258
International Board of Auditors,	83	International Research Seminars,	309
financial control duties of,	64	International Secretariat	
International Civil Aviation Organisation		of NATO Parliamentary Assembly,	270
air space and traffic management programmes,	283–284	NSIP management and,	63
NATO cooperation with,	174	ISAF (ISAF) (Afghanistan)	
International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)		counterterrorism initiatives of,	167, 169–170
cooperation with NATO,	267–268	establishment of,	155–158
IFOR cooperation with,	143–147	Iraq military initiatives compared with,	159–161
International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY)		NATO management of,	20–23
EU-NATO cooperation on,	250–251	Partner countries' involvement in,	203–204
IFOR cooperation with,	143–147	Russian support for,	214
NATO stabilisation efforts in,	22	Ukrainian participation in,	223–224
Partnership for Peace and cooperation with,	196, 237–239	UN-NATO cooperation in,	255–258
International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, civil emergency planning programmes of,	298	International Staff	
International law, violations of, in Kosovo conflict,	149–152	budget and financial management of,	61
International Military Staff (IMS)		civilian duties of,	73–75
budget and financial activities,	59	Council of Europe activities,	263
delegation and mission duties of,	73–75	Defence Investment Division,	348
		International Military Staff liaison with,	101–102, 105–106
		key functions of,	77–84
		military operational structure and transformation,	95
		policy and decision-making procedures and,	38
		Political Affairs and Security Policy Division,	67–69
		public diplomacy communications and information programmes,	335–337
		Secretary General as executive officer for,	73–75
		Iraq	
		Military Committee role in,	86, 97
		multinational logistics support in,	321–322
		NATO role in,	159–161
		NATO Training Mission for,	23–24, 44

Iraqi Training, Education and Doctrine Centre,	159–161	Joint Command Centre (Heidelberg, Germany), ISAF in Afghanistan, responsibility for,	155–158
Israeli-Palestine conflict, NATO initiatives in,	230	Joint Committee on Proliferation (JCP),	295–296
Istanbul Conference of the State Parties to the CFE Treaty, Final Act, Russian provisions in,	216	principal committees and policy bodies hierarchy,	111–113, 116
Istanbul Cooperation Initiative Group (ICIG)		Joint Final Acceptance Inspection,	63
civil emergency planning programmes,	297	Joint Force Command (JFC) headquarters,	94, 97
cooperation, partnership, and dialogue activities,	28, 111–113, 134, 140	Joint Force Training Centre establishment of,	177
economic dimensions of,	67–69	structure and operations,	96
International Staff duties regarding,	80	Joint funding arrangements, NATO participation in,	58–64
Mediterranean Dialogue and, policy and decision-making, participation by,	234–235	Joint Medical Committee, COMEDS logistics and,	326
security issues in,	40	Joint Warfare Centre (JWC)	
Istanbul Summit (1999)		establishment of,	177
CFE Treaty agreement on adaptation,	293	Iraqi training course at,	159–161
defence planning initiatives of,	52	structure and operations,	95
security initiatives following,	21	Joint Working Group on Armaments, Ukrainian-NATO cooperation and,	220, 227
Istanbul Summit (2004)		Joint Working Group on Defence Reform (JWGDR),	224–225
anti-terrorist measures at,	172, 174	Joint Working Group on Economic Security,	67–68
CFE Treaty reaffirmation,	293	Joint Working Group on Scientific and Environmental Cooperation,	228
defence reforms at,	195, 201	Jones, James (General),	178
EU-NATO cooperation at,	250		
Interim Iraqi Government discussed at,	159–161		
KFOR deliberations at,	149–152		
Mediterranean Dialogue and, military modernisation initiatives,	234–235		
Partnership for Peace discussions at,	200		
"Platform for Cooperative Security" at,	259		
Italy			
in Afghanistan, support operations of,	155–158		
ISAF in Afghanistan, responsibility for,	155–158		
origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	17		

J

Japan		K	
Afghanistan support initiatives from,	155–158	Kabul Multinational Brigade, ISAF command of,	155–158
policy and decision-making consultation with,	41	Karzai, Hamid (President),	158
Joint Advanced Distributed Learning and Simulation Programme,	307, 315	Konaré, Alpha Oumar,	24, 163
Joint Analysis and Lessons Learned Centre		Kosovo	
establishment of,	177	crisis management in,	44, 47
structure and operations,	95–96	Military Committee role in,	86
		NATO air campaign in,	149–152, 210
		NATO peacekeeping operations in,	143–147, 149–152
		refugee crisis in,	298
		Russian peacekeeping operations in,	210, 214, 216
		Ukrainian peacekeeping operations in,	223
		UN operations in,	255–258
		Kosovo Force (KFOR)	
		establishment of,	149–152
		NATO airborne early warning system support,	279–281

OSCE support for,	260–262
Partner countries' participation in,	204
peacekeeping activities of,	149–152
UN cooperation with,	255–258
Kosovo Verification Mission (KVM),	149–152
OSCE cooperation on,	260–262
Kuchma, Leonid,	220
Kursk submarine incident,	210, 215
Kuwait,	234–235

L

Land mines. See also Antipersonnel mines	
EAPC/PIP initiatives concerning,	202, 206
NATO control and reduction programme,	289–296
in Ukraine,	225–226
Latvia	
accession dialogues with NATO,	183, 187
accession to NATO,	17
Legal counsel, for International Military Staff,	102
“Level of ambition” concept, defence planning initiatives and,	53
Lithuania	
accession dialogues with NATO,	183, 187
accession to NATO,	17
Logistics	
International Military Staff operations involving,	102, 104–105, 326
NATO programmes for,	319–327
Russian-NATO cooperation on,	216
specialised organisations and agencies for,	107–110
London Summit (1990),	185
Loya Jirga (Afghan grand council), ISAF support for,	155–158

M

Maastricht Treaty, NATO-EU cooperation and,	245
Madrid Summit (1997), NATO-EU cooperation during,	245
Measures of Cooperation with Serbia and Montenegro,	237–239
policy and decision-making, participation by,	40–41
Secretary General as chair of,	73–75

Mediterranean Dialogue	
air space and traffic management programmes,	283–284
anti-terrorism initiatives in,	167–168
arms control and disarmament programmes,	290
civil emergency planning programmes,	297, 300
crisis management partnership with NATO,	45, 49
development of,	231–235
economic initiatives of,	67–69
education and training programmes, expanded activities of,	307–311, 313, 28
International Military Staff duties concerning,	101, 103, 106
International Staff duties regarding,	79–80, 82–84
Military Committee duties regarding,	86–87, 90, 96
NATO Programme for Security through Science programmes and, NATO Science Committee and,	339–343, 207–208
Operation Active Endeavour participation of,	168–169
policy and decision-making, participation by,	40–41
security partnership with,	20–21
Mediterranean Dialogue Work Programme, International Staff duties regarding,	79–80, 82–84
Mediterranean region	
NATO initiatives in,	231–235
Operation Active Endeavour in,	168–169
OSCE-NATO cooperation in,	259–262
Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS),	285–288
Medium Term Resource Plan,	60
Membership Action Plan (MAP)	
accession protocols and,	183–187
in Albania,	149–152
Balkans stabilisation and,	22
International Staff duties concerning,	78
launching of,	189–190
in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*,	153–154
NATO enlargement process and, overview of,	183–187, 189–190
Memorandum of Agreement, for economic initiatives in Russia,	67–68
Memorandum of Understanding on Civil Emergency Planning and Disaster Preparedness	
NATO-Russia cooperation,	299
NATO-Ukraine cooperation,	299–300
Memorandum of Understanding on Strategic Airlift,	227
Meteorology, NATO programmes for,	329–330
Middle East	

Mediterranean Dialogue concerning, policy and decision-making, participation by,	231–235 40	Military Oceanography (MILOC) Group,	331–332
Military Authorities (NATO), defence planning initiatives and,	54	Military organisation and structures (NATO),	85–99
Military Budget		civil-military cooperation,	97
common funding for,	59	International Military Staff,	101–106
control of,	63	modernisation of,	25–26
financial management of,	61–62	NATO role in,	22, 85–99
“over and above rule” for,	60	reform of,	21
Military Budget Committee (MBC)		Russian-NATO cooperation on,	212
budget and financial activities of,	59, 61	shared roles and responsibilities,	92
capability packages for,	60–61	transformation process and,	86, 89–99
Financial Controller’s responsibilities for,	102, 104	Military Representatives (MILREPS), duties of,	85–86, 95
International Staff duties regarding, members and policy body hierarchies,	81 111–113	Military Staff (European Union),	247–248
policy and decision-making procedures and,	35–36	Military Technical Agreement	
Military Command Structure, organisation and duties of,	85, 88–99	in Afghanistan,	155–158
Military Committee (European Union),	86	in Kosovo conflict,	149–152
establishment of,	247–248	Milosevic, Slobodan,	149–150
Military Committee Meteorological Group (MCMG),	329–330	“Ministerial Guidance” document, defence planning and,	54
Military Committee (NATO)		Missile defence	
Air Defence Study Working Group,	275–277	control and disarmament programmes,	290, 292, 295
budget and financial activities,	59	NATO capabilities for,	175, 179–180
capability packages managed by, COMEDS logistics and,	60 326	Missile Defence Feasibility Study (MDFS),	25–26
crisis management activities,	47–48	Missile Defence Project Group, International Staff duties regarding,	81
defence planning review by,	54–55	Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR),	292
International Military Staff intelligence reports to,	77, 101–106	Moldova	
logistics principles and policies,	320–321	arms reduction in,	202, 293
Mediterranean Dialogue and, military supervisory duties of,	232–233 73–75	Istanbul Commitments in,	293
organisation and structure,	85–87	Partnership for Peace and,	196
policy and decision-making by,	37	Russian treaty issues in,	216
principal committees and policy bodies hierarchy,	111–113, 115	Movement and transportation logistics, NATO programmes for,	322
public diplomacy communications and information programmes,	333	Multinational Division (MND) Central South, in Iraq,	159–160
Research and Technology Organisation and,	347–348	Multinational Force in Iraq, establishment of,	159–161
scientific research collaboration activities of,	107–110	Multinational Joint Logistic Centre,	320
Senior NATO Logisticians’ Conference and,	322	Multinational logistics, NATO programmes for,	321–322
Ukrainian cooperation with,	220, 226–227		
Military Concept for Defence against Terrorism,	167–168, 171		
Military Liaison Mission			
in Russia,	212		
in Ukraine,	222–223		

N

NAC-PSC meetings, EU-NATO cooperation and,	248	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 125
Narcotics trafficking, in Afghanistan,	155–158	NATO Communications and Information Systems School (NCISS),	107–110, 307, 312
National Armaments Directors (NAD), duties of,	285–288	NATO Computer Incident Response Capability Coordination Centre (NCIRC-CC),	84
National delegations (to NATO), organisation and structure,	73–75	NATO Consultation, Command and Control Agency (NC3A) missile defence capabilities discussed at,	175, 180
National Liberation Army (NLA), in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*,	153–154	organisation and activities,	107–110, 303–306
National Reserve Forces Committee (NRF), structure and operations,	98–99	NATO Consultation, Command and Control Board (NC3B) International Military Staff liaison with,	105–106
NATO ACCS Management Organisation (NACMO),	275–277	International Staff duties regarding,	81
NATO Advisory Team, in Albania,	149–152	principal committees and policy bodies hierarchy,	111–113, 119, 303–306
NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Programme Management Agency (NAPMA),	107–110, 279–281	Research and Technology Organisation and,	348
NATO Air Command and Control System Management Agency (NACMA),	107–110	NATO Consultation, Command and Control Organisation (NC3O),	285–288, 303–306
NATO Air Command and Control System Management Organisation (NACMO), Board of Directors,	111–113, 120	NATO Crisis Response System (NCRS),	48–49
NATO Air Defence Committee (NADC) defence assets and capabilities development,	80–81	NATO Defense College Academic Advisory Board, Chairman of the Military Committee on,	87
principal committees and policy bodies hierarchy,	111–113, 118	NATO Defense College (Rome) education and training programmes,	307–309
programmes of,	275–277	IMS Financial Controller's responsibilities for,	102
NATO Air Defence Ground Environment (NADGE),	275–277	Russian participation in,	215
NATO Air Traffic Management Committee (NATMC) activities of,	283–284	specialised activities of,	107–110
defence assets and capabilities development,	80	structure and operations,	87, 96
members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 132	Ukrainian participation in,	227
NATO Battlefield Information Collection and Exploitation System (BICES) Agency,	107–110	NATO Documentation Centre,	337
NATO CIS Services Agency (NCSA),	303–306	NATO Economic Committee,	67–69
NATO Codification System,	323	NATO EF 2000 and TORNADO Development Production and Logistics Management Agency (NETMA),	107–110, 285–288
NATO Committee for Standardization (NCS) activities of,	3 349–351	NATO Electronic Warfare Advisory Committee (NEWAC),	317
		NATO-EU Capability Group,	251
		NATO-EU Declaration on the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP),	243, 246–247
		NATO Force Structure budget and financial management activities,	57
		Military Command Structure vs.,	88, 90, 93, 97

NATO HAWK Management Office (NHMO),	107–110, 285–288	NATO Medium Extended Air Defence System Design and Development, Production and Logistics Management Agency (NAMEADSMA),	107–110, 285–288
NATO Headquarters (Brussels), expansion of,	184	“NATO+1” meetings,	231–232
NATO Headquarters Consultation, Command and Control Staff (NHQC3S),	303–306	“NATO+7” meetings,	231–232
NATO Headquarters Crisis Management Organisation,	48	NATO Moscow Information Office. See also NATO Information Office,	337
NATO Headquarters Information and Systems Management Services (ISMS),	303–306	NATO Parliamentary Assembly (NPA)	
NATO Headquarters Skopje,	153–154	activities of,	268–271
NATO Headquarters Tirana, establishment of,	149–152	Ukrainian initiatives of,	225
NATO Helicopter Design and Development Production and Logistics Management Agency (NAHEMA),	107–110, 285–288	NATO/PfP Education Network,	307, 316
NATO HQ Consultation, Command and Control (C3) Staff (NHQC3S)		NATO/PfP Trust Fund	
International Military Staff liaison with,	105–106	anti-personnel mines programme,	289–296
International Staff duties regarding,	81	arms control and disarmament programmes and,	289–296
NATO Information and Documentation Centre (NIDC), in Ukraine		establishment of,	202–203, 206
public diplomacy communications and information programmes,	223, 337	logistics programmes,	324
NATO Information Office (NIO), in Russia. See also NATO Moscow Information Office,	212	small arms and light weapons programmes,	294–296
NATO Integrated Air Defence System,	275–277	Ukrainian demilitarisation and,	225–226
NATO Intelligence and Warning System (NIWS),	48	NATO Pipeline Committee (NPC)	
NATO Liaison Office (NLO), in Ukraine,	223	logistics programmes,	324
NATO Library catalogue,	336	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 133
NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency (NAMSA)		NATO Pipeline System (NIPS),	324
logistics support,	321, 323–324	NATO Production and Logistics Organisations	
NATO/PfP Trust Fund and,	203	budget and financial management of,	61
organisation and structure,	107–110	common funding activities of,	58
Senior NATO Logisticians’ Conference and,	322	NATO Programme for Security through Science,	207–208, 339–343
in Ukraine,	225	NATO Response Force (NRF)	
NATO Maintenance and Supply Agency Organisation (NAMSO), logistics operations,	323	creation of,	167, 175, 177, 179
NATO Maritime Interdiction Operational Training Centre,	307, 314	EU Battle Groups and,	251
structure and operations,	96	International Staff duties regarding,	78
NATO Maritime Patrol Aircraft,	255–258	military modernisation and,	25
		military operational structure and,	94
		NATO Review,	337
		NATO–Russia cooperation	
		enlargement of,	27
		NATO Programme for Security through Science,	341–343
		Operation Active Endeavour participation and,	169
		NATO–Russia Council (NRC)	
		activities of,	209–211
		air space and traffic management programmes,	283–284
		anti-terrorism initiatives of,	171
		arms control and disarmament programmes,	290
		civil emergency planning programmes,	297, 299

cooperation, partnership, and dialogue activities,	111–113, 134, 138	NATO Staff Centre,	
economic initiatives of,	67–69	International Staff duties regarding,	83
International Military Staff duties concerning,	101, 103	NATO Standardization Agency (NSA)	
Military Committee duties regarding,	86–87	activities of,	349–351
policy and decision-making, participation in,	40–41	COMEDS logistics and,	326
Science Committee,	341–343, 345	NATO Standardization Organization (NSO),	349
Secretary General as chair of,	73–75	NATO Standardization Staff Group (NSSG),	349–351
NATO-Russia Information, Consultation and Training Centre,	67–68	NATO Training Group (NTG),	307, 313
NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council		NATO Training Mission for Iraq,	45, 159–161
anti-terrorism initiatives of,	171	NATO-Ukraine Action Plan,	220–221
establishment of,	209–210	International Staff duties regarding,	79
NATO-Russia Retraining Centre, establishment of,	215	NATO-Ukraine Annual Target Plans,	67–68
NATO-Russia Work Programme, International Staff duties regarding,	79	NATO-Ukraine Commission (NUC)	
NATO Science Committee,	207–208, 345	activities,	219–221, 224
Research and Technology Organisation and,	348	anti-terrorism initiatives of,	171
NATO Science Partnership Prize,	341–343	arms control and disarmament programmes,	290
NATO Science Programme,	342–343	civil emergency planning programmes,	297, 299–300
NATO Security Committee (NSC), members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 134	cooperation, partnership, and dialogue activities,	111–113, 134, 139
NATO Security Investment Programme (NSIP),	81	economic initiatives of,	67–69
air defence activities,	275–277	International Military Staff duties concerning,	101, 103
auditing procedures for,	64	Military Committee duties regarding,	86–87
budget and financial management of,	60–63	Operation Active Endeavour participation and,	169
missile defence capabilities and,	180	policy and decision-making, participation by,	40–41
NATO Security Operation Programmes, in Bosnia/Herzegovina,	143–147	Secretary General as chair of,	73–75
NATO SHAPE School (Oberammergau)		NATO-Ukraine Defence Documentation Office,	223
Bosnia/Herzegovina workshop at,	143–147	NATO-Ukraine Distinctive Partnership, air space and traffic management programmes,	283–284
education and training programmes,	307, 310	NATO-Ukraine Military Work Plan,	226–227
International Committee of the Red Cross and,	268	NATO Undersea Research Centre,	348
Mediterranean Dialogue civil emergency planning programme,	300	NATO-UN Roundtable meetings,	255–258
specialised activities of,	107–110	Netherlands	
structure and operations,	96	assistance to Ukraine by,	225
Ukrainian participation in,	227	ISAF in Afghanistan, assistance to,	155–158, 170
NATO Special Committee, members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 134	New Zealand, policy and decision-making consultation with,	41
NATO Staff Association, International Staff duties regarding,	83	Nice, Treaty of (2000),	247
		No-fly zones, in Bosnia/Herzegovina,	143–147
		Non-article 5 operations	

crisis management,	43, 45–46, 48–49	Article 7,	255–258
military organisation and structure,	93	Article 12,	255–258
Non-governmental organisations (NGOs), NATO cooperation with,	268–272	origins of North Atlantic Alliance and, policy and decision-making procedures,	17 33–36, 37–38
North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD),	275–277	text of,	371–374
North Atlantic Alliance. See North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO),		UN Charter and,	255–258
North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC)		North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)	
formation of,	185	in Afghanistan,	155–158
Russian participation in,	209–210	air defence programme,	275–277
Ukraine participation in,	219	air space and traffic management programme,	283–284
North Atlantic Council (NAC)		Alliance relations with,	15–16
in Afghanistan, role of,	155–158	anti-terrorism initiatives of,	167–174
budget and financial management of,	61–62	armaments cooperation and planning programme,	285–288
budgeting powers of,	60	arms control and disarmament programmes,	289–296
Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society and,	343–344	Bosnia/Herzegovina initiatives of,	143–147
common funding principles of,	58	Brussels headquarters of,	73–75
crisis management duties of,	43, 47, 49	civil emergency planning programme,	299–302
defence planning initiatives and,	53–54	civilian organisation and structures,	21, 73–75
European Union cooperation with,	243–251	communication and information systems,	303–306
International Military Staff duties,	73–75, 101–102, 104–105	creation of,	9
ISAF in Afghanistan, responsibility for,	155–158, 168, 170	crisis management activities,	43–50
International Staff duties regarding,	77, 83–84	in Darfur,	163
in Iraq,	159–161	defence planning dimension of,	51–56
KFOR establishment and,	149–152	economic initiatives of,	67–69
Kosovo conflict and,	149–152	education and training programmes,	307–316
logistics principles and policies,	320–321	electronic warfare programme,	317
in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*, peacekeeping role of,	153–154	enlargement process,	21, 183–187
Mediterranean Dialogue and,	230–231	European Union strategic partnership with,	78, 243–251
Membership Action Plan and,	189–190	fiftieth anniversary,	21
Military Committee oversight by,	85, 87–90, 93, 96	International Military Staff functions,	101–106
NATO Programme for Security through Science,	342	international organisations and,	263–265
OSCE and,	259–262	International Staff functions,	77–84
policy and decision-making by,	35	in Iraq,	159–161
policy and decision-making consultation with,	33–36, 41	Kosovo conflict and KFOR operation,	149–152
policy oversight inspections and surveys,	84	logistics programmes,	319–327
principal committees and policy bodies diagram,	111–113	in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*,	153–154
Secretary General's duties on,	73–75	Mediterranean region operations,	229–235
Senior NATO Logisticians' Conference and,	322	Membership Action Plan of,	189–190
structure and organisation,	114	meteorology programmes,	329–330
transitional strategy proposal for Bosnia/Herzegovina,	143–147	military headquarters in Bosnia/Herzegovina established,	143–147
North Atlantic Treaty (1949)		military oceanography programmes,	331–332
Article 2,	67–69	military organization and structures,	21–22, 85–99
Article 5,	39, 43–50; 93, 167, 255–258	mission of,	9–11, 15–16
		new capabilities of,	175–180
		nuclear policy of,	65–66
		Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe and,	259–262
		origins of,	16–17
		parliamentary and non-governmental organisations and,	268–272
		Partnership for Peace programme and,	193–208

policy and decision-making institutions,	33–41
principal committees and policy bodies,	111–113
public diplomacy communications and information programmes,	333–337
research and technology programmes,	347–348
Russia's partnership with,	209–217
scientific and environmental programmes,	339–345
Secretary General as spokesman for,	73–75
security tasks of,	18–20
South-East initiatives of,	237–239
specialised organisations and agencies,	107–110
Standardization programmes of,	349–351
Ukraine cooperation with,	219–228
United Nations relations with,	255–258
Weapons of mass destruction programmes,	205–206, 243–247
WEU and,	243–247
Northrop Grumman,	179
Norway	
NATO military dispositions, participation in,	39
Operation Active Endeavour participation of,	169
origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	17
Nuclear, biological, or chemical (NBC) weapons	
NATO arms control and reduction programmes,	25–26, 65–66, 289–296
Partner countries operations,	170, 172
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT),	290–291
Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) Review Conference,	291
Nuclear Planning Group (NPG)	
Military Committee and,	85, 87, 92
nuclear policy forums of,	65–66
policy and decision-making by,	36–37
principal committees and policy bodies hierarchy,	111–113, 115
Secretary General's duties on,	73–75
Nuclear policy, NATO development of,	65–66
Nuclear weapons	
intermediate-range nuclear forces, NATO deployment of,	183–184
NATO arms control and disarmament programmes,	289–296

O

Objective Based Budgeting (OBB) system, NATO's use of,	83
Oceanography, NATO military organisations and agencies,	331–332
Office of the High Representative (OHR), IFOR cooperation with in ,	143–147
Office of the Legal Adviser, International Staff and,	77
Ohrid Framework Agreement,	153–154
Olympic Games of 2004 (Athens)	
Airborne Early Warning and Control System support during,	279–281
Airborne Warning and Control Systems operations during,	97
anti-terrorist protection initiatives,	174
civil emergency planning programmes for,	298
Open Skies Treaty,	289, 294
Operation Active Endeavour,	24, 168–169, 214
Ukrainian participation in,	223–224
Operational Capabilities Concept, in Partnership for Peace,	199–200
Operational commitments of NATO, International Staff duties regarding,	79–80
Operation Allied Harmony,	153–154
Operational Task Forces, International Staff duties regarding,	79–80
Operation Althea,	143–147, 250
Operation Amber Fox,	153–154, 250
Operation Concordia,	250, 261
Operation Deliberate Force,	143–147
Operation Display Deterrence,	23
Operation Eagle Assist,	24–25
Operation Enduring Freedom	
ISAF and,	23, 155–158, 169–170
Ukrainian participation in,	223
Operation Essential Harvest,	153–154
Operation Iraqi Freedom,	23
Orange Revolution in Ukraine,	27, 219, 221
Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE)	
in Afghanistan,	155–158
anti-terrorism initiatives of,	171–172
crisis management partnerships,	45
education and training programmes,	309

EU-NATO cooperation and,	250	ISAF participation,	169–170
IFOR cooperation with,	143–147	NATO economic initiatives with,	67–69
International Military Staff cooperation with,	103	NATO Parliamentary Assembly and,	270
Kosovo Verification Mission of,	149–152	NATO Programme for Security through Science programmes and,	339–343
Ministerial Council of,	259–260	Partnership for Peace obligations of,	193–208
NATO cooperation with,	259–262	peace-support operations of,	203–204
NATO enlargement and,	186	policy and decision-making consultation with,	40–41
NATO Programme for Security through Science and,	343	security, science and environmental initiatives of,	207–208
peacekeeping operations,	143–147	Partnership Action Plan on Defence Institution Building,	200–201
policy and decision-making consultation with,	40	Partnership Action Plan on Terrorism (PAP-T),	25, 168, 171, 200
role in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia* of,	153–154	Partnership Action Plans, counter-terrorism initiatives and,	168, 171
Vienna Document and,	289, 293	Partnership Coordination Cell (PCC)	
Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons		in Partnership for Peace programme,	199
civil emergency planning programmes of,	297–298	in Russia,	212
International Staff duties regarding,	80	in Ukraine,	223
NATO relations with,	263–265	Partnership for Peace (PfP). See also NATO/PfP Trust Fund	
Oslo, North Atlantic Council meeting in (1992),	143–147	in Albania,	149–152
crisis management initiatives at,	43	arms control and disarmament programmes and,	289–296
Ostpolitik policy, German adoption of,	183	Balkan states' participation in,	22
Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production, and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and Their Destruction,	202	in Bosnia/Herzegovina,	143–147
Overall Summary Appraisal of Defence Planning,	56	civil emergency planning programmes,	289–302
“Over and above rule,” budget and financial management based on,	60	COMEDS logistics and,	326
		defence reform initiatives of,	193–208
		disaster relief operations,	197, 206–207
		education and training programmes,	307, 316
		Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and,	193–208
		evolution of,	193–208
		formation of,	185
		International Military Staff duties concerning,	101, 103
		International Staff duties regarding,	79–80
		Kosovo programmes and procedures,	149–152
		Mediterranean Dialogue and,	234–235
		Membership Action Plan vs.,	189–190
		Military Committee duties regarding,	86–87, 90, 92, 96
		Military Oceanography Group support,	331–332
		NATO Air Defence Committee and,	275–277
		NATO Parliamentary Assembly and,	270
		policy and decision-making by,	40–41
		Russian participation in,	209–217
		security, science and environmental initiatives,	208
		small arms and light weapons programmes,	206–207
		South-East Europe initiatives,	237–239
		Staff Elements,	199
		Status of Forces Agreement,	216

P

Pakistan, NATO crisis assistance to,	45, 178
Parliamentary organisations, NATO cooperation with,	268–271
Partner countries	
air space and traffic management programmes with,	283–284
civilian organisation and structures from,	73–75
common-funded resources with NATO,	57–64
counter-terrorism initiatives and,	167–169, 171–174
in Euro-Atlantic Partnership, expanded relations with,	193–208, 27
International Military Staff operations in,	101, 103, 106
Iraq initiatives and,	159–161

Training Centres,	199	overview of,	33
Ukrainian participation in,	219–228	principal committees and policy bodies directory,	111–113
Partnership for Peace Planning and Review Process (PARP)		Policy Coordination Group (PCG),	38
in Albania,	149–152	crisis management activities,	47
interoperability/capability guidance from,	199, 201–202	International Staff duties regarding,	79
Membership Action Plan and,	189–190	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 123
in Ukraine,	225–226	Policy Planning Unit, of International Staff,	77
Partnership institutions, enlargement of,	26–27, 136	Political Affairs and Security Policy Division, Defence and Security Economics Directorate,	67–69
Partnership Real-time Information Management and Exchange System (PRIME),	199–200	Political and Security Committee (EU),	247–248
Peacekeeping and peace-support operations		Political Committee (PC)	
in Afghanistan,	155–158	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 121
in Bosnia/Herzegovina, overview of NATO role,	143–147	powers and duties,	38
crisis management activities and,	43–45	Political issues	
in Darfur,	163	counter-terrorism efforts of NATO and,	169–174
EU-NATO cooperation on,	245, 248, 250	International Staff duties concerning,	77–78
in Iraq,	159–161	military operations and,	85–87, 93–94, 98
in Kosovo,	149–152	Political-Military Framework	
in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*,	153–154	NATO-led PFP operations,	93–94
Partner countries involvement in,	195, 197–199, 203–204	in Partnership for Peace,	199
Russian participation in,	215–216	Political-Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace (PiP/SC), principal committees and policy bodies hierarchy,	111–113, 117
in Ukraine,	223–224	Portugal	
Pension Budget (NATO),	83	ISAF in Afghanistan, assistance to,	170
<i>Perestroika</i> , Soviet adoption of,	184	origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	17
“Permanent Council.” See North Atlantic Council		Portuguese Air Command and Control System (POACCS),	275–277
Permanent Representatives		Prague Capabilities Commitment	
NATO Parliamentary Assembly and,	270	anti-terrorism initiatives of,	167
policy and decision-making by,	33–35	International Staff duties regarding,	78
Petersburg Tasks (Amsterdam Treaty), NATO-EU cooperation on,	245, 247	launching of,	175–177
Planning structures, of International Military Staff,	101–103	military modernisation,	25–26
“Platform for Cooperative Security” (Istanbul Summit),	259	Prague Summit (2002)	
Poland		accession dialogues at,	187
accession to NATO,	17, 183, 186	Balkans stabilisation initiatives at,	22
assistance to Ukraine by,	225	EU-NATO cooperation discussed at,	248
ISAF in Afghanistan, assistance to,	170	Iraq training mission at,	23
Membership Action Plan and,	189–190	Mediterranean Dialogue and,	233–234
operations in Iraq,	23, 159–161	Membership Action Plan countries at,	189–190
Solidarity movement in,	184	military modernisation at,	25
Policy and planning procedures		missile defence capabilities discussed at,	176–180
consensus decision-making in,	33	organisation and agency review initiatives from,	107–110
consultative process,	37–38	OSCE-NATO cooperation at,	259
of International Military Staff,	101–103	Partnership for Peace discussions at,	199–200
International Staff duties concerning,	84		
International Staff duties concerning,	77		
organisations involved in,	33–37		

S

Safe Areas, Alliance support for,	143–147	Partnership for Peace initiatives,	207–208
St. Malo Summit, EU-NATO cooperation during,	246–247	Russian-NATO cooperation on,	209–217
Scheffer, Jaap de Hoop, (Secretary General)	225, 258	Ukrainian-NATO cooperation on,	220–224
Science Committee (SCOM), members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 128	Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC)	
Science for Peace Projects,	340	crisis management activities,	47
Scientific research		International Staff duties regarding,	79
EAPC cooperation on,	197–198, 207–208	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 126
International Staff duties regarding,	82–83	organisation and programmes,	299, 301
NATO public diplomacy programmes,	339–345	programmes in Russia,	299
NATO Research and Technology Agency and,	107–110	Senior Civilian Representative, in Afghanistan,	155–158
Russia-NATO cooperation on,	217	Senior Defence Group on Proliferation (DGP),	295–296
Ukrainian-NATO cooperation on,	228	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 130
Secretariat (North Atlantic Council), policy and decision-making procedures,	36	Senior Military Representative, to Albania,	149–152
Secretary General (NATO)		Senior NATO Logisticians' Conference (SNLC)	
defence planning review by,	56	logistics support operations,	320, 322–323
duties of,	73–75	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 127
financial management duties of,	61	Movement and Transportation Group,	323
International Military Staff intelligence support to,	104–106	Senior Political Committee (SPC)	
International Staff, leadership of,	74, 77	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 120
policy and decision-making procedures and,	38	powers and duties,	35
public diplomacy communications and information programmes,	335–337	Senior Politico-Military Group on Proliferation (SGP),	295–296
Senior NATO Logisticians' Conference and,	322	members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 122
specialised organisations and agencies directors and steering committees, meetings with,	107–110	Senior Resource Board (SRB)	
Security Cooperation Programme (Bosnia/Herzegovina),	237–239	International Staff duties regarding,	81
Security investment,		members and policy body hierarchies,	111–113, 129
International Staff duties regarding,	80–81	policy and decision-making procedures and,	35–36
Security issues		resource management duties of,	60–61
changing environment for,	20–21	September 11 terrorist attacks (United States)	
Euro-Atlantic Partnership and Partnership for Peace initiatives involving,	193–207	Airborne Early Warning and Control System support following,	279–281
fundamental NATO tasks concerning,	18–20	Alliance efforts on anti-terrorism and anti-proliferation of WMD and,	167–174
International Military Staff duties concerning,	103, 105–106	Article 5 (Washington Treaty) and,	15–16
International Staff duties regarding,	77–78, 82–84	civil aircraft management following,	283–284
in Mediterranean and Middle East region,	230–235	civil emergency planning programmes following,	299–302
parliamentary/nongovernmental organisations and,	269–272	crisis management policies following,	44, 46, 49
		NATO collaboration with science community after,	82
		Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons,	263–265
		Partner countries' anti-terrorism response,	204–205
		security issues in wake of,	19–20
		UN initiatives following,	255–258

Serbia and Montenegro. See also Federal Republic of Yugoslavia		OSCE-NATO cooperation on,	260–262
EU-NATO cooperation in,	249–251	Standardization procedures	
Partnership for Peace participation sought,	22, 193, 237–239	International Military Staff responsibilities for,	104–106
UN operations in,	255–258	NATO programmes for,	349–351
Situation Centre (SITCEN) (NATO),	47	Standardization Agreements,	350–351
International Military Staff involvement in,	105	Standardization Tasking Authorities,	350–351
International Staff duties regarding,	79–80	“Standards before Status” policy, Kosovo conflict and,	149–152
Slovakia		Standards Implementation Process, Kosovo stabilisation and,	149–152
accession to NATO,	17, 183, 187	Standards Review Mechanism, Kosovo stabilisation and,	149–152
Afghanistan assistance from,	170	Standing Group of Partner Medical Experts,	326
Slovenia, accession to NATO,	17, 183, 187	Standing Naval Force Mediterranean (STANAVFORMED)	
Small arms and light weapons, NATO initiatives concerning,	206–207, 294–296	Mediterranean Dialogue countries and,	232–233
Solidarity mouvement,	184	Operation Active Endeavour and, UN-NATO cooperation on,	255–258
South East Europe Initiative (SEEI)		Status of Forces Agreement (PfP)	
economic dimensions of,	67–69	Russian accession to,	216–217
launching of,	237–239	in Ukraine,	226–227
policy and decision-making, participation by,	40	Steering Committees, for specialised organisations and agencies,	107–110
South East Europe Security Cooperation Steering Group (SEEGROUP),	237–239	Stock Holding and Asset Requirements Exchange (SHARE),	321, 323
Soviet Union. See also Commonwealth of Independent States; Russia		Strategic Commands and Commanders	
crisis management following collapse of,	46	budget and financial management activities of,	57, 61
disintegration of,	209–217	capability packages managed by,	60
political reforms in,	183–185	COMEDS logistics and,	26
Spain		crisis management activities,	48–49
Component Command Headquarters in,	94	defence planning initiatives and, duties of,	85–87
Operation Active Endeavour participation,	169	financial controllers' duties in, International Military Staff liaison with,	63–64
origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	17	International Staff duties regarding, policy and decision-making participation by,	79
Spanish Quick Reaction Force, in Afghanistan,	155–158	Senior NATO Logisticians' Conference and,	37
Stabilisation Force (SFOR)		Conference and,	322
EUFOR as replacement for,	143–147	Strategic Concept	
IFOR replaced with,	143–147	for arms control and disarmament programmes,	289–296
NATO airborne early warning system support,	279–281	crisis management initiatives of,	199, 43
OSCE cooperation with,	260–262	defence planning under,	52–53
Partner countries' participation in, reductions in,	204	for economic policy,	67–69
UN cooperation with,	143–147	for Euro-Atlantic Partnership,	194
	255–258	logistics support for,	319–320
Stability issues, in Mediterranean and Middle East region,	233–234	military duties regarding,	86, 89–90, 95
Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe			
economic dimensions of,	67–68		
establishment of,	237–239		

for NATO-OSCE cooperation,	259–262
security tasks of,	18–20
Strategic nuclear weapons, defined,	65–66
“Strategy to Address Threats to Security and Stability in the 21st Century,”	259–260
Study on NATO Enlargement,	183–187
Submarine rescue operations, NATO initiatives,	210, 215
Subordinate Commanders, budget and financial management activities of,	61
Sub-strategic nuclear weapons, defined,	65–66
Sudan. See also Darfur, Sudan	
crisis assistance to African Union in,	44
Military Committee role in,	86
NATO mission in,	24, 143
Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR)	
in Afghanistan, role of,	155–158
crisis management activities,	48
duties of,	87–94
financial controllers’ duties at,	63–64
NATO SHAPE School and,	310, 313
Supreme Allied Commander Operations,	73–75
Supreme Allied Commander Transformation (SACT),	73–75
duties of,	87, 89, 91–95
education and training programmes,	310, 313
Supreme Allied Command Transformation, financial controllers’ duties at,	63–64
Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers in Europe (SHAPE)	
force generation conference for Afghanistan at,	170
Iraq policy review at,	159–161
NATO Airborne Early Warning and Control Programme Management Agency and,	279–281
operational structure,	93
Partnership Coordination Cell programme at,	199
Russian Military Liaison Branch Office,	212
Sweden, ISAF participation by,	170

T

Tactical Decision Aids (TDAs),	329–330
Tailored Cooperation Programme,	237–239

Tajikistan	
antipersonnel mines in,	202
as partner country,	196, 201
Taliban, ouster from Afghanistan of,	155–158, 169–170
Tarasyuk, Borys,	224
Technology Advisory Board,	348
Terrorism	
Alliance’s role in fight against,	167–174
anti-terrorism efforts of Partner countries,	193–208
International Staff duties regarding, NATO initiatives concerning,	78, 80, 82–84, 24–25
Russian anti-terrorism initiatives, UN-NATO cooperation initiatives against,	209–214, 217, 255–258
Terrorist Threat Intelligence Unit,	26, 172
Thales Corporation,	179
the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia*	
accession to NATO and,	183
crisis management in,	44, 47
European Union peacekeeping operations in,	143–147, 249–250
Kosovo refugees in,	149–152
Membership Action Plan participation,	189–190
NATO peacekeeping role in,	143–147, 153–154
OSCE-NATO cooperation in,	260–262
Partnership for Peace participation, UN operations in,	22, 255–258
Three Wise Men’s Report,	342
Trainer Cargo Aircraft (TCA), NATO acquisition of,	279–281
Training and Education Enhancement Programme (TEEP), in Partnership for Peace,	199
Trajkovski, Boris (President),	153–154
Transatlantic Industrial Partnership for Surveillance (TIPS), Alliance ground surveillance (AGS) capability and,	179
Transit Agreement, Russia- NATO,	216
Transportation logistics, NATO support for,	322
Treaty-Limited Equipment (TLE) (CFE Treaty),	292–293
Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe, R ussia-NATO cooperation on,	216
Turkey	
civil emergency planning programmes for,	297–298, 300

ISAF in Afghanistan, command of,	155–158, 170	origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	16–17
NATO air defence operations in,	279–281	Partnership for Peace obligations based on,	198
NATO military operations in,	94, 97		
Operation Display Deterrence,	23	United Nations Counter Terrorism Committee (UN-CTC),	174
origins of North Atlantic Alliance and,	17	NATO cooperation on,	255–258
		United Nations Development Programme (UNDP),	343
		United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP),	343
		United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	
		civil emergency planning programmes and,	298
		crisis management initiatives with,	47
		IFOR cooperation with,	143–147
		Kosovo conflict and actions of,	149–152
		NATO cooperation with,	255–258
		Partnership for Peace cooperation with,	207
		United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo,	260–262
		United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs	
		civil emergency planning programmes of,	298
		Partnership for Peace cooperation with,	207–208
		United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime,	255–258
		United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR)	
		Alliance support for, in Bosnia/Herzegovina,	143–147
		NATO cooperation with,	255–258
		United Nations Secretary General, North Atlantic Alliance and,	255–258
		United Nations Security Council	
		Alliance cooperation on Bosnia/Herzegovina with,	143–147
		Kosovo conflict and resolutions of,	149–152
		NATO relations with,	255–258
		United Nations Security Council Resolutions (UNSCR)	
		UNSCR 1088,	143–147
		UNSCR 1244,	149–152
		UNSCR 1386,	155–158
		UNSCR 1413,	155–158
		UNSCR 1441,	23
		UNSCR 1444,	155–158
		UNSCR 1510,	155–158
		UNSCR 1546,	159–161
		United Nations (UN)	
		in Afghanistan,	155–158

U

Ukraine

antipersonnel mines in,	294
civil emergency planning in,	297, 299–300
crisis management operations in,	45, 47
economic initiatives in,	67–69
NATO cooperation with,	27, 219–228
NATO-Russia Council activities in,	211
Orange Revolution in,	219, 221
policy and decision-making, participation by,	40
security partnership with,	20–21
small arms and light weapons control in,	290, 294

Ukrainian Border Guard, 225

Ukrainian Defence Academy, 227

Ukrainian Ministry of Emergencies and Protection of the Population from the Consequences of the Chernobyl Catastrophe, 300

Ukrainian National Defense Academy, 309

Ukrainian Parliament, NATO Parliamentary Assembly and, 270

UNAMA, presidential elections in Afghanistan, 155–158

Undersea Research Centre, structure and operations, 96

UN First Committee, 290

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR). See Soviet Union

United Arab Emirates (UAE)
 Mediterranean Dialogue, 234–235
 policy and planning consultations with, 41

United Kingdom,
 Airbone Early Warning and Control aircraft and, 279
 ISAF leadership of, 155, 158
 Component Command, 94
 NATO pipeline system in, 324
 nuclear policy and, 65–66
 origins of NATO and, 17

United Nations Charter
 Kosovo conflict and, 149–152
 North Atlantic Treaty and, 255–258

Women in NATO Forces, International Military Staff duties regarding,	105–106
Working Group on Battle-Area Meteorological Systems and Support,	329
Working Group on Operations, Planes and Communication, meteorological support operations,	329
World Bank, South East Europe initiatives of,	237–239
World Health Organisation (WHO), International Staff duties regarding,	80

Y

Youth Atlantic Treaty Association (YATA),	272
Yugoslavia (former). See also Federal Republic of Yugoslavia crisis management in,	44, 46–47
Yushchenko, Viktor,	221

NATO Public Diplomacy Division

1110 Brussels - Belgium

Website: www.nato.int

Email: natodoc@hq.nato.int