



**THE READER'S GUIDE  
TO THE NATO SUMMIT  
IN WASHINGTON**

**23 - 25 APRIL 1999**





# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	
	How to use this Guide	7
<b>2</b>	<b>Summing up the Summit</b>	
	The Washington Declaration	11
	Washington Summit Communiqué	13
	<i>Achievements of the Washington Summit</i>	25
<b>3</b>	<b>NATO in the Balkans</b>	
	Statement on Kosovo	29
	Chairman's Summary of the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council at the Level of Heads of State and Government with Countries in the Region of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia	31
	Statement following the Meetings of Foreign and Defence Ministers	33
	Extracts from the Washington Summit Communiqué on NATO's Role in the Former Yugoslavia	35
	<i>NATO's Role in Relation to Kosovo</i>	37
	<i>NATO's Role in Bosnia and Herzegovina</i>	43
<b>4</b>	<b>Strategy and Defence</b>	
	The Alliance's Strategic Concept	47
	Defence Capabilities Initiative	61
	<i>Background to the Strategic Concept</i>	63
	<i>Development of the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within NATO</i>	65
	<i>The Combined Joint Task Forces Concept</i>	67
	<i>Reform of NATO's Integrated Military Command Structure</i>	69
<b>5</b>	<b>NATO's Open Door</b>	
	Membership Action Plan	73
	<i>The Accession of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland</i>	81
	<i>NATO's Open Door Policy</i>	83
<b>6</b>	<b>NATO's Partnership Activities</b>	
	Chairman's Summary of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council at Summit Level	87
	Declaration of the Heads of State and Government Participating in the NATO-Ukraine Commission Summit	89
	<i>Further Development of the EAPC</i>	91
	<i>Partnership for Peace - An Enhanced and More Operational Partnership</i>	93
	<i>NATO and Russia</i>	95
	<i>NATO and Ukraine</i>	97
	<i>Mediterranean Dialogue</i>	99
	<i>Civil Emergency Planning in the Framework of the EAPC</i>	101
	<i>The NATO Science Programme</i>	105

**7 Appendices**

<i>What is NATO?</i>	109
<i>The Origins of the North Atlantic Council and The Role of Summits in NATO's History</i>	113
<i>NATO Acronyms and Expressions</i>	117



# ***Introduction***

How to use this Guide



## HOW TO USE THIS GUIDE



“Here in Washington, we have paid tribute to the achievements of the past and we have shaped a new Alliance to meet the challenges of the future.”

*from the Washington Summit Communiqué*

“The crisis in Kosovo represents a fundamental challenge to the values for which NATO has stood since its foundation: democracy, human rights and the rule of law.... We will not allow this campaign of terror to succeed.”

*from the Washington Statement on Kosovo*



*The Washington Summit took place during an unprecedented period in the history of the Alliance. In April 1999, attention was focused on the Balkans, with NATO engaged in an air campaign in Yugoslavia in support of the political aims of the international community for peace in Kosovo. At the same time, the Alliance, commemorating its 50th Anniversary, welcomed three new members into its ranks and concluded two years of intense work on the ambitious agenda set out at the 1997 Madrid Summit.*

*The documents issued at the Summit reflect these exceptional times. The texts reveal the breadth and depth of work undertaken by the Alliance on a daily basis and underscore NATO's ability to adapt appropriately to changing circumstances. Above all, they describe the many facets of the Alliance's commitment to promote peace, stability and freedom and to build a Europe “whole and free, where security and prosperity are shared and indivisible” (from The Washington Declaration).*

*This brochure brings together all official texts and declarations issued in the context of the Washington Summit. Each of these is reproduced in its entirety and represents the formal views of the Alliance and of the countries participating in the various Washington meetings.*

*A number of background texts are also included in this compilation. They provide additional historical information or clarification of Alliance programmes and activities covered by the formal texts, such as the reform of NATO's military structure and the initiatives designed to further enhance the Partnership for Peace programme. These texts are informal documents, as opposed to formally agreed NATO communiqués and declarations, and provide general background information.*

*The materials contained in this brochure are organised thematically, beginning with 'The Washington Declaration', the vision statement of the Alliance, and the 'Washington Summit Communiqué', which outlines point by point the achievements of the Summit itself. These are general documents describing the overall aims and direction of the Alliance.*

*Reflecting NATO's deep involvement in the Balkan region, the next section, titled 'NATO in the Balkans', gives both official statements and background material on the crisis in Kosovo and on NATO's role in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In Washington, NATO leaders - at times in session with leaders of the twenty-five Partner countries and leaders of countries in the region - focused much of their attention on events unfolding in Yugoslavia, and the Summit documentation reflects this.*

*Next comes a group of texts focused more specifically on strategic and defence matters. This begins with the Strategic Concept, which outlines the purposes and tasks of the Alliance and provides guidelines for developing the capabilities to achieve them. In Washington, the Alliance also issued a statement on a new programme to improve defence capabilities, the Defence Capabilities Initiative. This statement is reproduced in full after the Strategic Concept. Background papers follow, giving more detailed information on related issues, such as the development of the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within the Alliance and the Reform of NATO's Integrated Military Command Structure.*

*The participation of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland as full members of the Alliance was a highlight of the Summit. Reflecting NATO's commitment to keeping the door open, Alliance leaders unveiled a Membership Action Plan, aimed at providing assistance and guidelines to countries aspiring to join the Alliance. Background sheets accompanying this text give more details on the recent accession of the three new members and on NATO's Open Door Policy.*

*The section entitled 'NATO's Partnership Activities' contains official texts from the Summit of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) and the NATO-Ukraine Summit, with additional background information on these two items as well as on the variety of NATO's work with its Partner countries. The number and range of Partnership programmes and initiatives underscore the Alliance's goal of creating "the core of a cooperative security network between NATO and its Partners for the 21st century" (from the Washington Summit Communiqué). Finally, appendices at the end of the booklet give basic background information on NATO, on the origins of the North Atlantic Council and the role of summits in the history of the Alliance, and on special expressions and acronyms in common use.*

*The NATO Office of Information and Press hopes this collection of documents captures the exceptional events surrounding the Washington Summit and provides a valuable resource to scholars, specialists and the general public.*





## ***Summing up the Summit***

The Washington Declaration

•

Washington Summit Communiqué

•

*Achievements of the Washington Summit*



## THE WASHINGTON DECLARATION

• • •

Signed and issued by the Heads of State and Government  
participating in the meeting  
of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C.  
23 and 24 April 1999

1. We, the Heads of State and Government of the member countries of the North Atlantic Alliance, declare for a new century our mutual commitment to defend our people, our territory and our liberty, founded on democracy, human rights and the rule of law. The world has changed dramatically over the last half century, but our common values and security interests remain the same.
2. At this anniversary summit, we affirm our determination to continue advancing these goals, building on the habits of trust and co-operation we have developed over fifty years. Collective defence remains the core purpose of NATO. We affirm our commitment to promote peace, stability and freedom.
3. We pay tribute to the men and women who have served our Alliance and who have advanced the cause of freedom. To honour them and to build a better future, we will contribute to building a stronger and broader Euro-Atlantic community of democracies - a community where human rights and fundamental freedoms are upheld; where borders are increasingly open to people, ideas and commerce; where war becomes unthinkable.
4. We reaffirm our faith, as stated in the North Atlantic Treaty, in the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and reiterate our desire to live in peace with all nations, and to settle any international dispute by peaceful means.
5. We must be as effective in the future in dealing with new challenges as we were in the past. We are charting NATO's course as we enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century: an Alliance committed to collective defence, capable of addressing current and future risks to our security, strengthened by and open to new members, and working together with other institutions, Partners and Mediterranean Dialogue countries in a mutually reinforcing way to enhance Euro-Atlantic security and stability.
6. NATO embodies the vital partnership between Europe and North America. We welcome the further impetus that has been given to the strengthening of European defence capabilities to enable the European Allies to act more effectively together, thus reinforcing the transatlantic partnership.
7. We remain determined to stand firm against those who violate human rights, wage war and conquer territory. We will maintain both the political solidarity and the military forces necessary to protect our nations and to meet the security challenges of the next century. We pledge to improve our defence capabilities to fulfil the full range of the Alliance's 21<sup>st</sup> century missions. We will

continue to build confidence and security through arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation measures. We reiterate our condemnation of terrorism and our determination to protect ourselves against this scourge.

8. Our Alliance remains open to all European democracies, regardless of geography, willing and able to meet the responsibilities of membership, and whose inclusion would enhance overall security and stability in Europe. NATO is an essential pillar of a wider community of shared values and shared responsibility. Working together, Allies and Partners, including Russia and Ukraine, are developing their cooperation and erasing the divisions imposed by the Cold War to help to build a Europe whole and free, where security and prosperity are shared and indivisible.
9. Fifty years after NATO's creation, the destinies of North America and Europe remain inseparable. When we act together, we safeguard our freedom and security and enhance stability more effectively than any of us could alone. Now, and for the century about to begin, we declare as the fundamental objectives of this Alliance enduring peace, security and liberty for all people of Europe and North America.

# WASHINGTON SUMMIT COMMUNIQUÉ

• • •

Issued by the Heads of State and Government  
participating in the meeting  
of the North Atlantic Council in Washington, D.C.  
on 24 April 1999

## AN ALLIANCE FOR THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY

1. We, the Heads of State and Government of the member countries of the North Atlantic Alliance, have gathered in Washington to celebrate the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of NATO and to set forth our vision of the Alliance of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The North Atlantic Alliance, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law, remains the basis of our collective defence; it embodies the transatlantic link that binds North America and Europe in a unique defence and security partnership.
2. Fifty years ago, the North Atlantic Alliance was founded in troubled and uncertain times. It has withstood the test of five decades and allowed the citizens of Allied countries to enjoy an unprecedented period of peace, freedom and prosperity. Here in Washington, we have paid tribute to the achievements of the past and we have shaped a new Alliance to meet the challenges of the future. This new Alliance will be larger, more capable and more flexible, committed to collective defence and able to undertake new missions including contributing to effective conflict prevention and engaging actively in crisis management, including crisis response operations. The Alliance will work with other nations and organisations to advance security, prosperity and democracy throughout the Euro-Atlantic region. The presence today of three new Allies - the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland - demonstrates that we have overcome the division of Europe.
3. The Alliance takes the opportunity of this 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary to recognise and express its heartfelt appreciation for the commitment, sacrifice, resolve and loyalty of the servicemen and women of all Allies to the cause of freedom. The Alliance salutes these active and reserve forces' essential contributions, which for 50 years have guaranteed freedom and safeguarded trans-Atlantic security. Our nations and our Alliance are in their debt and offer them profound thanks.
4. The NATO of the 21<sup>st</sup> century starts today - a NATO which retains the strengths of the past and has new missions, new members and new partnerships. To this end, we have:
  - approved an updated Strategic Concept;
  - reaffirmed our commitment to the enlargement process of the Alliance and approved a Membership Action Plan for countries wishing to join;

- completed the work on key elements of the Berlin Decisions on building the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance and decided to further enhance its effectiveness;
  - launched the Defence Capabilities Initiative;
  - intensified our relations with Partners through an enhanced and more operational Partnership for Peace and strengthened our consultations and co-operation within the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council;
  - enhanced the Mediterranean Dialogue; and
  - decided to increase Alliance efforts against weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.
5. As part of the Alliance's adaptation to the new security challenges, we have updated our Strategic Concept to make it fully consistent with the Alliance's new security environment. The updated Concept reaffirms our commitment to collective defence and the transatlantic link; takes account of the challenges the Alliance now faces; presents an Alliance ready and with a full range of capabilities to enhance the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area; reaffirms our commitment to building the ESDI within the Alliance; highlights the enhanced role of partnership and dialogue; underlines the need to develop defence capabilities to their full potential to meet the spectrum of Alliance missions, including forces which are more deployable, sustainable, survivable and able to engage effectively; and provides guidance to the NATO Military Authorities to this end.
6. To achieve its essential purpose, as an Alliance of nations committed to the Washington Treaty and the United Nations Charter, the Alliance performs the following fundamental security tasks:
- Security:** 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.
- Consultation:** To serve, as provided for in Article 4 of the North Atlantic 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 co-ordination of their efforts in fields of common concern.
- Deterrence and Defence:** 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:
- **Crisis Management:** 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.
  - **Partnership:** 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.
7. We warmly welcome the participation of the three new Allies - the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland - in their first Alliance Summit meeting. Their accession to the North Atlantic Treaty opens a new chapter in the history of the Atlantic Alliance.

We reaffirm today our commitment to the openness of the Alliance under Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty and in accordance with Paragraph 8 of the Madrid Summit Declaration. We pledge that NATO will continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area. This is part of an evolutionary process that takes into account political and security developments in the whole of Europe. Our commitment to enlargement is part of a broader strategy of projecting stability and working together with our Partners to build a Europe whole and free. The ongoing enlargement process strengthens the Alliance and enhances the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic region. The three new members will not be the last.

At the Summit in Madrid we recognised the progress made by a number of countries aspiring to join the Alliance in meeting the responsibilities and obligations for possible membership.

Today we recognise and welcome the continuing efforts and progress in both Romania and Slovenia. We also recognise and welcome continuing efforts and progress in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. Since the Madrid Summit, we note and welcome positive developments in Bulgaria. We also note and welcome recent positive developments in Slovakia. We are grateful for the co-operation of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup> with NATO in the present crisis and welcome its progress on reforms. We welcome Albania's co-operation with the Alliance in the present crisis and encourage its reform efforts.

We welcome the efforts and progress aspiring members have made, since we last met, to advance political, military and economic reforms. We appreciate the results achieved, and look forward to further progress by these countries in strengthening their democratic institutions and in restructuring their economies and militaries. We take account of the efforts of these aspiring members, together with a number of other Partner countries, to improve relations with neighbours and contribute to security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic region. We look forward to further deepening our co-operation with aspiring countries and to increasing their political and military involvement in the work of the Alliance.

The Alliance expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, and as NATO determines that the inclusion of these nations would serve the overall political and strategic interests of the Alliance and that the inclusion would enhance overall European security and stability. To give substance to this commitment, NATO will maintain an active relationship with those nations that have expressed an interest in NATO membership as well as those who may wish to seek membership in the future. Those nations that have expressed an interest in becoming NATO members will remain under active consideration for future membership. No European democratic country whose admission would fulfil the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration, regardless of its geographic location, each being considered on its own merits. All states have the inherent right to choose the means to ensure their own security. Furthermore, in order to enhance overall security and stability in Europe, further steps in the ongoing enlargement process of the Alliance should balance the security concerns of all Allies.

We welcome the aspirations of the nine countries currently interested in joining the Alliance. Accordingly, we are ready to provide advice, assistance and practical support. To this end, we approve today a Membership Action Plan which includes the following elements:

- the submission by aspiring members of individual annual national programmes on their preparations for possible future membership, covering political, economic, defence, resource, security and legal aspects;
- a focused and candid feedback mechanism on aspirant countries' progress on their programmes that includes both political and technical advice, as well as annual 19+ 1 meetings at Council level to assess progress;

<sup>(1)</sup>  
Turkey  
recognises the  
Republic of  
Macedonia with its  
constitutional  
name.

- a clearinghouse to help coordinate assistance by NATO and by member states to aspirant countries in the defence/military field;
- a defence planning approach for aspirants which includes elaboration and review of agreed planning targets.

We direct that NATO Foreign Ministers keep the enlargement process, including the implementation of the Membership Action Plan, under continual review and report to us. We will review the process at our next Summit meeting which will be held no later than 2002.

8. We reaffirm our commitment to preserve the transatlantic link, including our readiness to pursue common security objectives through the Alliance wherever possible. We are pleased with the progress achieved in implementing the Berlin decisions and reaffirm our strong commitment to pursue the process of reinforcing the European pillar of the Alliance on the basis of our Brussels Declaration of 1994 and of the principles agreed at Berlin in 1996. We note with satisfaction that the key elements of the Berlin decisions are being put in place. These include flexible options for the selection of a European NATO Commander and NATO Headquarters for WEU-led operations, as well as specific terms of reference for DSACEUR and an adapted CJTF concept. Close linkages between the two organisations have been established, including planning, exercises (in particular a joint crisis management exercise in 2000) and consultation, as well as a framework for the release and return of Alliance assets and capabilities.
9. We welcome the new impetus given to the strengthening of a common European policy in security and defence by the Amsterdam Treaty and the reflections launched since then in the WEU and - following the St. Malo Declaration - in the EU, including the Vienna European Council Conclusions. This is a process which has implications for all Allies. We confirm that a stronger European role will help contribute to the vitality of our Alliance for the 21<sup>st</sup> century, which is the foundation of the collective defence of its members. In this regard:
  - a. We acknowledge the resolve of the European Union to have the capacity for autonomous action so that it can take decisions and approve military action where the Alliance as a whole is not engaged;
  - b. As this process goes forward, NATO and the EU should ensure the development of effective mutual consultation, co-operation and transparency, building on the mechanisms existing between NATO and the WEU;
  - c. We applaud the determination of both EU members and other European Allies to take the necessary steps to strengthen their defence capabilities, especially for new missions, avoiding unnecessary duplication;
  - d. We attach the utmost importance to ensuring the fullest possible involvement of non-EU European Allies in EU-led crisis response operations, building on existing consultation arrangements within the WEU. We also note Canada's interest in participating in such operations under appropriate modalities.
  - e. We are determined that the decisions taken in Berlin in 1996, including the concept of using separable but not separate NATO assets and capabilities for WEU-led operations, should be further developed.
10. On the basis of the above principles and building on the Berlin decisions, we therefore stand ready to define and adopt the necessary arrangements for ready access by the European Union to the collective assets and capabilities of the Alliance, for operations in which the Alliance as a whole is not engaged militarily as an Alliance. The Council in Permanent Session will approve these arrangements, which will respect the requirements of NATO operations and the coherence of its command structure, and should address:



- a. Assured EU access to NATO planning capabilities able to contribute to military planning for EU-led operations;
- b. The presumption of availability to the EU of pre-identified NATO capabilities and common assets for use in EU-led operations;
- c. Identification of a range of European command options for EU-led operations, further developing the role of DSACEUR in order for him to assume fully and effectively his European responsibilities;
- d. The further adaptation of NATO's defence planning system to incorporate more comprehensively the availability of forces for EU-led operations.

We task the Council in Permanent Session to address these measures on an ongoing basis, taking into account the evolution of relevant arrangements in the EU. The Council will make recommendations to the next Ministerial meeting for its consideration.

11. We have launched a Defence Capabilities Initiative to improve the defence capabilities of the Alliance to ensure the effectiveness of future multinational operations across the full spectrum of Alliance missions in the present and foreseeable security environment with a special focus on improving interoperability among Alliance forces (and where applicable also between Alliance and Partner forces). Defence capabilities will be increased through improvements in the deployability and mobility of Alliance forces, their sustainability and logistics, their survivability and effective engagement capability, and command and control and information systems. In this connection, we endorse the Council decision to begin implementing the Multinational Joint Logistics Centre concept by the end of 1999, and to develop the C3 system architecture by 2002 to form a basis for an integrated Alliance core capability allowing interoperability with national systems. We have established a temporary High-Level Steering Group to oversee the implementation of the Defence Capabilities Initiative and to meet the requirement of co-ordination and harmonisation among relevant planning disciplines, including for Allies concerned force planning, with the aim of achieving lasting effects on improvements in capabilities and interoperability. Improvements in interoperability and critical capabilities should also strengthen the European pillar in NATO.
12. We reaffirm our commitment to the 1995 Peace Agreement, negotiated in Dayton and signed in Paris, which established Bosnia and Herzegovina as a single, democratic and multi-ethnic state, and to the full implementation of the Peace Agreement. We reiterate our readiness to work constructively with all Parties that support the Peace Agreement and seek to implement it.
13. The Madrid Peace Implementation Council meeting in December 1998 confirmed that the next two years would be vital in strengthening the peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina and recognised that SFOR's presence remains essential, both to keep the peace and to provide the secure environment and support for civilian implementation. Return of refugees to areas in which they are a minority will remain vital for political stability and reconciliation. We will support efforts to take this process forward.
14. SFOR will continue to work closely and effectively with the High Representative, whose role we support, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, the OSCE and other major international organisations, the UN International Police Task Force and other agencies implementing the civilian aspects of the Peace Agreement. We commend the crucial contribution of men and women of both NATO and Partner countries serving in SFOR, who are helping to bring peace to Bosnia and Herzegovina.
15. SFOR's presence cannot, however, be maintained indefinitely. SFOR is being streamlined through efficiency measures. We note that the Council in Permanent Session is examining options on the future size and structure of SFOR.

16. The continuing crisis in and around Kosovo threatens to further destabilise areas beyond the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY). The potential for wider instability underscores the need for a comprehensive approach to the stabilisation of the crisis region in South-Eastern Europe. We recognise and endorse the crucial importance of making South-Eastern Europe a region free from violence and instability. A new level of international engagement is thus needed to build security, prosperity and democratic civil society, leading in time to full integration into the wider European family.
17. NATO is determined to play its full part in this process by contributing to the building of a more secure and co-operative relationship with and between the countries of the region. Given the differences in economic development and the diversity and complexity of the problems of each country in the region, international efforts to develop and stabilise the region must be comprehensive, coherent and well co-ordinated. To achieve these ends, NATO, the WEU, the EU, the OSCE and the UN must work closely together. The international financial institutions also have a crucial role to play. The Alliance's efforts to enhance regional security and stability in South-Eastern Europe and to help resolve humanitarian problems, and the efforts by other international organisations, as well as those by the countries of the region, should be mutually reinforcing.
18. We will be meeting with colleagues from the countries of South-Eastern Europe tomorrow. We intend to build on that meeting by maintaining NATO's consultations with the countries of the region. Accordingly, we will propose to them a consultative forum on security matters which brings together all NATO members and countries of the region at an appropriate level.
19. We direct the Council in Permanent Session, building on, as appropriate, the existing EAPC and PfP framework, to give substance to this proposal, *inter alia*, in the following areas:
  - 19+ 1 consultations where appropriate;
  - the promotion of regional co-operation in the framework of an EAPC co-operative mechanism, taking into account other regional initiatives;
  - targeted NATO security co-operation programmes for the countries in the region, as appropriate;
  - regionally focused PfP activities and exercises;
  - better targeting and co-ordination of Allies' and Partners' bilateral assistance to the region.
20. The Alliance's efforts to enhance regional security in South-Eastern Europe complement those by other international organisations, as well as those by the countries of the region. We welcome the forthcoming European Union conference on a Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe on 27<sup>th</sup> May 1999, and the South-Eastern Europe Co-operation process, as well as other regional efforts. Coherence and co-ordination between the various initiatives will be of great importance.
21. The security of the Balkan region is essential to achieving lasting stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. Our goal is to see the integration of the countries of the region into the Euro-Atlantic community. We want all the countries and peoples of South-Eastern Europe to enjoy peace and security and establish normal relations with one another, based on respect of human rights, democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.
22. We reaffirm our commitment to consultation, partnership and practical co-operation through the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace. We commit ourselves today to build an enhanced and more operational relationship with Partners for the 21<sup>st</sup> century that strengthens stability, mutual confidence, and security throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. The EAPC and the PfP have transformed political-military relations across the continent and have

become the instruments of choice when the Alliance and its Partners consult and act together in the pursuit of peace and security. We look forward to consulting with our Partners at tomorrow's EAPC Summit meeting.

23. The EAPC, founded in 1997, contributes substantially to stronger political consultation and practical co-operation between the Alliance and its Partners, for solutions to security issues. We applaud this expanded dimension of political consultations, which has enhanced transparency and confidence among all EAPC members. The Alliance and its Partners have consulted regularly on regional security issues, such as on Bosnia and Herzegovina and on Kosovo. We have also developed new areas of co-operation such as peacekeeping, humanitarian de-mining, control over transfer of small arms, and the co-ordination of disaster relief and humanitarian assistance.
24. We welcome the successful fulfillment by the Alliance and its Partners of five years of Partnership for Peace and the full implementation of PfP enhancements launched in 1997. Enhanced PfP has ensured that NATO-Partner co-operation contributes concretely to Euro-Atlantic stability and security. The participation of 15 PfP Partners in IFOR/SFOR demonstrates the real-life benefits of PfP's focus on interoperability and provides valuable lessons for future Alliance-Partner co-operation. The presence of Partner officers in an international capacity in NATO military headquarters enables Partners to participate in planning for NATO-PfP exercises and NATO-led PfP operations. Enhanced PfP has also permitted NATO to take action to assist Albania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia with their unique security concerns.
25. We welcome and take special note of the initiatives designed to make the Partnership more operational and ensure greater Partner involvement in appropriate decision-making and planning, as we had envisioned in our Madrid Declaration. These steps will ensure that the Partnership will be better able to address its objectives, and will provide a solid foundation for its continuing evolution as the core of a co-operative security network between NATO and its Partners for the 21<sup>st</sup> century. To further this goal, we have today approved the following comprehensive package. We have:
  - approved a Political-Military Framework for NATO-led PfP operations, which will enhance Partners' roles in political guidance and oversight, planning, and command arrangements for such operations;
  - endorsed the expanded and adapted Planning and Review Process, which will further enhance interoperability of Partner forces declared available for PfP activities, and will allow for more focused and increased Partner contributions of valuable forces and capabilities for future NATO-led PfP operations;
  - endorsed the outline Operational Capabilities Concept for NATO-led PfP operations, which will provide for deeper military co-operation between the Alliance and Partners with the goal of improving the ability of Partner forces and capabilities to operate with the Alliance in NATO-led PfP operations and directed the Council in Permanent Session to pursue its further development;
  - endorsed the outline programme on enhancing PfP training and education to optimise and harmonise NATO and national PfP activities in order to meet the current and future demands of an enhanced and more operational PfP. The outline programme includes the role of three new PfP tools - a PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes, a PfP Exercise Simulation Network and PfP Training Centres. We directed the Council in Permanent Session to develop a PfP Training and Education Enhancement Programme.
26. We remain firmly committed to our partnership with Russia under the NATO-Russia Founding Act. NATO and Russia have a common objective in strengthening security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area. Throughout the Kosovo crisis, NATO and Russia have shared the common goals of the international community: to halt the violence, to avert a humanitarian catastro-

- phe, and to create the conditions for a political solution. These goals remain valid. Consultation and dialogue are even more important in times of crisis. NATO and its member countries are determined to build on the areas of common ground with Russia concerning the international response to the crisis in Kosovo and remain ready to resume consultations and co-operation in the framework of the Founding Act.
27. Close relations between NATO and Russia are of great importance to stability and security in the Euro-Atlantic area. Since the conclusion of the Founding Act in May 1997, considerable and encouraging progress has been made in intensifying consultation and co-operation with Russia. The NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council has developed into an important venue to consult, to promote transparency and confidence-building, and to foster co-operation. Russia's participation in the implementation of the peace agreement for Bosnia and Herzegovina was a significant step towards a new co-operative relationship. We have developed an extensive dialogue on such matters as disarmament and arms control, including the adaptation of the CFE Treaty; peacekeeping and nuclear weapons issues. Strategy, defence policy and doctrines, budgets and infrastructure development programmes, and non-proliferation, are further examples of this increasing co-operation.
  28. We attach great importance to a strong, enduring and distinctive partnership between NATO and Ukraine. Ukraine has an important role to play in enhancing security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area and in particular in Central and Eastern Europe. We are pleased with the progress reached since the signing of the NATO-Ukraine Charter in Madrid, and will continue to strengthen our distinctive partnership. We continue to support Ukrainian sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity, democratic development, economic prosperity and Ukraine's status as a non-nuclear weapons state as key factors of stability and security in Europe. We encourage Ukraine to carry forward its democratic and economic transformation, including its defence reform, and reaffirm NATO's support for Ukraine's efforts to this end. We applaud the progress made in the Joint Working Group on Defence Reform. We welcome the establishment of a NATO Liaison Office in Kyiv to further enhance Ukraine's role as a distinctive Partner. We also look forward to today's inaugural Summit meeting of the NATO-Ukraine Commission.
  29. The Mediterranean Dialogue is an integral part of the Alliance's co-operative approach to security since security in the whole of Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean. We are pleased with the development of our Mediterranean Dialogue. The Dialogue is progressive in nature and we welcome the progress towards developing broader and deeper co-operation and dialogue with the countries in the Mediterranean region. We endorse the enhancements to the political and practical co-operation of the Mediterranean Dialogue agreed by the Council in Permanent Session and direct it to pursue their early implementation. We encourage Allied nations and Mediterranean Dialogue countries to organise events such as the Rome Conference in 1997 and the Valencia Conference in 1999 as positive steps to strengthen mutual regional understanding. We look forward to further opportunities to strengthen co-operation in areas where NATO can add value, particularly in the military field, and where Dialogue countries have expressed interest. The Dialogue and other international efforts, including the EU Barcelona process, are complementary and mutually reinforcing and thus contribute to transparency and building confidence in the region.
  30. The proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) weapons and their means of delivery can pose a direct military threat to Allies' populations, territory, and forces and therefore continues to be a matter of serious concern for the Alliance. The principal non-proliferation goal of the Alliance and its members is to prevent proliferation from occurring, or, should it occur, to reverse it through diplomatic means. We reiterate our full support for the international non-proliferation regimes and their strengthening. We recognise progress made in this regard. In order to respond to the risks to Alliance security posed by the spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their delivery means, we have launched an Initiative that builds upon work since the Brussels Summit to improve overall Alliance political and military efforts in this area.

31. The WMD Initiative will: ensure a more vigorous, structured debate at NATO leading to strengthened common understanding among Allies on WMD issues and how to respond to them; improve the quality and quantity of intelligence and information-sharing among Allies on proliferation issues; support the development of a public information strategy by Allies to increase awareness of proliferation issues and Allies' efforts to support non-proliferation efforts; enhance existing Allied programmes which increase military readiness to operate in a WMD environment and to counter WMD threats; strengthen the process of information exchange about Allies' national programmes of bilateral WMD destruction and assistance; enhance the possibilities for Allies to assist one another in the protection of their civil populations against WMD risks; and create a WMD Centre within the International Staff at NATO to support these efforts. The WMD initiative will integrate political and military aspects of Alliance work in responding to proliferation.
32. Arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation will continue to play a major role in the achievement of the Alliance's security objectives. NATO has a long-standing commitment in this area. Allied forces, both conventional and nuclear, have been significantly reduced since the end of the Cold War as part of the changed security environment. All Allies are States Parties to the central treaties related to disarmament and non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention and the Chemical Weapons Convention, and are committed to the full implementation of these treaties. NATO is a defensive Alliance seeking to enhance security and stability at the minimum level of forces consistent with the requirements for the full range of Alliance missions. As part of its broad approach to security, NATO actively supports arms control and disarmament, both conventional and nuclear, and pursues its approach against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means. In the light of overall strategic developments and the reduced salience of nuclear weapons, the Alliance will consider options for confidence and security building measures, verification, non-proliferation and arms control and disarmament. The Council in Permanent Session will propose a process to Ministers in December for considering such options. The responsible NATO bodies would accomplish this. We support deepening consultations with Russia in these and other areas in the Permanent Joint Council as well as with Ukraine in the NATO-Ukraine Commission and with other Partners in the EAPC.
33. The CFE Treaty is a cornerstone of European security. We reaffirm our commitment to the successful adaptation of the Treaty reflecting the new security environment and paving the way to greater conventional security and stability in Europe. In the course of the negotiations so far, Members of the Alliance have already declared their intention to undertake reductions in their equipment entitlements or holdings, and we strongly encourage others to follow suit with similar substantial reductions. In this context, we are pleased that agreement has been reached by CFE States Parties in Vienna in March 1999 on the key outstanding issues, permitting drafting work to proceed without delay. Allies will do their utmost to complete an adapted Treaty for signature by the time of the OSCE Istanbul Summit in November 1999. Until the adaptation process is completed, the continued full implementation of the existing Treaty and its associated documents will remain crucial.
34. We call on Russia to ratify the START II Treaty without delay. This would pave the way for considerable reductions of nuclear arsenals and would allow negotiations on a START III Treaty aiming at further far-reaching reductions. We remain committed to an early entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and call upon all countries to accede to and implement the Treaty in due course. We support the early commencement of negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty.
35. We are determined to achieve progress on a legally binding protocol including effective verification measures to enhance compliance and promote transparency that strengthens the implementation of the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. We re-emphasise the importance of universal adherence to, and effective implementation of, the Chemical Weapons Convention. We

- support de-mining efforts in Bosnia, the development of practical initiatives under the auspices of the EAPC, and - for signatories - activities to meet obligations under the Ottawa Convention.
36. We call on Belarus, Russia and Ukraine to ratify the Open Skies Treaty without delay.
  37. We will seek to intensify on a mutually reinforcing basis the Alliance's contacts and co-operation with other international organisations with a role to play in consolidating democracy and preserving peace in the Euro-Atlantic area.
  38. As stated in the Washington Treaty, we recognise the primary responsibility of the United Nations Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security. The Alliance and the UN have worked together effectively in implementing the Peace Agreement in Bosnia and Herzegovina. We look forward to developing further contact and exchanges of information with the United Nations, in the context of co-operation in conflict prevention, crisis management, crisis response operations, including peacekeeping, and humanitarian assistance. In the crisis in Kosovo, the Alliance is using its civil and military capabilities to work with the UNHCR, the lead agency in the field of refugee relief, and other relevant international organisations, in providing humanitarian assistance and refugee relief. The Alliance will consider on a case-by-case basis future co-operation of this kind.
  39. Co-operation and co-ordination between the Alliance and the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe has expanded considerably in the light of the support we have provided to the OSCE-led Kosovo Verification Missions. We hope to make use of these important bridges between our two organisations to work together in conflict prevention, peacekeeping, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation, in the spirit of the OSCE's Common Concept for the Development of Co-operation between Mutually Reinforcing Institutions. We continue to support the efforts of the OSCE to develop a Document-Charter on European Security, worthy of adoption at the OSCE Istanbul Summit in November 1999.
  40. The Alliance and the European Union share common strategic interests. Our respective efforts in building peace in the former Yugoslavia are complementary. Both organisations make decisive contributions to peace and stability on the European continent. Co-operation between the two organisations on topics of common concern, to be decided on a case-by-case basis, could be developed when it enhances the effectiveness of action by NATO and the EU.
  41. The Alliance, in order to adapt its structures to better prepare it to meet future challenges, launched a comprehensive programme including the continuing adaptation of NATO's command structure. Accordingly, Allies welcome the activation decision of the implementation phase of the Alliance's new command structure. This will ensure NATO's ability to carry out the whole range of its missions more effectively and flexibly; support an enlarged Alliance and our more operational relationship with Partners; and provide, as part of the development of the ESDI within NATO, for European command arrangements able to prepare, support, command and conduct WEU-led operations. After successful trials, we have embarked on the full implementation of the CJTF concept, giving us an important new tool for crisis management in the next century. Allies also welcome the full integration of Spain into NATO's military structure from January this year, another significant milestone for the Alliance.
  42. Terrorism constitutes a serious threat to peace, security and stability that can threaten the territorial integrity of States. We reiterate our condemnation of terrorism and reaffirm our determination to combat it in accordance with our international commitments and national legislation. The terrorist threat against deployed NATO forces and NATO installations requires the consideration and development of appropriate measures for their continued protection, taking full account of host nation responsibilities.
  43. NATO Heads of State and Government believe that a key to the future success of the North Atlantic Alliance is the efficient production and availability of advanced weapons and technolo-

gy in support of security for all its members. We also believe that viable defence industries on both sides of the Atlantic are critical to the efficient functioning of NATO military forces. To that end, we welcome continued transatlantic defence industrial co-operation to help ensure interoperability, economies of scale, competition and innovation. We will seek to ensure that NATO's armament activities meet the Alliance's evolving military needs.

44. We welcome the presence in Washington of the President and other representatives of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly (NPA). The NPA plays a significant role in complementing NATO's efforts to project stability throughout Europe. We therefore attach great importance to enhancing our relations with the NPA in areas of common concern. We also appreciate the contribution made by the Atlantic Treaty Association in promoting better understanding of the Alliance and its objectives among our publics.

• • •

45. We express our deep appreciation for the gracious hospitality extended to us by the Government of the United States on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty.





## ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE WASHINGTON SUMMIT

• • •

*“The NATO of the 21<sup>st</sup> century starts today.”  
from the Washington Summit Communiqué*

*From 23-25 April 1999, NATO held the 15<sup>th</sup> Summit in its 50 year history in Washington, DC. The Summit took place during an exceptional period in the Alliance’s history, in the midst of a commemoration of its 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary, tempered by an unprecedented NATO air campaign aimed at bringing peace to Kosovo, in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Although much of the focus at the Summit was necessarily on the crisis in Kosovo, in Washington NATO leaders nonetheless put their imprimatur on a host of other programmes and accomplishments with long-term implications for the Alliance.*

*The achievements of Washington fulfilled the promise of the Madrid Summit held two years earlier, in July 1997. At Madrid, the Alliance invited the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to begin accession talks and promised that the door would remain open to others. In Washington, the leaders of these three countries took their place for the first time at the Summit table, and the Alliance unveiled an initiative designed to help other interested countries prepare for possible membership in the future. “The three new members will not be the last,” Alliance leaders stated in the Washington Summit Communiqué.*

*At Madrid, NATO leaders had pledged to enhance the Partnership for Peace programme and the full range of Alliance partnership activities; in Washington, leaders noted the progress achieved in this regard and unveiled new initiatives designed to continue the work. At Madrid, Alliance leaders had requested a review of the Strategic Concept (in essence the roadmap of Alliance tasks and the means to achieve them); in Washington a new Strategic Concept was approved, one that reflects the transformed Euro-Atlantic security landscape at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. At Madrid, NATO and Ukraine had signed a Charter on a Distinctive Partnership; in Washington NATO leaders and the Ukrainian President held their first Summit meeting and acknowledged the importance of Ukraine to Euro-Atlantic security and stability.*

*The work of the Washington Summit is reflected in all the Summit documentation, but most comprehensively in the Washington Summit Communiqué and the Strategic Concept. The Communiqué captures, in a single document, the major themes of the Summit and of the Alliance at this key period in its history. The Strategic Concept equips the Alliance for the security challenges and opportunities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and guides its future political and military development.*

*The concrete accomplishments of the Summit - in the form of decisions and programmes - have set the stage for the Alliance to enter the 21<sup>st</sup> century. While recognising that the Euro-Atlantic security climate has changed dramatically over the last ten years, the Strategic Concept also acknowledges “the appearance of complex new risks to Euro-Atlantic peace and stability, including oppression, ethnic conflict, economic distress, the collapse of political order, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.” It sets out the Alliance’s purposes and tasks for the future and reflects the resolve of Alliance member countries to maintain an “adequate military capability and clear preparedness to act collectively in the common defence....”*

*An important feature of the transforming military posture of NATO is the development of the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within the Alliance. At the Washington Summit, Alliance leaders*

welcomed the progress achieved so far and called for continuing work to make ESDI a reality. NATO also launched a Defence Capabilities Initiative, designed to help Alliance military forces become more mobile, interoperable, sustainable and effective. Similarly, the Alliance has introduced changes in the integrated military command structure reflecting the transformed security environment. These changes will allow NATO to carry out its operations more efficiently.

The Washington Summit Communiqué outlines another new Alliance initiative, on Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD). NATO's principal aim with regard to these destructive weapons is to "prevent proliferation from occurring, or, should it occur, to reverse it through diplomatic means." In order to respond more effectively to the challenges of proliferation, NATO is establishing a WMD Centre within the International Staff at NATO Headquarters. The Centre will coordinate an integrated political-military approach to the following tasks: encouraging debate and understanding of WMD issues in NATO; enhancing existing programmes to increase military readiness to operate in a WMD environment; and increasing the exchange of information on WMD destruction assistance programmes among allied countries.

Even as they welcomed three new members to their first Summit, NATO leaders emphasized that the door would remain open to others. A Membership Action Plan (MAP), the "practical manifestation of the Open Door," was unveiled at the Summit. The MAP is a programme of activities from which interested countries may choose, on the basis of national decisions and self-selection. The programme covers five areas: political and economic issues, defence/military issues, resources, security and legal issues. NATO stresses that the programme should not be considered a list of criteria for membership, and that active participation in PfP and EAPC remains essential for countries interested in possible future membership. The Alliance underscores the fact that any decision on membership would be made on a case-by-case basis in accordance with the Madrid Summit Declaration and the Washington Summit Declaration.

After the Summit-level meeting of the North Atlantic Council, leaders or representatives from the countries in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council also met in Washington. EAPC leaders discussed the situation in Kosovo and expressed their support for the demands of the international community, and their abhorrence of the policies of violence, repression and ethnic cleansing being carried out in Kosovo by the authorities of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. Leaders expressed their support for broad-based security and for economic and democracy-building efforts for the southeastern Europe region. They also endorsed a report entitled "Towards a Partnership for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century - The Enhanced and more Operational Partnership", which aims to improve the ability of the Alliance and Partner forces to operate together in the future.

Although Russia declined to participate in the Washington Summit because of events in Yugoslavia, NATO leaders through the Washington Summit Communiqué reiterated their commitment to partnership with Russia under the NATO-Russia Founding Act. They also underscored the fact that close relations between NATO and Russia are of mutual interest and of great importance to stability and security in the Euro-Atlantic area.

NATO leaders also held their first-ever summit with the President of Ukraine. Both sides welcomed the progress in their Distinctive Partnership and discussed a variety of Euro-Atlantic security issues.

The Washington Summit Communiqué reiterates the importance of NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue as an integral part of the Alliance's cooperative approach to security. NATO leaders directed the Alliance to pursue early implementation of enhancements to the political and practical cooperation initiated under the Dialogue.

The achievements of the Washington Summit were both practical and conceptual, the fruit of several years of work. They also reflected the immediate priorities of NATO member countries, in particular the urgency of bringing to an end the conflict in Kosovo and restoring the rights of the people of Kosovo. They demonstrated that NATO is an Alliance that has been able to adapt to changing times and has shown itself ready to take on the challenges of the next century.



## ***NATO in the Balkans***

Statement on Kosovo

•

Chairman's Summary of the Meeting of the North Atlantic Council  
at the Level of Heads of State and Government  
with Countries in the Region of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia

•

Statement following the Meetings of Foreign and Defence Ministers

•

Extracts from the Washington Summit Communiqué on NATO's Role  
in the Former Yugoslavia

•

*NATO's Role in Relation to Kosovo*

•

*NATO's Role in Bosnia and Herzegovina*



# STATEMENT ON KOSOVO

• • •

Issued by the Heads of State and Government  
participating in the meeting  
of the North Atlantic Council in Washington, D.C.  
23 and 24 April 1999

1. The crisis in Kosovo represents a fundamental challenge to the values for which NATO has stood since its foundation: democracy, human rights and the rule of law. It is the culmination of a deliberate policy of oppression, ethnic cleansing and violence pursued by the Belgrade regime under the direction of President Milosevic. We will not allow this campaign of terror to succeed. NATO is determined to prevail.
2. NATO's military action against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) supports the political aims of the international community, which were reaffirmed in recent statements by the UN Secretary-General and the European Union: a peaceful, multi-ethnic and democratic Kosovo where all its people can live in security and enjoy universal human rights and freedoms on an equal basis.
3. Our military actions are directed not at the Serb people but at the policies of the regime in Belgrade, which has repeatedly rejected all efforts to solve the crisis peacefully. President Milosevic must:
  - Ensure a verifiable stop to all military action and the immediate ending of violence and repression in Kosovo;
  - Withdraw from Kosovo his military, police and para-military forces;
  - Agree to the stationing in Kosovo of an international military presence;
  - Agree to the unconditional and safe return of all refugees and displaced persons, and unhindered access to them by humanitarian aid organisations; and
  - Provide credible assurance of his willingness to work for the establishment of a political framework agreement based on the Rambouillet accords.
4. There can be no compromise on these conditions. As long as Belgrade fails to meet the legitimate demands of the international community and continues to inflict immense human suffering, Alliance air operations against the Yugoslav war machine will continue. We hold President Milosevic and the Belgrade leadership responsible for the safety of all Kosovar citizens. We will fulfil our promise to the Kosovar people that they can return to their homes and live in peace and security.
5. We are intensifying NATO's military actions to increase the pressure on Belgrade. Allied governments are putting in place additional measures to tighten the constraints on the Belgrade regime. These include intensified implementation of economic sanctions, and an embargo on petroleum products on which we welcome the EU lead. We have directed our Defence Ministers to determine ways that NATO can contribute to halting the delivery of war material including by launching maritime operations, taking into account the possible consequences on Montenegro.
6. NATO is prepared to suspend its air strikes once Belgrade has unequivocally accepted the above mentioned conditions and demonstrably begun to withdraw its forces from Kosovo according to a precise and rapid timetable. This could follow the passage of a United Nations Security Council resolution, which we will seek, requiring the withdrawal of Serb forces and the demilitarisation of

Kosovo and encompassing the deployment of an international military force to safeguard the swift return of all refugees and displaced persons as well as the establishment of an international provisional administration of Kosovo under which its people can enjoy substantial autonomy within the FRY. NATO remains ready to form the core of such an international military force. It would be multinational in character with contributions from non-NATO countries.

7. Russia has a particular responsibility in the United Nations and an important role to play in the search for a solution to the conflict in Kosovo. Such a solution must be based on the conditions of the international community as laid out above. President Milosevic's offers to date do not meet this test. We want to work constructively with Russia, in the spirit of the Founding Act.
8. The long-planned, unrestrained and continuing assault by Yugoslav military, police and paramilitary forces on Kosovars and the repression directed against other minorities of the FRY are aggravating the already massive humanitarian catastrophe. This threatens to destabilise the surrounding region.
9. NATO, its members and its Partners have responded to the humanitarian emergency and are intensifying their refugee and humanitarian relief operations in close cooperation with the UNHCR, the lead agency in this field, and with other relevant organisations. We will continue our assistance as long as necessary. NATO forces are making a major contribution to this task.
10. We pay tribute to the servicemen and women of NATO whose courage and dedication are ensuring the success of our military and humanitarian operations.
11. Atrocities against the people of Kosovo by FRY military, police and paramilitary forces represent a flagrant violation of international law. Our governments will co-operate with the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) to support investigation of all those, including at the highest levels, responsible for war crimes and crimes against humanity. NATO will support the ICTY in its efforts to secure relevant information. There can be no lasting peace without justice.
12. We acknowledge and welcome the courageous support that states in the region are providing to our efforts in Kosovo. The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Albania have played a particularly important role, not least in accepting hundreds of thousands of refugees from Kosovo. The states in the region are bearing substantial economic and social burdens stemming from the current conflict.
13. We will not tolerate threats by the Belgrade regime to the security of its neighbours. We will respond to such challenges by Belgrade to its neighbours resulting from the presence of NATO forces or their activities on their territory during this crisis.
14. We reaffirm our support for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all countries in the region.
15. We reaffirm our strong support for the democratically elected government of Montenegro. Any move by Belgrade to undermine the government of President Djukanovic will have grave consequences. FRY forces should leave the demilitarised zone of Prevlaka immediately.
16. The objective of a free, prosperous, open and economically integrated Southeast Europe cannot be fully assured until the FRY embarks upon the transition to democracy. Accordingly, we express our support for the objective of a democratic FRY which protects the rights of all minorities, including those in Vojvodina and Sandjak, and promise to work for such change through and beyond the current conflict.
17. It is our aim to make stability in Southeast Europe a priority of our transatlantic agenda. Our governments will co-operate urgently through NATO as well as through the OSCE, and for those of us which are members, the European Union, to support the nations of Southeast Europe in forging a better future for their region - one based upon democracy, justice, economic integration, and security co-operation.

## CHAIRMAN'S SUMMARY

• • •

Meeting of the North Atlantic Council  
at the Level of Heads of State and Government with Countries  
in the Region of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia  
25 April 1999

1. NATO Heads of State and Government today met with their counterparts from Albania, Bulgaria, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup>, Romania and Slovenia, and the Foreign Ministers of Bosnia-Herzegovina and Croatia. They discussed the current situation in Kosovo, its impact on the countries in the region and longer term strategies for security, prosperity and stability in Southeastern Europe.
2. There was general agreement that the Kosovo crisis represents a fundamental challenge to the entire Euro-Atlantic community and to the region in particular. NATO Heads of State and Government and leaders of the countries in the region condemned the ongoing violence and repression in Kosovo. They emphasized that the oppression, ethnic cleansing and violence must end and that all refugees and displaced persons must be allowed to return to their homes in safety and security, to allow for a credible, verifiable and durable political solution for Kosovo. They underscored the necessity for the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to accept the international community's demands.
3. The meeting expressed support for the territorial integrity and sovereignty of all states in the region.
4. NATO Heads of State and Government acknowledged that the neighbouring states are particularly affected by the humanitarian, political and economic implications of the crisis. Participants agreed to intensify their efforts to support refugee and humanitarian relief operations.
5. NATO Heads of State and Government expressed their gratitude for the efforts and solidarity shown by the neighbouring states in support of the Alliance's and the international community's objectives. In this context, they reaffirmed that the security of the neighbouring states was of direct and material concern to Alliance member states and that NATO would respond to any challenges by Belgrade to the neighbouring states resulting from the presence of NATO forces and their activities on their territory during this crisis.
6. The meeting also underscored the need for developing a longer term comprehensive strategy with the help of different institutions for securing stability and prosperity based on democratic principles and enhanced economic and political development. Participants emphasized their common aim of forging a better future for the region, including the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, based upon democracy, justice, economic integration and security cooperation. The full implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement was considered an essential element of this process.
7. NATO and the countries in the region agreed to continue consultations both on the current crisis in Kosovo and on the development of a broader strategy for the region.

(1)  
See footnote  
page 15.





## STATEMENT

• • •

issued following the Meetings of the Foreign and Defence Ministers  
at the NATO Summit in Washington D.C.  
23 April 1999

Alliance Foreign and Defence Ministers met informally in separate meetings on 23 April 1999 in the framework of the Washington Summit in order to take stock of developments in the Kosovo crisis.

They exchanged views on the political and military situation and underlined that NATO airstrikes would continue until President Milosevic had met the demands of the international community as reaffirmed by Heads of State and Government today in their statement. They also reviewed the extensive humanitarian support which NATO is providing in Albania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup>. They welcomed the support for NATO offered by Partners in the region and elsewhere.

Foreign Ministers considered ways to promote security and stability in Southeast Europe through NATO as well as through other institutions.

Defence Ministers considered ways that NATO can contribute to halting delivery of war material to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Ministers paid tribute to the many thousands of NATO servicemen and servicewomen for their unstinting commitment to the Alliance's military and humanitarian missions.

(1)  
See footnote  
page 15.



## EXTRACTS FROM THE WASHINGTON SUMMIT COMMUNIQUE ON NATO'S ROLE IN THE FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

• • •

*At the Washington Summit, NATO Heads of State and Government reaffirmed their commitment to the Dayton Peace Agreement and examined the current priority tasks for the Stabilisation Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the need to streamline the Force, as well as to consider its future size and structure. For ease of reference, the relevant paragraphs of the Washington Communiqué (Paragraphs 12 to 15), which refer to these issues, are reproduced below.*

*The Heads of State and Government also discussed the need for a comprehensive approach to the stabilisation of the crisis region in Southeastern Europe. The relevant paragraphs of their communiqué (paragraphs 16 to 21) are also reproduced below.*

*The full text of the communiqué can be found in Part 1 of this booklet.*

- “12. We reaffirm our commitment to the 1995 Peace Agreement, negotiated in Dayton and signed in Paris, which established Bosnia and Herzegovina as a single, democratic and multi-ethnic state, and to the full implementation of the Peace Agreement. We reiterate our readiness to work constructively with all Parties that support the Peace Agreement and seek to implement it.
13. The Madrid Peace Implementation Council meeting in December 1998 confirmed that the next two years would be vital in strengthening the peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina and recognised that SFOR's presence remains essential, both to keep the peace and to provide the secure environment and support for civilian implementation. Return of refugees to areas in which they are a minority will remain vital for political stability and reconciliation. We will support efforts to take this process forward.
14. SFOR will continue to work closely and effectively with the High Representative, whose role we support, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, the OSCE and other major international organisations, the UN International Police Task Force and other agencies implementing the civilian aspects of the Peace Agreement. We commend the crucial contribution of men and women of both NATO and Partner countries serving in SFOR, who are helping to bring peace to Bosnia and Herzegovina.
15. SFOR's presence cannot, however, be maintained indefinitely. SFOR is being streamlined through efficiency measures. We note that the Council in Permanent Session is examining options on the future size and structure of SFOR.”

• • •

- “16. The continuing crisis in and around Kosovo threatens to further destabilise areas beyond the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY). The potential for wider instability underscores the need for a comprehensive approach to the stabilisation of the crisis region in South-Eastern Europe. We recognise and endorse the crucial importance of making South-Eastern Europe a region free from violence and instability. A new level of international engagement is thus needed to build

- security, prosperity and democratic civil society, leading in time to full integration into the wider European family.
17. NATO is determined to play its full part in this process by contributing to the building of a more secure and co-operative relationship with and between the countries of the region. Given the differences in economic development and the diversity and complexity of the problems of each country in the region, international efforts to develop and stabilise the region must be comprehensive, coherent and well co-ordinated. To achieve these ends, NATO, the WEU, the EU, the OSCE and the UN must work closely together. The international financial institutions also have a crucial role to play. The Alliance's efforts to enhance regional security and stability in South-Eastern Europe and to help resolve humanitarian problems, and the efforts by other international organisations, as well as those by the countries of the region, should be mutually reinforcing.
  18. We will be meeting with colleagues from the countries of South-Eastern Europe tomorrow. We intend to build on that meeting by maintaining NATO's consultations with the countries of the region. Accordingly, we will propose to them a consultative forum on security matters which brings together all NATO members and countries of the region at an appropriate level.
  19. We direct the Council in Permanent Session, building on, as appropriate, the existing EAPC and PfP framework, to give substance to this proposal, inter alia, in the following areas:
    - 19+ 1 consultations where appropriate;
    - the promotion of regional co-operation in the framework of an EAPC co-operative mechanism, taking into account other regional initiatives;
    - targeted NATO security co-operation programmes for the countries in the region, as appropriate;
    - regionally focused PfP activities and exercises;
    - better targeting and co-ordination of Allies' and Partners' bilateral assistance to the region.
  20. The Alliance's efforts to enhance regional security in Southeastern Europe complement those by other international organisations, as well as those by the countries of the region. We welcome the forthcoming European Union conference on a Stability Pact for South-Eastern Europe on 27th May 1999, and the South-Eastern Europe Co-operation process, as well as other regional efforts. Coherence and co-ordination between the various initiatives will be of great importance.
  21. The security of the Balkan region is essential to achieving lasting stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. Our goal is to see the integration of the countries of the region into the Euro-Atlantic community. We want all the countries and peoples of South-Eastern Europe to enjoy peace and security and establish normal relations with one another, based on respect of human rights, democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law."

# NATO'S ROLE IN RELATION TO THE CONFLICT IN KOSOVO



## NATO'S OBJECTIVES

*NATO's objectives in relation to the conflict in Kosovo were set out in the Statement issued at the Extraordinary Meeting of the North Atlantic Council held at NATO on 12 April 1999 and were reaffirmed by Heads of State and Government in Washington on 23 April 1999:*

- *a verifiable stop to all military action and the immediate ending of violence and repression;*
- *the withdrawal from Kosovo of the military, 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;*
- *the establishment of a political framework agreement for Kosovo on the basis of the Rambouillet Accords, in conformity with international law and the Charter of the United Nations.*

*Throughout the conflict, the achievement of these objectives, accompanied by measures to ensure their full implementation, has been regarded by the Alliance as the prerequisite for bringing to an end the violence and human suffering in Kosovo.*

## BACKGROUND TO THE CONFLICT

*Kosovo lies in southern Serbia and has a mixed population of which the majority are ethnic Albanians. Until 1989, the region enjoyed a high degree of autonomy within the former Yugoslavia, when Serbian leader Slobodan Milosevic altered the status of the region, removing its autonomy and bringing it under the direct control of Belgrade, the Serbian capital. The Kosovar Albanians strenuously opposed the move.*

*During 1998, open conflict between Serbian military and police forces and Kosovar Albanian forces resulted in the deaths of over 1,500 Kosovar Albanians and forced 400,000 people from their homes. The international community became gravely concerned about the escalating conflict, its humanitarian consequences, and the risk of it spreading to other countries. President Milosevic's disregard for diplomatic efforts aimed at peacefully resolving the crisis and the destabilising role of militant Kosovar Albanian forces was also of concern.*

*On 28 May 1998, the North Atlantic Council, meeting at Foreign Minister level, set out NATO's two major objectives with respect to the crisis in Kosovo, namely:*

- *to help to achieve a peaceful resolution of the crisis by contributing to the response of the international community; and*
- *to promote stability and security in neighbouring countries with particular emphasis on Albania and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup>.*

(1)  
See footnote  
page 15.

*On 12 June 1998 the North Atlantic Council, meeting at Defence Minister level, asked for an assessment of possible further measures that NATO might take with regard to the developing Kosovo Crisis. This led to consideration of a large number of possible military options.*

*On 13 October 1998, following a deterioration of the situation, the NATO Council authorised Activation Orders for air strikes. This move was designed to support 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. At the last moment, following further diplomatic initiatives including visits to Belgrade by NATO's Secretary General Solana, US Envoys Holbrooke and Hill, the Chairman of NATO's Military Committee, General Naumann, and the Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Clark, President Milosevic agreed to comply and the air strikes were called off.*

*UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1199, among other things, expressed deep concern about the excessive use of force by Serbian security forces and the Yugoslav army, and called for a cease-fire by both parties to the conflict. In the spirit of the UNSCR, limits were set on the number of Serbian forces in Kosovo, and on the scope of their operations, following a separate agreement with Generals Naumann and Clark.*

*It was agreed, in addition, that the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) would establish a Kosovo Verification Mission (KVM) to observe compliance on the ground and that NATO would establish an aerial surveillance mission. The establishment of the two missions was endorsed by UN Security Council Resolution 1203. Several non-NATO nations that participate in Partnership for Peace (PfP) agreed to contribute to the surveillance mission organised by NATO.*

*In support of the OSCE, the Alliance established a special military task force to assist with the emergency evacuation of members of the KVM, if renewed conflict should put them at risk. This task force was deployed in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup> under the overall direction of NATO's Supreme Allied Commander Europe.*

*Despite these steps, 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 and disproportionate force by the Serbian Army and Special Police. Some of these incidents were defused through the mediation efforts of the OSCE verifiers but in mid-January, the situation deteriorated further after escalation of the Serbian offensive against Kosovar Albanians.*

*Renewed international efforts were made to give new political impetus to finding a peaceful solution to the conflict. The six-nation Contact Group<sup>2</sup> established by the 1992 London Conference on the Former Yugoslavia met on 29 January. It was agreed to convene urgent negotiations between the parties to the conflict, under international mediation.*

*NATO supported and reinforced the Contact Group efforts by agreeing on 30 January to the use of air strikes if required, and by issuing a warning to both sides in the conflict. These concerted initiatives culminated in initial negotiations in Rambouillet near Paris, from 6 to 23 February, followed by a second round in Paris, from 15 to 18 March. At the end of the second round of talks, the Kosovar Albanian delegation signed the proposed peace agreement, but the talks broke up without a signature from the Serbian delegation.*

*Immediately afterwards, Serbian military and police forces stepped up the intensity of their operations against the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, moving extra troops and modern tanks into the region, in a clear breach of compliance with the October agreement. Tens of thousands of people began to flee their homes in the face of this systematic offensive.*

*On 20 March, the OSCE Kosovo Verification Mission was withdrawn from the region, having faced obstruction from Serbian forces to the extent that they could no longer continue to fulfil their task. US Ambassador Holbrooke then flew to Belgrade, in a final attempt to persuade President Milosevic to stop*

(2)  
France, Italy,  
Germany, Russia,  
United Kingdom  
and United States.

*attacks on the Kosovar Albanians or face imminent NATO air strikes. Milosevic refused to comply, and on 23 March the order was given to commence air strikes (Operation Allied Force).*

*On 10 June 1999, after an air campaign lasting seventy-seven days, NATO Secretary General Javier Solana announced that he had instructed General Wesley Clark, Supreme Allied Commander Europe, temporarily to suspend NATO's air operations against Yugoslavia. This decision was taken after consultations with the North Atlantic Council and confirmation from General Clark that the full withdrawal of Yugoslav forces from Kosovo had begun.*

*The withdrawal was in accordance with the Military-Technical Agreement concluded between NATO and the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on the evening of 9 June. The agreement was signed by Lt. General Sir Michael Jackson, on behalf of NATO, and by Colonel General Svetozar Marjanovic of the Yugoslav Army and Lieutenant General Obrad Stevanovic of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, on behalf of the Governments of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and Republic of Serbia. The withdrawal was also consistent with the agreement between the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and the European Union and Russian special envoys, President Ahtisaari of Finland and Mr. Victor Chernomyrdin, former Prime Minister of Russia, reached on 3 June.*

*The NATO Secretary General announced that he had written to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Mr. Kofi Annan, and to the President of the United Nations Security Council, informing them of these developments. The Secretary General of NATO urged all parties to the conflict to seize the opportunity for peace and called on them to comply with their obligations under the agreements which had now been concluded and under all relevant UN Security Council resolutions.*

*Paying tribute to General Clark and to the forces which had contributed to Operation Allied Force, and to the cohesion and determination of all the Allies, the Secretary General stated that NATO was ready to undertake its new mission to bring the people back to their homes and to build a lasting and just peace in Kosovo.*

*On 10 June the UN Security Council passed a resolution (UNSCR 1244) welcoming the acceptance by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of the principles on a political solution to the Kosovo crisis, including an immediate end to violence and a rapid withdrawal of its military, police and paramilitary forces. The Resolution, adopted by a vote of 14 in favour and none against, with one abstention (China), announced the Security Council's decision to deploy international civil and security presences in Kosovo, under United Nations auspices.*

*Acting under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, the Security Council also decided that the political solution to the crisis would be based on the general principles adopted on 6 May by the Foreign Ministers of the Group of Seven industrialised countries and the Russian Federation - the Group of 8 - and the principles contained in the paper presented in Belgrade by the President of Finland and the Special Representative of the Russian Federation which was accepted by the Government of the Federal Republic on 3 June. Both documents were included as annexes to the Resolution.*

*The principles included, among others, an immediate and verifiable end to violence and repression in Kosovo; the withdrawal of the military, police and paramilitary forces of the Federal Republic; deployment of effective international and security presences, with substantial NATO participation in the security presence and unified command and control; establishment of an interim administration; the safe and free return of all refugees; a political process providing for substantial self-government, as well as the demilitarisation of the Kosovo Liberation Army (KLA); and a comprehensive approach to the economic development of the crisis region.*

*The Security Council authorised Member States and relevant international organisations to establish the international security presence, and decided that its responsibilities would include deterring renewed hostilities, demilitarising the KLA and establishing a secure environment for the return of refugees and in which the international civil presence could operate. The Security Council also authorised the UN*

*Secretary-General to establish the international civil presence and requested him to appoint a Special Representative to control its implementation.*

*Following the adoption of UNSCR 1244, General Jackson, acting on the instructions of the North Atlantic Council, made immediate preparations for the rapid deployment of the security force mandated by the United Nations Security Council.*

*The first elements entered Kosovo on 12 June. As agreed in the Military Technical Agreement, the deployment of the security force - KFOR - was synchronised with the departure of Serb security forces from Kosovo. By 20 June, the Serb withdrawal was complete and KFOR was well established in Kosovo.*

*At its full strength KFOR will comprise some 50.000 personnel. It is a multinational force under unified command and control with substantial NATO participation. Agreement has been reached on the arrangements for participation by the Russian Federation. More than twelve other non-NATO nations have also indicated their intention to contribute to KFOR.*

*Also on 20 June, following confirmation by the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) that Serb security forces had vacated Kosovo, the Secretary General of NATO announced that, in accordance with the Military Technical Agreement, he had formally terminated the air campaign.*

*NATO forces have been at the forefront of the humanitarian efforts to relieve the suffering of the many thousands of refugees forced to flee Kosovo by the Serbian ethnic cleansing campaign. In the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup> NATO troops built refugee camps, refugee reception centres and emergency feeding stations, and moved many hundreds of tons of humanitarian aid to those in need. In Albania, NATO deployed substantial forces to provide similar forms of assistance. NATO has also assisted the UNHCR<sup>3</sup> with co-ordination of humanitarian aid flights as well as supplementing these flights by using aircraft from member countries. The Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) established at NATO in June 1998 has also played an important role in the co-ordination of support to UNHCR relief operations.*

*Of particular concern to NATO countries and to the international community as a whole, from the outset of the crisis, has been the situation of the Kosovar Albanians remaining in Kosovo, whose plight has been described by refugees leaving the province. All indications pointed to organised persecution involving mass executions; exploitation as human shields; rape; mass expulsions; burning and looting of homes and villages; destruction of crops and livestock; suppression of identity, origins and property ownership by confiscation of documents; hunger, starvation and exhaustion; and many other abuses of human rights and international norms of civilised behaviour.*

## **SUPPORT FOR NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES**

*The Alliance has fully recognised the immense humanitarian, political, and economic problems facing the countries in the region as a result of the conflict in Kosovo. In particular, Alliance efforts have focussed on providing immediate practical assistance in dealing with the refugee crisis by reassigning NATO forces in the region to humanitarian tasks.*

*At the beginning of April 1999, the NATO Commander in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup> was given full authority to coordinate NATO's assistance to that country and to establish a forward headquarters in Albania, in coordination with the Albanian authorities and the UNHCR, in order to assess the humanitarian situation and provide support. The North Atlantic Council also tasked the NATO Military Authorities to undertake further planning to this end. Subsequent assistance has included the provision of emergency accommodation and building of refugee camps, and assisting humanitarian aid organisations by providing transport and other forms of help including the distribution of food and aid. NATO countries are providing financial and other support to Albania and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup> and have given reassurances that they would respond to any challenges by Yugoslavia to their security stemming from the presence of NATO forces and their activities on their territories.*

(1) See footnote page 15.

(3) United Nations High Commission for Refugees.



NATO Heads of State and Government in Washington set out their vision for achieving lasting peace, stability and future prosperity, based on increasing integration into the European mainstream, working hand in hand with other institutions towards these goals. They established a process of individual consultations and discussions between the nineteen NATO countries and the countries of the region on a 19+ 1 basis and undertook to promote regional cooperation within the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC). They also agreed to use the resources of the Partnership for Peace (PfP) to provide more direct and focussed assistance in addressing their security concerns. The Alliance also welcomed related measures being taken in other forums, including the European Union proposal to convene a conference on a stability pact for south eastern Europe at the end of May 1999, as well as recognising the role of the G7 group of countries and of financial institutions, like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund, in the process of reconstruction which would have to follow the end of the Kosovo crisis.

## FACTS AND FIGURES

- *Between March 1998 and March 1999, before NATO governments decided upon military action, over 2000 people were killed as a result of the Serb government's policies in Kosovo.*
- *During the summer of 1998, a quarter of a million Kosovar Albanians were forced from their homes as their houses, villages and crops were destroyed.*
- *In January 1999, evidence was discovered, by a United Nations humanitarian team, of the massacre of over 40 people in the village of Racak.*
- *By the beginning of April 1999, the United Nations High Commission for Refugees estimated that the campaign of ethnic cleansing had resulted in 226,000 refugees in Albania, 125,000 in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup>, and 33,000 in Montenegro.*
- *Assistance given by NATO forces to alleviate the refugee situation included providing equipment and building camps to house 50,000 refugees in Albania; assistance in expanding camps in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup>; providing medical support and undertaking emergency surgery on the victims of shootings by Serb forces; transporting refugees to safety; and providing transport for humanitarian aid and supplies.*
- *By the end of May 1999, over 230,000 refugees had arrived in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup>, over 430,000 in Albania and some 64,000 in Montenegro. Approximately 21,500 refugees had reached Bosnia and over 61,000 had been evacuated to other countries. Within Kosovo itself, an estimated 580,000 people had been rendered homeless.*
- *It is estimated that by the end of May, 1.5 million people, i.e. 90% of the population of Kosovo, had been expelled from their homes. Some 225,000 Kosovar men were believed to be missing. At least 5000 Kosvars had been executed.*
- *NATO forces have flown in many thousands of tons of food and equipment into the area. 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.*

(1)

See footnote  
page 15.



## NATO'S ROLE IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA



*At the Washington Summit, Alliance leaders reaffirmed their commitment to the full implementation of the 1995 Peace Agreement, which established Bosnia and Herzegovina as a single, democratic and multi-ethnic state. One of NATO's biggest challenges this decade has been to help keep the peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina first by establishing and leading a multinational, military, Implementation Force (IFOR), from 1995 to 1996, and subsequently by dispatching a similar Stabilisation Force (SFOR) to the region.*

*The Stabilisation Force (SFOR), now numbering around 31,000 troops drawn from 38 nations, supports the efforts of the international community and the United Nations aimed at:*

- *implementing the peace agreement in Bosnia;*
- *preventing the conflict from spreading;*
- *ending the humanitarian crisis; and*
- *helping to create conditions for the country to rebuild itself.*

*NATO's priorities in Bosnia in 1999 are as follows:*

- *maintaining a continued military presence to deter hostilities and providing a secure environment and support for civil implementation;*
- *achieving progress in returning displaced persons to their homes, something that Alliance leaders in Washington considered vital for political stability and reconciliation; and*
- *taking steps to promote reconciliation between the armed forces of the Bosniac-Croat Federation and the Republika Srpska, and to develop the role of the Standing Committee on Military Matters established under the Dayton Peace Agreements, as an effective, centralised defence institution for the country as a whole.*

### BACKGROUND

*From 1992 until the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement at the end of 1995, the Alliance supported United Nations objectives in the former Yugoslavia through various maritime and air operations:*

- *monitoring and enforcing U.N. sanctions by NATO naval forces in the Adriatic (in conjunction with the Western European Union (WEU));*
- *monitoring and enforcing the U.N. no-fly zone over Bosnia by NATO air forces;*
- *providing close air support to the U.N. Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in Bosnia; and*
- *carrying out air strikes to relieve the siege of Sarajevo.*

*Decisive action by the Alliance in support of the United Nations, together with a determined diplomatic effort, led to a genuine cease-fire and made a negotiated solution to the conflict possible in autumn 1995.*

*In December 1995, the North Atlantic Council launched Operation JOINT ENDEAVOUR. The Implementation Force (IFOR), a NATO-led multinational force of some 60,000 personnel, was deployed to implement the military aspects of the Dayton Peace Agreements. IFOR brought together NATO and non-NATO countries in an unprecedented coalition for peace.*

*In December 1996, IFOR was replaced by the Stabilisation Force (SFOR), at that time a force of approximately 30,000 personnel. In the summer of 1998, a transition strategy for SFOR was agreed*

*upon, to permit a gradual and progressive reduction in the size, role and profile of the force to match the transition from military to civil implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement. A process of regular, formal reviews of the scope for force reductions was initiated.*

*In December 1998, the Alliance decided to begin streamlining SFOR - given that it does not intend to maintain SFOR's presence in Bosnia indefinitely at existing levels - and began to examine options for more substantial adjustments in the size and structure of SFOR in the longer term.*

*Moreover, recognising that an international military presence cannot be the sole basis for security and stability in Bosnia in the longer term, NATO has initiated a Security Cooperation Programme (SCP), which is making concrete, practical contributions to strengthening stability and promoting reconciliation within the Bosnian defence community.*



## ***Strategy and Defence***

The Alliance's Strategic Concept

•

Defence Capabilities Initiative

•

*Background to the Strategic Concept*

•

*Development of the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within NATO*

•

*The Combined Joint Task Forces Concept*

•

*Reform of NATO's Integrated Military Command Structure*



# THE ALLIANCE'S STRATEGIC CONCEPT

• • •

Approved by the Heads of State and Government  
participating in the meeting  
of the North Atlantic Council in Washington D.C.  
on 23 and 24 April 1999

## INTRODUCTION

1. At their Summit meeting in Washington in April 1999, NATO Heads of State and Government approved the Alliance's new Strategic Concept.
2. NATO has successfully ensured the freedom of its members and prevented war in Europe during the 40 years of the Cold War. By combining defence with dialogue, it played an indispensable role in bringing East-West confrontation to a peaceful end. The dramatic changes in the Euro-Atlantic strategic landscape brought by the end of the Cold War were reflected in the Alliance's 1991 Strategic Concept. There have, however, been further profound political and security developments since then.
3. The dangers of the Cold War have given way to more promising, but also challenging prospects, to new opportunities and risks. A new Europe of greater integration is emerging, and a Euro-Atlantic security structure is evolving in which NATO plays a central part. The Alliance has been at the heart of efforts to establish new patterns of cooperation and mutual understanding across the Euro-Atlantic region and has committed itself to essential new activities in the interest of a wider stability. It has shown the depth of that commitment in its efforts to put an end to the immense human suffering created by conflict in the Balkans. The years since the end of the Cold War have also witnessed important developments in arms control, a process to which the Alliance is fully committed. The Alliance's role in these positive developments has been underpinned by the comprehensive adaptation of its approach to security and of its procedures and structures. The last ten years have also seen, however, the appearance of complex new risks to Euro-Atlantic peace and stability, including oppression, ethnic conflict, economic distress, the collapse of political order, and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.
4. The Alliance has an indispensable role to play in consolidating and preserving the positive changes of the recent past, and in meeting current and future security challenges. It has, therefore, a demanding agenda. It must safeguard common security interests in an environment of further, often unpredictable change. It must maintain collective defence and reinforce the transatlantic link and ensure a balance that allows the European Allies to assume greater responsibility. It must deepen its relations with its partners and prepare for the accession of new members. It must, above all, maintain the political will and the military means required by the entire range of its missions.
5. This new Strategic Concept will guide the Alliance as it pursues this agenda. It expresses NATO's enduring purpose and nature and its fundamental security tasks, identifies the central

features of the new security environment, specifies the elements of the Alliance's broad approach to security, and provides guidelines for the further adaptation of its military forces.

## **PART I – THE PURPOSE AND TASKS OF THE ALLIANCE**

6. 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 just and lasting peaceful order in Europe. It will continue to do so. The achievement of this aim can be put at risk by crisis and conflict affecting the security of the Euro-Atlantic area. The Alliance therefore not only ensures the defence of its members but contributes to peace and stability in this region.
7. The Alliance embodies the transatlantic link by which the security of North America is permanently tied to the security of Europe. It is the practical expression of effective collective effort among its members in support of their common interests.
8. The fundamental guiding principle by which the Alliance works is that of common commitment and mutual co-operation among sovereign states in support of the indivisibility of security for all of its members. Solidarity and cohesion within the Alliance, through daily cooperation in both the political and military spheres, ensure that no single Ally is forced to rely upon its own national efforts alone in dealing with basic security challenges. Without depriving member states of their right and duty to assume their sovereign responsibilities in the field of defence, the Alliance enables them through collective effort to realise their essential national security objectives.
9. The resulting sense of equal security among the members of the Alliance, regardless of differences in their circumstances or in their national military capabilities, contributes to stability in the Euro-Atlantic area. The Alliance does not seek these benefits for its members alone, but is committed to the creation of conditions conducive to increased partnership, cooperation, and dialogue with others who share its broad political objectives.
10. To achieve its essential purpose, as an Alliance of nations committed to the Washington Treaty and the United Nations Charter, the Alliance performs the following fundamental security tasks:

**Security:** 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.

**Consultation:** 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 co-ordination of their efforts in fields of common concern.

**Deterrence and Defence:** 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:

- **Crisis Management:** 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.



- Partnership: 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.

11. In fulfilling its purpose and fundamental security tasks, the Alliance will continue to respect the legitimate security interests of others, and seek the peaceful resolution of disputes as set out in the Charter of the United Nations. The Alliance will promote peaceful and friendly international relations and support democratic institutions. The Alliance does not consider itself to be any country's adversary.

## **PART II – STRATEGIC PERSPECTIVES**

### **THE EVOLVING STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT**

12. The Alliance operates in an environment of continuing change. Developments in recent years have been generally positive, but uncertainties and risks remain which can develop into acute crises. Within this evolving context, NATO has played an essential part in strengthening Euro-Atlantic security since the end of the Cold War. Its growing political role; its increased political and military partnership, cooperation and dialogue with other states, including with Russia, Ukraine and Mediterranean Dialogue countries; its continuing openness to the accession of new members; its collaboration with other international organisations; its commitment, exemplified in the Balkans, to conflict prevention and crisis management, including through peace support operations: all reflect its determination to shape its security environment and enhance the peace and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area.
13. In parallel, NATO has successfully adapted to enhance its ability to contribute to Euro-Atlantic peace and stability. Internal reform has included a new command structure, including the Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept, the creation of arrangements to permit the rapid deployment of forces for the full range of the Alliance's missions, and the building of the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within the Alliance.
14. The United Nations (UN), the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the European Union (EU), and the Western European Union (WEU) have made distinctive contributions to Euro-Atlantic security and stability. Mutually reinforcing organisations have become a central feature of the security environment.
15. The United Nations Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security and, as such, plays a crucial role in contributing to security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area.
16. The OSCE, as a regional arrangement, is the most inclusive security organisation in Europe, which also includes Canada and the United States, and plays an essential role in promoting peace and stability, enhancing cooperative security, and advancing democracy and human rights in Europe. The OSCE is particularly active in the fields of preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention, crisis management, and post-conflict rehabilitation. NATO and the OSCE have developed close practical cooperation, especially with regard to the international effort to bring peace to the former Yugoslavia.
17. The European Union has taken important decisions and given a further impetus to its efforts to strengthen its security and defence dimension. This process will have implications for the entire Alliance, and all European Allies should be involved in it, building on arrangements developed by NATO and the WEU. The development of a common foreign and security policy (CFSP) includes the progressive framing of a common defence policy. Such a policy, as called for in the Amsterdam Treaty, would be compatible with the common security and defence policy estab-

lished within the framework of the Washington Treaty. Important steps taken in this context include the incorporation of the WEU's Petersberg tasks into the Treaty on European Union and the development of closer institutional relations with the WEU.

18. As stated in the 1994 Summit declaration and reaffirmed in Berlin in 1996, the Alliance fully supports the development of the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance by making available its assets and capabilities for WEU-led operations. To this end, the Alliance and the WEU have developed a close relationship and put into place key elements of the ESDI as agreed in Berlin. In order to enhance peace and stability in Europe and more widely, the European Allies are strengthening their capacity for action, including by increasing their military capabilities. The increase of the responsibilities and capacities of the European Allies with respect to security and defence enhances the security environment of the Alliance.
19. The stability, transparency, predictability, lower levels of armaments, and verification which can be provided by arms control and non-proliferation agreements support NATO's political and military efforts to achieve its strategic objectives. The Allies have played a major part in the significant achievements in this field. These include the enhanced stability produced by the CFE Treaty, the deep reductions in nuclear weapons provided for in the START treaties; the signature of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, the indefinite and unconditional extension of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the accession to it of Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine as non-nuclear weapons states, and the entry into force of the Chemical Weapons Convention. The Ottawa Convention to ban anti-personnel landmines and similar agreements make an important contribution to alleviating human suffering. There are welcome prospects for further advances in arms control in conventional weapons and with respect to nuclear, chemical, and biological (NBC) weapons.

## **SECURITY CHALLENGES AND RISKS**

20. Notwithstanding positive developments in the strategic environment and the fact that large-scale conventional aggression against the Alliance is highly unlikely, the possibility of such a threat emerging over the longer term exists. The security of the Alliance remains subject to a wide variety of military and non-military risks which are multi-directional and often difficult to predict. These risks include uncertainty and instability in and around the Euro-Atlantic area and the possibility of regional crises at the periphery of the Alliance, which could evolve rapidly. Some countries in and around the Euro-Atlantic area face serious economic, social and political difficulties. Ethnic and religious rivalries, territorial disputes, inadequate or failed efforts at reform, the abuse of human rights, and the dissolution of states can lead to local and even regional instability. The resulting tensions could lead to crises affecting Euro-Atlantic stability, to human suffering, and to armed conflicts. Such conflicts could affect the security of the Alliance by spilling over into neighbouring countries, including NATO countries, or in other ways, and could also affect the security of other states.
21. The existence of powerful nuclear forces outside the Alliance also constitutes a significant factor which the Alliance has to take into account if security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area are to be maintained.
22. The proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery remains a matter of serious concern. In spite of welcome progress in strengthening international non-proliferation regimes, major challenges with respect to proliferation remain. The Alliance recognises that proliferation can occur despite efforts to prevent it and can pose a direct military threat to the Allies' populations, territory, and forces. Some states, including on NATO's periphery and in other regions, sell or acquire or try to acquire NBC weapons and delivery means. Commodities and technology that could be used to build these weapons of mass destruction and their delivery means are becoming more common, while detection and prevention of illicit trade in these materials and know-how continues to be difficult. Non-state actors have shown the potential to create and use some of these weapons.

23. The global spread of technology that can be of use in the production of weapons may result in the greater availability of sophisticated military capabilities, permitting adversaries to acquire highly capable offensive and defensive air, land, and sea-borne systems, cruise missiles, and other advanced weaponry. In addition, state and non-state adversaries may try to exploit the Alliance's growing reliance on information systems through information operations designed to disrupt such systems. They may attempt to use strategies of this kind to counter NATO's superiority in traditional weaponry.
24. Any armed attack on the territory of the Allies, from whatever direction, would be covered by Articles 5 and 6 of the Washington Treaty. However, Alliance security must also take account of the global context. Alliance security interests can be affected by other risks of a wider nature, including acts of terrorism, sabotage and organised crime, and by the disruption of the flow of vital resources. The uncontrolled movement of large numbers of people, particularly as a consequence of armed conflicts, can also pose problems for security and stability affecting the Alliance. Arrangements exist within the Alliance for consultation among the Allies under Article 4 of the Washington Treaty and, where appropriate, co-ordination of their efforts including their responses to risks of this kind.

### **PART III – THE APPROACH TO SECURITY IN THE 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY**

25. The Alliance is committed to a broad approach to security, which recognises the importance of political, economic, social and environmental factors in addition to the indispensable defence dimension. This broad approach forms the basis for the Alliance to accomplish its fundamental security tasks effectively, and its increasing effort to develop effective cooperation with other European and Euro-Atlantic organisations as well as the United Nations. Our collective aim is to build a European security architecture in which the Alliance's contribution to the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area and the contribution of these other international organisations are complementary and mutually reinforcing, both in deepening relations among Euro-Atlantic countries and in managing crises. NATO remains the essential forum for consultation among the Allies and the forum for agreement on policies bearing on the security and defence commitments of its members under the Washington Treaty.
26. The Alliance seeks to preserve peace and to reinforce Euro-Atlantic security and stability by: the preservation of the transatlantic link; the maintenance of effective military capabilities sufficient for deterrence and defence and to fulfil the full range of its missions; the development of the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance; an overall capability to manage crises successfully; its continued openness to new members; and the continued pursuit of partnership, cooperation, and dialogue with other nations as part of its co-operative approach to Euro-Atlantic security, including in the field of arms control and disarmament.

#### **THE TRANSATLANTIC LINK**

27. NATO is committed to a strong and dynamic partnership between Europe and North America in support of the values and interests they share. The security of Europe and that of North America are indivisible. Thus the Alliance's commitment to the indispensable transatlantic link and the collective defence of its members is fundamental to its credibility and to the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area.

## **THE MAINTENANCE OF ALLIANCE MILITARY CAPABILITIES**

28. 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. Such a capability, together with political solidarity, remains at the core of the Alliance's ability to prevent any attempt at coercion or intimidation, and to guarantee that military aggression directed against the Alliance can never be perceived as an option with any prospect of success.
29. Military capabilities effective under the full range of foreseeable circumstances are also the basis of the Alliance's ability to contribute to conflict prevention and crisis management through non-Article 5 crisis response operations. These missions can be highly demanding and can place a premium on the same political and military qualities, such as cohesion, multinational training, and extensive prior planning, that would be essential in an Article 5 situation. Accordingly, while they may pose special requirements, they will be handled through a common set of Alliance structures and procedures.

## **THE EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENCE IDENTITY**

30. The Alliance, which is the foundation of the collective defence of its members and through which common security objectives will be pursued wherever possible, remains committed to a balanced and dynamic transatlantic partnership. The European Allies have taken decisions to enable them to assume greater responsibilities in the security and defence field in order to enhance the peace and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area and thus the security of all Allies. On the basis of decisions taken by the Alliance, in Berlin in 1996 and subsequently, the European Security and Defence Identity will continue to be developed within NATO. This process will require close cooperation between NATO, the WEU and, if and when appropriate, the European Union. It will enable all European Allies to make a more coherent and effective contribution to the missions and activities of the Alliance as an expression of our shared responsibilities; it will reinforce the transatlantic partnership; and it will assist the European Allies to act by themselves as required through the readiness of the Alliance, on a case-by-case basis and by consensus, to make its assets and capabilities available for operations in which the Alliance is not engaged militarily under the political control and strategic direction either of the WEU or as otherwise agreed, taking into account the full participation of all European Allies if they were so to choose.

## **CONFLICT PREVENTION AND CRISIS MANAGEMENT**

31. In pursuit of its policy of preserving peace, preventing war, and enhancing security and stability and as set out in the fundamental security tasks, NATO will seek, in cooperation with other organisations, to prevent conflict, or, should a crisis arise, to contribute to its effective management, consistent with international law, including through the possibility of conducting non-Article 5 crisis response operations. The Alliance's preparedness to carry out such operations supports the broader objective of reinforcing and extending stability and often involves the participation of NATO's Partners. NATO recalls its offer, made in Brussels in 1994, to support on a case-by-case basis in accordance with its own procedures, peacekeeping and other operations under the authority of the UN Security Council or the responsibility of the OSCE, including by making available Alliance resources and expertise. In this context NATO recalls its subsequent decisions with respect to crisis response operations in the Balkans. Taking into account the necessity for Alliance solidarity and cohesion, participation in any such operation or mission will remain subject to decisions of member states in accordance with national constitutions.
32. NATO will make full use of partnership, cooperation and dialogue and its links to other organisations to contribute to preventing crises and, should they arise, defusing them at an early stage. A coherent approach to crisis management, as in any use of force by the Alliance, will require the Alliance's political authorities to choose and co-ordinate appropriate responses from a range of both political and military measures and to exercise close political control at all stages.

## **PARTNERSHIP, COOPERATION, AND DIALOGUE**

33. Through its active pursuit of partnership, cooperation, and dialogue, the Alliance is a positive force in promoting security and stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. Through outreach and openness, the Alliance seeks to preserve peace, support and promote democracy, contribute to prosperity and progress, and foster genuine partnership with and among all democratic Euro-Atlantic countries. This aims at enhancing the security of all, excludes nobody, and helps to overcome divisions and disagreements that could lead to instability and conflict.
34. The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) will remain the overarching framework for all aspects of NATO's cooperation with its Partners. It offers an expanded political dimension for both consultation and cooperation. EAPC consultations build increased transparency and confidence among its members on security issues, contribute to conflict prevention and crisis management, and develop practical cooperation activities, including in civil emergency planning, and scientific and environmental affairs.
35. The Partnership for Peace is the principal mechanism for forging practical security links between the Alliance and its Partners and for enhancing interoperability between Partners and NATO. Through detailed programmes that reflect individual Partners' capacities and interests, Allies and Partners work towards transparency in national defence planning and budgeting; democratic control of defence forces; preparedness for civil disasters and other emergencies; and the development of the ability to work together, including in NATO-led PfP operations. The Alliance is committed to increasing the role the Partners play in PfP decision-making and planning, and making PfP more operational. NATO has undertaken to consult with any active participant in the Partnership if that Partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence, or security.
36. Russia plays a unique role in Euro-Atlantic security. Within the framework of the NATO-Russia Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security, NATO and Russia have committed themselves to developing their relations on the basis of common interest, reciprocity and transparency to achieve a lasting and inclusive peace in the Euro-Atlantic area based on the principles of democracy and co-operative security. NATO and Russia have agreed to give concrete substance to their shared commitment to build a stable, peaceful and undivided Europe. A strong, stable and enduring partnership between NATO and Russia is essential to achieve lasting stability in the Euro-Atlantic area.
37. Ukraine occupies a special place in the Euro-Atlantic security environment and is an important and valuable partner in promoting stability and common democratic values. NATO is committed to further strengthening its distinctive partnership with Ukraine on the basis of the NATO-Ukraine Charter, including political consultations on issues of common concern and a broad range of practical cooperation activities. The Alliance continues to support Ukrainian sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity, democratic development, economic prosperity and its status as a non-nuclear weapons state as key factors of stability and security in central and eastern Europe and in Europe as a whole.
38. The Mediterranean is an area of special interest to the Alliance. Security in Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean. NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue process is an integral part of NATO's co-operative approach to security. It provides a framework for confidence building, promotes transparency and cooperation in the region, and reinforces and is reinforced by other international efforts. The Alliance is committed to developing progressively the political, civil, and military aspects of the Dialogue with the aim of achieving closer cooperation with, and more active involvement by, countries that are partners in this Dialogue.

## **ENLARGEMENT**

39. The Alliance remains open to new members under Article 10 of the Washington Treaty. It expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, and as NATO determines that the inclusion of these nations would serve the overall political and strategic interests of the Alliance, strengthen its effectiveness and cohesion, and enhance overall European security and stability. To this end, NATO has established a programme of activities to assist aspiring countries in their preparations for possible future membership in the context of its wider relationship with them. No European democratic country whose admission would fulfil the objectives of the Treaty will be excluded from consideration.

## **ARMS CONTROL, DISARMAMENT, AND NON-PROLIFERATION**

40. The Alliance's policy of support for arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation will continue to play a major role in the achievement of the Alliance's security objectives. The Allies seek to enhance security and stability at the lowest possible level of forces consistent with the Alliance's ability to provide for collective defence and to fulfil the full range of its missions. The Alliance will continue to ensure that - as an important part of its broad approach to security - defence and arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation objectives remain in harmony. The Alliance will continue to actively contribute to the development of arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation agreements as well as to confidence and security building measures. The Allies take seriously their distinctive role in promoting a broader, more comprehensive and more verifiable international arms control and disarmament process. The Alliance will enhance its political efforts to reduce dangers arising from the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery. The principal non-proliferation goal of the Alliance and its members is to prevent proliferation from occurring or, should it occur, to reverse it through diplomatic means. The Alliance attaches great importance to the continuing validity and the full implementation by all parties of the CFE Treaty as an essential element in ensuring the stability of the Euro-Atlantic area.

## **PART IV – GUIDELINES FOR THE ALLIANCE'S FORCES**

### **PRINCIPLES OF ALLIANCE STRATEGY**

41. The Alliance will maintain the necessary military capabilities to accomplish the full range of NATO's missions. The principles of Allied solidarity and strategic unity remain paramount for all Alliance missions. Alliance forces must safeguard NATO's military effectiveness and freedom of action. The security of all Allies is indivisible: an attack on one is an attack on all. With respect to collective defence under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, the combined military forces of the Alliance must be capable of deterring any potential aggression against it, of stopping an aggressor's advance as far forward as possible should an attack nevertheless occur, and of ensuring the political independence and territorial integrity of its member states. They must also be prepared to contribute to conflict prevention and to conduct non-Article 5 crisis response operations. The Alliance's forces have essential roles in fostering cooperation and understanding with NATO's Partners and other states, particularly in helping Partners to prepare for potential participation in NATO-led PfP operations. Thus they contribute to the preservation of peace, to the safeguarding of common security interests of Alliance members, and to the maintenance of the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area. By deterring the use of NBC weapons, they contribute to Alliance efforts aimed at preventing the proliferation of these weapons and their delivery means.

42. The achievement of the Alliance's aims depends critically on the equitable sharing of the roles, risks and responsibilities, as well as the benefits, of common defence. The presence of United States conventional and nuclear forces in Europe remains vital to the security of Europe, which is inseparably linked to that of North America. The North American Allies contribute to the Alliance through military forces available for Alliance missions, through their broader contribution to international peace and security, and through the provision of unique training facilities on the North American continent. The European Allies also make wide-ranging and substantial contributions. As the process of developing the ESDI within the Alliance progresses, the European Allies will further enhance their contribution to the common defence and to international peace and stability including through multinational formations.
43. The principle of collective effort in Alliance defence is embodied in practical arrangements that enable the Allies to enjoy the crucial political, military and resource advantages of collective defence, and prevent the renationalisation of defence policies, without depriving the Allies of their sovereignty. These arrangements also enable NATO's forces to carry out non-Article 5 crisis response operations and constitute a prerequisite for a coherent Alliance response to all possible contingencies. They are based on procedures for consultation, an integrated military structure, and on co-operation agreements. Key features include collective force planning; common funding; common operational planning; multinational formations, headquarters and command arrangements; an integrated air defence system; a balance of roles and responsibilities among the Allies; the stationing and deployment of forces outside home territory when required; arrangements, including planning, for crisis management and reinforcement; common standards and procedures for equipment, training and logistics; joint and combined doctrines and exercises when appropriate; and infrastructure, armaments and logistics cooperation. The inclusion of NATO's Partners in such arrangements or the development of similar arrangements for them, in appropriate areas, is also instrumental in enhancing cooperation and common efforts in Euro-Atlantic security matters.
44. Multinational funding, including through the Military Budget and the NATO Security Investment Programme, will continue to play an important role in acquiring and maintaining necessary assets and capabilities. The management of resources should be guided by the military requirements of the Alliance as they evolve.
45. The Alliance supports the further development of the ESDI within the Alliance, including by being prepared to make available assets and capabilities for operations under the political control and strategic direction either of the WEU or as otherwise agreed.
46. To protect peace and to prevent war or any kind of coercion, the Alliance will maintain for the foreseeable future an appropriate mix of nuclear and conventional forces based in Europe and kept up to date where necessary, although at a minimum sufficient level. Taking into account the diversity of risks with which the Alliance could be faced, it must maintain the forces necessary to ensure credible deterrence and to provide a wide range of conventional response options. But the Alliance's conventional forces alone cannot ensure credible deterrence. Nuclear weapons make a unique contribution in rendering the risks of aggression against the Alliance incalculable and unacceptable. Thus, they remain essential to preserve peace.

## **THE ALLIANCE'S FORCE POSTURE**

### THE MISSIONS OF ALLIANCE MILITARY FORCES

47. The primary role of Alliance military forces is to protect peace and to guarantee the territorial integrity, political independence and security of member states. The Alliance's forces must therefore be able to deter and defend effectively, to maintain or restore the territorial integrity of Allied nations and - in case of conflict - to terminate war rapidly by making an aggressor reconsider his decision, cease his attack and withdraw. NATO forces must maintain the ability to provide for collective defence while conducting effective non-Article 5 crisis response operations.

48. The maintenance of the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area is of key importance. An important aim of the Alliance and its forces is to keep risks at a distance by dealing with potential crises at an early stage. In the event of crises which jeopardise Euro-Atlantic stability and could affect the security of Alliance members, the Alliance's military forces may be called upon to conduct crisis response operations. They may also be called upon to contribute to the preservation of international peace and security by conducting operations in support of other international organisations, complementing and reinforcing political actions within a broad approach to security.
49. In contributing to the management of crises through military operations, the Alliance's forces will have to deal with a complex and diverse range of actors, risks, situations and demands, including humanitarian emergencies. Some non-Article 5 crisis response operations may be as demanding as some collective defence missions. Well-trained and well-equipped forces at adequate levels of readiness and in sufficient strength to meet the full range of contingencies as well as the appropriate support structures, planning tools and command and control capabilities are essential in providing efficient military contributions. The Alliance should also be prepared to support, on the basis of separable but not separate capabilities, operations under the political control and strategic direction either of the WEU or as otherwise agreed. The potential participation of Partners and other non-NATO nations in NATO-led operations as well as possible operations with Russia would be further valuable elements of NATO's contribution to managing crises that affect Euro-Atlantic security.
50. Alliance military forces also contribute to promoting stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area by their participation in military-to-military contacts and in other cooperation activities and exercises under the Partnership for Peace as well as those organised to deepen NATO's relationships with Russia, Ukraine and the Mediterranean Dialogue countries. They contribute to stability and understanding by participating in confidence-building activities, including those which enhance transparency and improve communication; as well as in verification of arms control agreements and in humanitarian de-mining. Key areas of consultation and cooperation could include inter alia: training and exercises, interoperability, civil-military relations, concept and doctrine development, defence planning, crisis management, proliferation issues, armaments cooperation as well as participation in operational planning and operations.

#### GUIDELINES FOR THE ALLIANCE'S FORCE POSTURE

51. To implement the Alliance's fundamental security tasks and the principles of its strategy, the forces of the Alliance must continue to be adapted to meet the requirements of the full range of Alliance missions effectively and to respond to future challenges. The posture of Allies' forces, building on the strengths of different national defence structures, will conform to the guidelines developed in the following paragraphs.
52. The size, readiness, availability and deployment of the Alliance's military forces will reflect its commitment to collective defence and to conduct crisis response operations, sometimes at short notice, distant from their home stations, including beyond the Allies' territory. The characteristics of the Alliance's forces will also reflect the provisions of relevant arms control agreements. Alliance forces must be adequate in strength and capabilities to deter and counter aggression against any Ally. They must be interoperable and have appropriate doctrines and technologies. They must be held at the required readiness and deployability, and be capable of military success in a wide range of complex joint and combined operations, which may also include Partners and other non-NATO nations.



53. This means in particular:
- a. that the overall size of the Allies' forces will be kept at the lowest levels consistent with the requirements of collective defence and other Alliance missions; they will be held at appropriate and graduated readiness;
  - b. that the peacetime geographical distribution of forces will ensure a sufficient military presence throughout the territory of the Alliance, including the stationing and deployment of forces outside home territory and waters and forward deployment of forces when and where necessary. Regional and, in particular, geostrategic considerations within the Alliance will have to be taken into account, as instabilities on NATO's periphery could lead to crises or conflicts requiring an Alliance military response, potentially with short warning times;
  - c. that NATO's command structure will be able to undertake command and control of the full range of the Alliance's military missions including through the use of deployable combined and joint HQs, in particular CJTF headquarters, to command and control multinational and multi-service forces. It will also be able to support operations under the political control and strategic direction either of the WEU or as otherwise agreed, thereby contributing to the development of the ESDI within the Alliance, and to conduct NATO-led non-Article 5 crisis response operations in which Partners and other countries may participate;
  - d. that overall, the Alliance will, in both the near and long term and for the full range of its missions, require essential operational capabilities such as an effective engagement capability; deployability and mobility; survivability of forces and infrastructure; and sustainability, incorporating logistics and force rotation. To develop these capabilities to their full potential for multinational operations, interoperability, including human factors, the use of appropriate advanced technology, the maintenance of information superiority in military operations, and highly qualified personnel with a broad spectrum of skills will be important. Sufficient capabilities in the areas of command, control and communications as well as intelligence and surveillance will serve as necessary force multipliers;
  - e. that at any time a limited but militarily significant proportion of ground, air and sea forces will be able to react as rapidly as necessary to a wide range of eventualities, including a short-notice attack on any Ally. Greater numbers of force elements will be available at appropriate levels of readiness to sustain prolonged operations, whether within or beyond Alliance territory, including through rotation of deployed forces. Taken together, these forces must also be of sufficient quality, quantity and readiness to contribute to deterrence and to defend against limited attacks on the Alliance;
  - f. that the Alliance must be able to build up larger forces, both in response to any fundamental changes in the security environment and for limited requirements, by reinforcement, by mobilising reserves, or by reconstituting forces when necessary. This ability must be in proportion to potential threats to Alliance security, including potential long-term developments. It must take into account the possibility of substantial improvements in the readiness and capabilities of military forces on the periphery of the Alliance. Capabilities for timely reinforcement and resupply both within and from Europe and North America will remain of critical importance, with a resulting need for a high degree of deployability, mobility and flexibility;
  - g. that appropriate force structures and procedures, including those that would provide an ability to build up, deploy and draw down forces quickly and selectively, are necessary to permit measured, flexible and timely responses in order to reduce and defuse tensions. These arrangements must be exercised regularly in peacetime;
  - h. that the Alliance's defence posture must have the capability to address appropriately and effectively the risks associated with the proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery,

which also pose a potential threat to the Allies' populations, territory, and forces. A balanced mix of forces, response capabilities and strengthened defences is needed;

- i. that the Alliance's forces and infrastructure must be protected against terrorist attacks.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF CONVENTIONAL FORCES

54. It is essential that the Allies' military forces have a credible ability to fulfil the full range of Alliance missions. This requirement has implications for force structures, force and equipment levels; readiness, availability, and sustainability; training and exercises; deployment and employment options; and force build-up and mobilisation capabilities. The aim should be to achieve an optimum balance between high readiness forces capable of beginning rapidly, and immediately as necessary, collective defence or non-Article 5 crisis response operations; forces at different levels of lower readiness to provide the bulk of those required for collective defence, for rotation of forces to sustain crisis response operations, or for further reinforcement of a particular region; and a longer-term build-up and augmentation capability for the worst case – but very remote – scenario of large scale operations for collective defence. A substantial proportion of Alliance forces will be capable of performing more than one of these roles.
55. Alliance forces will be structured to reflect the multinational and joint nature of Alliance missions. Essential tasks will include controlling, protecting, and defending territory; ensuring the unimpeded use of sea, air, and land lines of communication; sea control and protecting the deployment of the Alliance's sea-based deterrent; conducting independent and combined air operations; ensuring a secure air environment and effective extended air defence; surveillance, intelligence, reconnaissance and electronic warfare; strategic lift; and providing effective and flexible command and control facilities, including deployable combined and joint headquarters.
56. The Alliance's defence posture against the risks and potential threats of the proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery must continue to be improved, including through work on missile defences. As NATO forces may be called upon to operate beyond NATO's borders, capabilities for dealing with proliferation risks must be flexible, mobile, rapidly deployable and sustainable. Doctrines, planning, and training and exercise policies must also prepare the Alliance to deter and defend against the use of NBC weapons. The aim in doing so will be to further reduce operational vulnerabilities of NATO military forces while maintaining their flexibility and effectiveness despite the presence, threat or use of NBC weapons.
57. Alliance strategy does not include a chemical or biological warfare capability. The Allies support universal adherence to the relevant disarmament regimes. But, even if further progress with respect to banning chemical and biological weapons can be achieved, defensive precautions will remain essential.
58. Given reduced overall force levels and constrained resources, the ability to work closely together will remain vital for achieving the Alliance's missions. The Alliance's collective defence arrangements in which, for those concerned, the integrated military structure plays the key role, are essential in this regard. The various strands of NATO's defence planning need to be effectively coordinated at all levels in order to ensure the preparedness of the forces and supporting structures to carry out the full spectrum of their roles. Exchanges of information among the Allies about their force plans contribute to securing the availability of the capabilities needed for the execution of these roles. Consultations in case of important changes in national defence plans also remain of key importance. Cooperation in the development of new operational concepts will be essential for responding to evolving security challenges. The detailed practical arrangements that have been developed as part of the ESDI within the Alliance contribute to close allied co-operation without unnecessary duplication of assets and capabilities.
59. To be able to respond flexibly to possible contingencies and to permit the effective conduct of Alliance missions, the Alliance requires sufficient logistics capabilities, including transport capac-

ities, medical support and stocks to deploy and sustain all types of forces effectively. Standardisation will foster cooperation and cost-effectiveness in providing logistic support to allied forces. Mounting and sustaining operations outside the Allies' territory, where there may be little or no host-nation support, will pose special logistical challenges. The ability to build-up larger, adequately equipped and trained forces, in a timely manner and to a level able to fulfil the full range of Alliance missions, will also make an essential contribution to crisis management and defence. This will include the ability to reinforce any area at risk and to establish a multinational presence when and where this is needed. Forces of various kinds and at various levels of readiness will be capable of flexible employment in both intra-European and transatlantic reinforcement. This will require control of lines of communication, and appropriate support and exercise arrangements.

60. The interaction between Alliance forces and the civil environment (both governmental and non-governmental) in which they operate is crucial to the success of operations. Civil-military cooperation is interdependent: military means are increasingly requested to assist civil authorities; at the same time civil support to military operations is important for logistics, communications, medical support, and public affairs. Cooperation between the Alliance's military and civil bodies will accordingly remain essential.
61. The Alliance's ability to accomplish the full range of its missions will rely increasingly on multinational forces, complementing national commitments to NATO for the Allies concerned. Such forces, which are applicable to the full range of Alliance missions, demonstrate the Alliance's resolve to maintain a credible collective defence; enhance Alliance cohesion; and reinforce the transatlantic partnership and strengthen the ESDI within the Alliance. Multinational forces, particularly those capable of deploying rapidly for collective defence or for non-Article 5 crisis response operations, reinforce solidarity. They can also provide a way of deploying more capable formations than might be available purely nationally, thus helping to make more efficient use of scarce defence resources. This may include a highly integrated, multinational approach to specific tasks and functions, an approach which underlies the implementation of the CJTF concept. For peace support operations, effective multinational formations and other arrangements involving Partners will be valuable. In order to exploit fully the potential offered by multinational formations, improving interoperability, inter alia through sufficient training and exercises, is of the highest importance.

#### CHARACTERISTICS OF NUCLEAR FORCES

62. The fundamental purpose of the nuclear forces of the Allies is political: to preserve peace and prevent coercion and any kind of war. They will continue to fulfil an essential role by ensuring uncertainty in the mind of any aggressor about the nature of the Allies' response to military aggression. They demonstrate that aggression of any kind is not a rational option. The supreme guarantee of the security of the Allies is provided by the strategic nuclear forces of the Alliance, particularly those of the United States; the independent nuclear forces of the United Kingdom and France, which have a deterrent role of their own, contribute to the overall deterrence and security of the Allies.
63. A credible Alliance nuclear posture and the demonstration of Alliance solidarity and common commitment to war prevention continue to require widespread participation by European Allies involved in collective defence planning in nuclear roles, in peacetime basing of nuclear forces on their territory and in command, control and consultation arrangements. Nuclear forces based in Europe and committed to NATO provide an essential political and military link between the European and the North American members of the Alliance. The Alliance will therefore maintain adequate nuclear forces in Europe. These forces need to have the necessary characteristics and appropriate flexibility and survivability, to be perceived as a credible and effective element of the Allies' strategy in preventing war. They will be maintained at the minimum level sufficient to preserve peace and stability.

64. The Allies concerned consider that, with the radical changes in the security situation, including reduced conventional force levels in Europe and increased reaction times, NATO's ability to defuse a crisis through diplomatic and other means or, should it be necessary, to mount a successful conventional defence has significantly improved. The circumstances in which any use of nuclear weapons might have to be contemplated by them are therefore extremely remote. Since 1991, therefore, the Allies have taken a series of steps which reflect the post-Cold War security environment. These include a dramatic reduction of the types and numbers of NATO's sub-strategic forces including the elimination of all nuclear artillery and ground-launched short-range nuclear missiles; a significant relaxation of the readiness criteria for nuclear-armed forces; and the termination of standing peacetime nuclear contingency plans. NATO's nuclear forces no longer target any country. Nonetheless, NATO will maintain, at the minimum level consistent with the prevailing security environment, adequate sub-strategic forces based in Europe which will provide an essential link with strategic nuclear forces, reinforcing the transatlantic link. These will consist of dual capable aircraft and a small number of United Kingdom Trident warheads. Sub-strategic nuclear weapons will, however, not be deployed in normal circumstances on surface vessels and attack submarines.

## CONCLUSION

65. As the North Atlantic Alliance enters its sixth decade, it must be ready to meet the challenges and opportunities of a new century. The Strategic Concept reaffirms the enduring purpose of the Alliance and sets out its fundamental security tasks. It enables a transformed NATO to contribute to the evolving security environment, supporting security and stability with the strength of its shared commitment to democracy and the peaceful resolution of disputes. The Strategic Concept will govern the Alliance's security and defence policy, its operational concepts, its conventional and nuclear force posture and its collective defence arrangements, and will be kept under review in the light of the evolving security environment. In an uncertain world the need for effective defence remains, but in reaffirming this commitment the Alliance will also continue making full use of every opportunity to help build an undivided continent by promoting and fostering the vision of a Europe whole and free.

# DEFENCE CAPABILITIES INITIATIVE



## INTRODUCTION

1. At Washington, NATO Heads of State and Government launched a Defence Capabilities Initiative. The objective of this initiative is to improve defence capabilities to ensure the effectiveness of future multinational operations across the full spectrum of Alliance missions in the present and foreseeable security environment with a special focus on improving interoperability among Alliance forces, and where applicable also between Alliance and Partner forces.

### The Challenge: Adapting Capabilities for a New Security Environment

2. In accordance with the Alliance's new Strategic Concept, NATO must continue to maintain capabilities to deal with large-scale aggression against one or more of the members, although the probability of this occurring in the foreseeable future is low. Warning times for the possible emergence of such a threat are likely to remain long. Potential threats to Alliance security are more likely to result from regional conflicts, ethnic strife or other crises beyond Alliance territory, as well as the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery.
3. Future Alliance military operations, including non-Article 5 crisis response operations, are likely to be smaller in scale than those which were the basis for Alliance planning during the Cold War. They may also be longer in duration, extend multinational cooperation to lower levels and take place concurrently with other Alliance operations. In many cases non-Article 5 operations will include force contributions from Partners and possibly other non-Allied nations. Operations outside Alliance territory may need to be undertaken with no, or only limited, access to existing NATO infrastructure. It may not be possible to invoke existing national emergency legislation to provide civilian transport assets for deployments or to mobilise reserves. These developments will make new demands on the capabilities required of Alliance forces, in particular in the field of interoperability. It is important that all nations are able to make a fair contribution to the full spectrum of Alliance missions regardless of differences in national defence structures.
4. Significant progress has been made in recent years in adapting Alliance forces to the requirements of this new security environment. However, many Allies have only relatively limited capabilities for the rapid deployment of significant forces outside national territory, or for extended sustainment of operations and protection of forces far from home bases. Command and control and information systems need to be better matched to the requirements of future Alliance military operations which will entail the exchange of a much greater volume of information and extending to lower levels than in the past. Maintaining the effectiveness of multinational operations will require particular attention to the challenges of interoperability. In this context, increased attention must be paid to human factors (such as common approaches to doctrine, training and operational procedures) and standardisation, as well as to the challenges posed by the accelerating pace of technological change and the different speeds at which Allies introduce advanced capabilities. Improvements in interoperability and critical capabilities should also strengthen the European pillar in NATO.

## THE WAY AHEAD

5. Against this background, the Alliance has examined areas where improvements in capabilities would make a significant contribution towards meeting the challenges of the future. The aim has been to develop a common assessment of requirements for the full range of Alliance missions. In identifying the most important areas for improvement, and with a special focus on interoperability, the work has concentrated on the deployability and mobility of Alliance forces, on their sustainability and logistics, their survivability and effective engagement capability, and on command and control and information systems. In some cases it has been possible at this early stage to set out the steps to be taken to improve some capabilities. In others, further work is required to examine different options and make firm recommendations about improvements to be made. The initiative emphasises the importance of the resource dimension of this work as well as the requirement for better coordination between defence planning disciplines; takes into consideration the ability of European Allies to undertake WEU-led operations; addresses ways to improve capabilities of multinational formations; and considers issues such as training, doctrine, human factors, concept development and experimentation, and standardisation.
6. As part of this Defence Capabilities Initiative, Heads of State and Government have established a temporary High Level Steering Group (HLSG) to oversee the implementation of the DCI and to meet the requirement of coordination and harmonisation among relevant planning disciplines including for Allies concerned force planning, and with NATO standardisation, with the aim of achieving lasting effects on improvements in capabilities and interoperability.

## BACKGROUND TO THE STRATEGIC CONCEPT



*At the Washington Summit, the NATO Allies approved a strategy – the Strategic Concept – to equip the Alliance for the security challenges and opportunities of the 21<sup>st</sup> century and to guide its future political and military development.*

*The updated Strategic Concept provides overall guidance for the development of detailed policies and military plans. It describes the **Purpose and Tasks of the Alliance** and examines its **Strategic Perspectives** in the light of the evolving strategic environment and security challenges and risks. Setting out the **Alliance’s Approach to Security in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century**, the Concept reaffirms the importance of the transatlantic link and of maintaining the Alliance’s military capabilities and examines the role of other key elements in the Alliance’s broad approach to stability and security, namely the European Security and Defence Identity; conflict prevention and crisis management; partnership, cooperation and dialogue; enlargement; and arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation. Finally, the Concept gives **Guidelines for the Alliance’s Forces** based on the principles of Alliance strategy and the characteristics of the Alliance’s force posture. This includes sections addressing the missions of Alliance military forces and guidelines for the Alliance’s force posture as well as the characteristics of conventional and nuclear forces.*

*The Strategic Concept was first published in 1991. The new version, like its predecessor, is the authoritative statement of the Alliance’s objectives and provides the highest level guidance on the political and military means to be used in achieving them.*

### HISTORICAL NOTE

*The initial formulation of NATO strategy was known as “The Strategic Concept for the Defence of the North Atlantic Area”. Developed between October 1949 and April 1950, it set out a strategy of large-scale operations for territorial defence. In the mid-1950s the strategy of “massive retaliation” was developed. It emphasised deterrence based on the threat that NATO would respond to any aggression against its member countries by every means at its disposal, specifically including nuclear weapons.*

*Discussions of possible changes in this strategic approach began later in the 1950s and continued until 1967 when, following intensive debate within the Alliance, “massive retaliation” was replaced by the strategy of “flexible response”. This concentrated on giving NATO the advantages of flexibility and of creating uncertainty in the minds of any potential aggressor about NATO’s response in the case of a threat to the sovereignty or independence of any single member country. The concept was designed to ensure that aggression of any kind would be perceived as involving unacceptable risks.*

*The above strategies were enshrined in classified documents, which provided guidance to national governments and points of reference for military planning activities. They were not addressed to the general public. Although the underlying concepts were well known, little public discussion about their details was possible because their effectiveness depended greatly on secrecy. They reflected the realities of the Cold War, the political division of Europe and the confrontational ideological and military situation which characterised East-West relations for many years.*

*As the Cold War continued, however, the Alliance also sought to reduce its dangers and to lay the grounds for progress towards a more positive relationship with the Soviet Union and the other members of the Warsaw Pact. The Harmel Report, published in 1967, thus established defence and dialogue, including arms control, as the dual pillars of the Alliance's approach to security.*

*With the end of the Cold War era, the political situation in Europe and the overall military situation were transformed. A new Strategic Concept evolved during the two years following the fall of the Berlin Wall. This was debated and discussed within the Alliance and was completed in November 1991. Bearing little relation to previous concepts, it emphasised cooperation with former adversaries as opposed to confrontation. It maintained the security of its member nations as NATO's fundamental purpose but combined this with the specific obligation to work towards improved and expanded security for Europe as a whole. In other respects, too, the 1991 Strategic Concept differed dramatically from its predecessors: it was issued as a public document, open for discussion and comment by parliaments, security specialists, journalists and the wider public.*

*In 1997, NATO leaders agreed that the Concept should be reexamined and updated to reflect the changes that had taken place in Europe since its adoption, while confirming the Allies' commitment to collective defence and the transatlantic link and ensuring that NATO strategy is fully adapted to the challenges of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Intensive work was undertaken throughout the Alliance, to conclude the revision by the time of the Washington Summit.*

*In common with all other Alliance business, the approval of the Concept required consensus on both the substance and the language of the document by all the member countries of the Alliance. Against the background of the accession of three new member countries, representatives of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland were present from the outset of the discussions.*



## DEVELOPMENT OF THE EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENCE IDENTITY (ESDI) WITHIN NATO



*The North Atlantic Alliance is based on a shared commitment to the security of the Euro-Atlantic area by the European and North American members of the Alliance. Over recent years, the Alliance has been giving increasing recognition to the need to strengthen the European component of NATO through the development of the European and Security Defence Identity (ESDI).*

*At the Washington Summit, Alliance leaders reaffirmed their commitments to preserving the transatlantic link while reinforcing the European pillar of the Alliance on the basis of the Brussels Declaration of 1994 and the principles agreed at Berlin in 1996.*

*The 1994 Brussels Summit confirmed that the emergence of ESDI would strengthen the European pillar of the Alliance, enabling the European allies to take greater responsibility for their common security and defence while reinforcing the transatlantic link.*

*The Allies have been engaged since the 1994 Summit in fulfilling these commitments in concrete terms. Particularly important was the decision taken by Foreign and Defence Ministers, at their respective June 1996 meetings in Berlin and Brussels, to develop the ESDI within the Alliance. In pursuit of this aim, Ministers have taken a series of measures designed to prepare for operations led by the Western European Union (WEU), through the creation of coherent and effective forces capable of operating under the political control and strategic direction of the WEU. They have consulted regularly on the development of ESDI at their twice-yearly meetings. The Permanent Council of the WEU and NATO, meeting both separately and jointly, were charged with implementation.*

*The Washington Summit confirmed that the key elements of the Berlin agenda on building ESDI within the Alliance had been completed. This included:*

- *arrangements for the release, monitoring, and return or recall of NATO assets and capabilities made available, on a case-by-case basis, to support WEU-led operations;*
- *arrangements for close NATO-WEU consultations on planning and conducting WEU-led operations using NATO assets and capabilities;*
- *arrangements for the effective sharing of information, including intelligence, that NATO and the WEU would require in the context of WEU-led operations;*
- *arrangements to enable NATO's command structure to provide headquarters elements and command positions for conducting WEU-led operations;*
- *arrangements for supporting within the Alliance all European Allies in planning for the conduct of WEU-led operations on the basis, among other things, of illustrative mission profiles provided by the WEU;*
- *arrangements for incorporating the requirements for WEU-led operations in NATO's defence planning process; and*

- *testing and refining these and other features of the Alliance's support for WEU-led operations in the course of a 1998 NATO-WEU workshop and a 1999 NATO-WEU seminar, and through a joint NATO-WEU crisis management exercise scheduled for 2000.*

*The Washington Summit set out a number of principles, on the basis of which - and building on the Berlin decisions - Alliance Heads of State and Government declared their readiness to define and adopt the necessary arrangements for ready access by the European Union to the collective assets and capabilities of NATO for operations in which the Alliance as a whole is not engaged militarily as an Alliance.*

# THE COMBINED JOINT TASK FORCES CONCEPT



## THE CJTF CONCEPT IN BRIEF

- A **force** is any grouping of military capabilities, manpower and equipment in organised units.
- A **task force** is a group organised for the purposes of carrying out a specific mission or task. The group is then disbanded when the task has been accomplished.
- A **joint task force** is one involving two or more military services (army, navy, airforce, etc.).
- A **combined joint task force** involves the forces of two or more nations.

A Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) is a multinational, multi-service deployable task force generated and tailored primarily, but not exclusively, for military operations not involving the defence of Alliance territory, such as humanitarian relief and peacekeeping. It provides a flexible and efficient means whereby the Alliance can generate rapidly deployable forces with appropriate command and control arrangements.

The wide variety of circumstances under which CJTFs might operate places considerable demands on the command and control arrangements for such operations. The role of the CJTF headquarters is therefore crucial. CJTF headquarters “nuclei” or core staffs are being established on a permanent basis within selected “parent” headquarters of the NATO military command structure. The headquarters “nuclei” join with “augmentation” modules and “support” modules appropriate to a particular operation to form a CJTF headquarters specifically structured to meet the requirements of the operation in question.

## BACKGROUND

The CJTF concept was launched in late 1993 and was endorsed at the Brussels Summit of January 1994. On that occasion, Alliance Heads of State and Government directed that the further development of the concept should reflect their readiness to make NATO assets available, on the basis of case-by-case decisions by the North Atlantic Council, for operations led by the Western European Union (WEU), thereby supporting the building of the European Security and Defence Identity. In addition, they linked the development of the CJTF concept to practical political-military cooperation in the context of the Partnership for Peace (PfP).

The respective meetings of Alliance Foreign and Defence Ministers in Berlin and Brussels in June 1996 approved an overall political-military framework for the CJTF concept. The first phase of military implementation established the viability of the concept through staff work and trials involving three CJTF “parent” headquarters. The second phase was devoted to a thorough assessment of:

- (a) the Alliance’s capability to deploy small- and large-scale, land- and sea-based CJTF headquarters; and
- (b) any need to nominate additional CJTF “parent” headquarters.

*Based on this assessment, the third and final phase of implementation has commenced.*

*Trials and analyses have demonstrated the value of the CJTF concept. NATO Military Authorities are now working on the concept's full implementation. This process, which includes the acquisition of necessary headquarters support and command, control and communications equipment, is currently estimated for completion in late 2004. The implementation process is taking fully into account lessons learned from NATO-led operations in the former Yugoslavia.*

## REFORM OF NATO'S INTEGRATED MILITARY COMMAND STRUCTURE

• • •

*The role of the integrated military structure of NATO is to provide the organisational framework for fulfilling the military responsibilities and undertaking the military tasks given to the Alliance by its member governments.*

*Some of those tasks have to do with the basic obligation of the Alliance to defend its member countries against threats to their security, in accordance with Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty. Others relate to the implementation of the Alliance's new missions, that is, discretionary operations beyond those required by the commitment to collective defence of Article 5.*

*NATO has very few permanent military forces and only relatively small integrated, multinational staffs at the various military headquarters and agencies which make up the integrated military command structure. The majority of so-called "NATO Forces" are forces that remain under national control and only become available to the Alliance in specific circumstances. They are then placed under the responsibility of NATO military commanders. The integrated military command structure is the agreed basis for organising, training and controlling these forces.*

*The new security environment has allowed NATO countries to reorganise their forces. In most cases, this has meant introducing major reductions in nuclear weapons, cutting back conventional ground, air and naval forces by 30% to 40%, and reducing levels of readiness.*

*NATO countries have also endorsed a blueprint for developing a new NATO military command structure designed to enable the Alliance to carry out the whole range of its missions more effectively, including crisis management, peace-keeping or other peace support operations.*

*The new structure will comprise two Strategic Commands (SCs) - one for the Atlantic and one for Europe - with a simplified subordinate structure of regional and sub-regional commands.*

*There will be a reduction in the number of command headquarters located in different member countries, from the current 65 to 20. The result will be a structure that is more flexible and better adapted to NATO's present-day requirements. This will facilitate cooperation between NATO and its partner countries. Moreover, the new structure will also incorporate a framework for commanding operations involving rapidly deployable, multinational, multi-service units adapted to the requirements of the Alliance's Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF) concept.*

*The transition to the new command structure is a complex process, calling for new headquarters to be activated and former headquarters to be deactivated in a coordinated way, while ensuring that there is no overall reduction in the operational effectiveness of the Alliance. The whole process has to be managed within existing resource limitations and will not be fully implemented before the year 2003.*





## ***NATO's Open Door***

**Membership Action Plan**

•

*The Accession of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland*

•

*NATO's Open Door Policy*





## MEMBERSHIP ACTION PLAN (MAP)

• • •

1. The door to NATO membership under Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty remains open. The Membership Action Plan (MAP), building on the Intensified, Individual Dialogue on membership questions, is designed to reinforce that firm commitment to further enlargement by putting into place a programme of activities to assist aspiring countries in their preparations for possible future membership. It must be understood that decisions made by aspirants on the basis of advice received will remain national decisions undertaken and implemented at the sole responsibility of the country concerned.
2. The programme offers aspirants a list of activities from which they may select those they consider of most value to help them in their preparations. Active participation in PfP and EAPC mechanisms remains essential for aspiring countries who wish to further deepen their political and military involvement in the work of the Alliance.
3. Any decision to invite an aspirant to begin accession talks with the Alliance will be made on a case-by-case basis by Allies in accordance with paragraph 8 of the Madrid Summit Declaration, and the Washington Summit Declaration. Participation in the Membership Action Plan, which would be on the basis of self-differentiation, does not imply any timeframe for any such decision nor any guarantee of eventual membership. The programme cannot be considered as a list of criteria for membership.

### **IMPLEMENTATION**

4. The Membership Action Plan, which is a practical manifestation of the Open Door, is divided into five chapters. These chapters are:
  - I. Political and Economic issues
  - II. Defence/Military issues
  - III. Resource issues
  - IV. Security issues
  - V. Legal issue

Within each, the MAP identifies issues that might be discussed (non-exhaustive) and highlights mechanisms through which preparation for possible eventual membership can best be carried forward.

The list of issues identified for discussion does not constitute criteria for membership and is intended to encompass those issues which the aspiring countries themselves have identified as matters which they wish to address.

5. Each aspiring country will be requested to draw up an annual national programme on preparations for possible future membership, setting objectives and targets for its preparations and containing specific information on steps being taken, the responsible authorities and, where appropriate, a schedule of work on specific aspects of those preparations. It would be open to aspirants to update the programme when they chose. The programme would form a basis for the Alliance to keep track of aspirants' progress and to provide feedback.

6. Meetings will take place in a 19+1 format in the Council and other bodies and in NATO IS/NMA Team formats as appropriate.
7. Feedback and advice to aspirants on MAP issues will be provided through mechanisms based on those currently in use for Partners, 19+1 meetings and NATO Team workshops. These workshops will be held, when justified, to discuss particular issues drawn from the MAP.
8. The NATO Team will normally be headed by the appropriate Assistant Secretary General, Assistant Director of the International Military Staff, Head of Office or his representative. The NATO Team will liaise closely with the appropriate NATO bodies regarding advice to aspirants. Relevant procedures will be refined over time as experience is gained. Aspirants should make requests in writing for workshops to ASG/PA. He will be responsible for the implementation of the Membership Action Plan and the scheduling of meetings under the overall direction and coordination of the SPC(R).
9. Each year the Alliance will draw up for individual aspirants a report providing feedback focused on progress made in the areas covered in their annual national programmes. This document would form the basis of discussion at a meeting of the North Atlantic Council with the aspirant country. The report would help identify areas for further action, but it would remain at the aspirant's discretion to commit itself to taking further action.

## I. POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ISSUES

1. Aspirants would be offered the opportunity to discuss and substantiate their willingness and ability to assume the obligations and commitments under the Washington Treaty and the relevant provisions of the Study on NATO Enlargement. Future members must conform to basic principles embodied in the Washington Treaty such as democracy, individual liberty and other relevant provisions set out in its Preamble.
2. Aspirants would also be expected:
  - (a) to settle their international disputes by peaceful means;
  - (b) to demonstrate commitment to the rule of law and human rights;
  - (c) to settle ethnic disputes or external territorial disputes including irredentist claims or internal jurisdictional disputes by peaceful means in accordance with OSCE principles and to pursue good neighbourly relations;
  - (d) to establish appropriate democratic and civilian control of their armed forces;
  - (e) to refrain from the threat or use of force in any manner inconsistent with the purposes of the UN;
  - (f) to contribute to the development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions and by promoting stability and well-being;
  - (g) to continue fully to support and be engaged in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and the Partnership for Peace;
  - (h) to show a commitment to promoting stability and well-being by economic liberty, social justice and environmental responsibility.

3. Moreover, aspirants would be expected upon accession:
  - (a) to unite their efforts for collective defence and for the preservation of peace and security;
  - (b) to maintain the effectiveness of the Alliance through the sharing of responsibilities, costs and benefits;
  - (c) to commit themselves to good faith efforts to build consensus on all issues;
  - (d) to undertake to participate fully in the Alliance consultation and decision-making process on political and security issues of concern to the Alliance;
  - (e) to commit themselves to the continued openness of the Alliance in accordance with the Washington Treaty and the Madrid and Washington Summit Declarations.

### **IMPLEMENTATION**

4. Aspirants will be expected to describe how their policies and practice are evolving to reflect the considerations set out above (in paragraphs 1-2 above), and to provide their views on, and substantiate their willingness and ability to comply with other parts of the NATO “acquis”, including the NATO Strategic Concept, the development of the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance, the NATO-Russia Founding Act and the NATO-Ukraine Charter.
5. Aspirants would be expected to provide information on an annual basis on the state of their economy, including main macro-economic and budgetary data as well as pertinent economic policy developments.
6. Aspirants would be asked to provide a written contribution to the NATO Team, which would then be passed directly on to the Allies for their comments. After appropriate consultation in the Alliance, the NATO Team would then convene a meeting to discuss the contribution provided and relevant political issues. Such meetings would be held yearly; additional meetings could be convened upon mutual agreement.
7. An annual Senior Political Committee (Reinforced) meeting will be held to provide direct feedback from Allies to individual aspirants.

## **II. DEFENCE/MILITARY ISSUES**

1. The ability of aspiring countries to contribute militarily to collective defence and to the Alliance’s new missions and their willingness to commit to gradual improvements in their military capabilities will be factors to be considered in determining their suitability for NATO membership. Full participation in operational PfP is an essential component, as it will further deepen aspirants’ political and military ties with the Alliance, helping them prepare for participation in the full range of new missions. New members of the Alliance must be prepared to share the roles, risks, responsibilities, benefits and burdens of common security and collective defence. They should be expected to subscribe to Alliance strategy as set out in the Strategic Concept and as laid out in other Ministerial statements.
2. Aspirants would be expected upon accession:
  - (a) to accept the approach to security outlined in the Strategic Concept;

- (b) to provide forces and capabilities for collective defence and other Alliance missions;
- (c) to participate, as appropriate, in the military structure;
- (d) to participate, as appropriate, in the Alliance's collective defence planning;
- (e) to participate, as appropriate, in NATO agencies;
- (f) to continue fully to support PfP and the development of cooperative relations with non-NATO Partners;
- (g) to pursue standardisation and/or interoperability.

## **IMPLEMENTATION**

3. The following measures are designed to help aspirants develop the capabilities of their armed forces, including by enhancing interoperability, to be able to contribute to the effectiveness of the Alliance and thus demonstrate their suitability for future membership. The measures build where possible on extant initiatives.
- (a) Aspirants will be able in accordance with existing PfP procedures to request tailored Individual Partnership Programmes to better focus their participation in PfP directly on the essential membership related issues. Within each IPP, certain generic areas would be marked as being essential for aspirants, and aspirants would be invited to give due priority to those areas of cooperation.
  - (b) Annual Clearinghouse meetings for aspirants in a 19+ 1 format would be developed to help coordinate bilateral and multilateral assistance and maximise their mutual effectiveness to better assist them in their preparations for membership.
  - (c) Within the general framework of the expanded and adapted PARP and in accordance with PARP procedures, planning targets specifically covering areas most directly relevant for nations preparing their force structures and capabilities for possible future Alliance membership will be elaborated with aspirants. Aspirants will undergo a review process on their progress in meeting these planning targets.
  - (d) These planning targets will be established on the basis of consultations between each aspiring country and NATO and may be applied to any component of their force structures, rather than solely to their PfP-declared forces.
  - (e) PARP Ministerial Guidance will include approaches and specific measures which aspirants might adopt, in the context of the MAP, to prepare their forces for possible future NATO membership.
  - (f) The PARP Survey will be used for aspirants to seek more information and data in a number of areas, for example, general defence policy, resources, and present and planned outlays for defence.
  - (g) As a sign of transparency, and in accordance with PARP procedures: aspirants will be encouraged to circulate individual PARP documents to other aspirants in addition to circulating them to NATO Allies; and aspirants will be encouraged to invite, in particular, other aspiring countries to participate in the review process on planning targets.
  - (h) Aspirants will be invited to observe and participate in selected, clearly defined phases of NATO-only exercises when Council decides to open these in accordance with current procedures. Priority consideration will be given to ensuring exercise effectiveness.

- (i) Any future NATO facilities established for the assessment of Partner forces for NATO-led peace support operations and of Partner performance in NATO/PfP exercises and operations will be used to assess the degree of interoperability and the range of capabilities of aspirants' forces. If these assessment facilities are extended to encompass forces beyond those for peace support operations, they will be used to assist aspirants.
- (j) Appropriate use may be made of simulation technology for training forces and procedures.

### **III. RESOURCE ISSUES**

1. New Alliance members would be expected to commit sufficient budget resources to allow themselves to meet the commitments entailed by possible membership. National programmes of aspirants must put in place the necessary structures to plan and implement defence budgets that meet established defence priorities and make provision for training schemes to familiarise staff with NATO practices and procedures in order to prepare for possible future participation in Alliance structures.
2. Aspirants would be expected upon accession:
  - (a) to allocate sufficient budget resources for the implementation of Alliance commitments;
  - (b) to have the national structures in place to deal with those budget resources;
  - (c) to participate in the Alliance's common-funded activities at agreed cost shares;
  - (d) to participate in Alliance structures (permanent representation at the NATO HQ; military representation in the NATO command structure; participation, as appropriate, in NATO Agencies).

#### **IMPLEMENTATION**

3. Through existing mechanisms, including those within PfP, possible internships and training sessions, and NATO Team workshops, aspirants upon request will be:
  - (a) provided advice on their development of national structures, procedures and mechanisms to deal with the above issues and to ensure the most efficient use of their defence spending;
  - (b) assisted in training the staff needed to man those structures and work in and with NATO.

### **IV. SECURITY ISSUES**

1. Aspirants would be expected upon accession to have in place sufficient safeguards and procedures to ensure the security of the most sensitive information as laid down in NATO security policy.

## IMPLEMENTATION

2. Appropriate courses may be made available, on request, to aspiring countries on Personnel, Physical, Document, Industrial Security and INFOSEC. Individual programmes for aspirants may be developed as warranted. The NATO Security and Special Committees may wish to meet with aspirants, whenever they judge it necessary or useful

## V. LEGAL ISSUES

1. In order to be able to undertake the commitments of membership, aspirants should examine and become acquainted with the appropriate legal arrangements and agreements which govern cooperation within NATO. This should enable aspirants to scrutinise domestic law for compatibility with those NATO rules and regulations. In addition, aspirants should be properly informed about the formal legal process leading to membership.
  - (a) New members, upon completion of the relevant procedures, will accede to:

The North Atlantic Treaty (Washington, 4<sup>th</sup> April 1949)
  - (b) Upon invitation, new members should accede to:
    - (i) The Agreement between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces (London SOFA) (London, 19<sup>th</sup> June 1951)
    - (ii) The Protocol on the status of International Military Headquarters set up pursuant to the North Atlantic Treaty (Paris Protocol) (Paris, 28<sup>th</sup> August 1952)
  - (c) It is expected that new members accede to the following status agreements:
    - (i) The Agreement on the status of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation, National Representatives and International Staff (Ottawa Agreement) (Ottawa, 20<sup>th</sup> September 1951)
    - (ii) The Agreement on the status of Missions and Representatives of third States to the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (Brussels Agreement) (Brussels, 14<sup>th</sup> September 1994)
  - (d) It is expected that new members accede to the following technical agreements:
    - (i) The Agreement between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty for the Security of Information (Brussels, 6<sup>th</sup> March 1997)
    - (ii) The Agreement for the mutual safeguarding of secrecy of inventions relation to defence and for which applications for patents have been made (Paris, 21<sup>st</sup> September 1960)
    - (iii) The NATO Agreement on the communication of technical information for defence purposes (Brussels, 19<sup>th</sup> October 1970)
  - (e) For possible eventual access to ATOMAL information, new members would be expected to accede to:
    - (i) the “Agreement for Cooperation Regarding Atomic Information” (C-M(64)39 - Basic Agreement);
    - (ii) the “Administrative Arrangements to Implement the Agreement” (C-M(68)41, 5<sup>th</sup> Revise);
  - (f) Domestic legislation of aspirants should, as much as possible, be compatible with the other arrangements and implementation practices which govern NATO-wide cooperation.

## **IMPLEMENTATION**

2. NATO Team workshops will provide for briefings on legal issues and discussions on the steps that would have to be taken. Aspirants could provide information on existing legal arrangements and the steps that would have to be taken to accede to the agreements, including whether or not there are any constitutional/legal barriers to doing so.
3. Aspirants might also provide information on whether and how domestic legislation might impede immediate and full integration into Alliance activities. Exchange of information and experience on this issue could take place with all aspirants as appropriate.





## THE ACCESSION OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC, HUNGARY AND POLAND



*One of the highlights of the Washington Summit was the presence, for the first time, of the Heads of State and Government of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland. These three countries formally joined the Alliance on 12 March 1999, bringing the number of member countries to 19. The entry of these three democracies into the Alliance, under Article 10 of the Washington Treaty, is part of a continuing process.*

*A number of measures were successfully completed by each of the new members prior to accession, in order to ensure the effectiveness of their future participation in the Alliance. These included measures in the security sphere (e.g. arrangements for receiving, storing and using classified information), as well as in areas such as air defence, infrastructure, force planning and communication and information systems. However, work on the integration of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland did not finish on accession day. Full integration will require continuing efforts over a longer period.*

*These are the main stages leading up to the accession of the three new member countries:*

- *10 January 1994. At the NATO Summit in Brussels, the 16 Allied leaders said they expected and would welcome NATO enlargement that would reach to democratic states to the East. They reaffirmed that the Alliance, as provided for in Article 10 of the Washington Treaty, was open to membership of other European states in a position to further the principles of the Washington Treaty and to contribute to security in the North Atlantic area.*
- *September 1995. The Alliance adopted a Study on NATO Enlargement. Without giving fixed criteria for inviting countries to join, the Study described a number of factors to be taken into account in the enlargement process. It also stipulated that the process should take into account political- and security-related developments throughout Europe. The Study remains the basis for NATO's approach to inviting new members to join.*
- *During 1996, an intensified individual dialogue was undertaken with 12 interested Partner countries. These sessions improved their understanding of how the Alliance works and gave the Alliance a better understanding of where these countries stood in terms of their internal development as well as the resolution of any disputes with neighbouring countries. The Study identified this as an important precondition for membership.*
- *10 December 1996. The NATO Allies began drawing up recommendations on which country or countries should be invited to start accession talks, in preparation for a decision to be made at the Madrid Summit of July 1997.*
- *Early 1997. Intensified individual dialogue meetings took place with 11 Partner countries, at their request. In parallel, NATO military authorities undertook an analysis of relevant military factors concerning countries interested in NATO membership.*
- *8 July 1997. Allied leaders, meeting in Madrid, invited the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to start accession talks with the Alliance. They also reaffirmed that NATO would remain open to new members.*

- *September and November 1997. Accession talks were held with each of the three invited countries. At the end of the process, the three countries sent letters of intent confirming commitments undertaken during the talks.*
- *16 December 1997. NATO Foreign Ministers signed Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of the three countries.*
- *During 1998, Allied countries ratified the Protocols of Accession according to their national procedures.*
- *12 March 1999. After completion of their own national legislative procedures, the Foreign Ministers of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland deposited instruments of accession to the North Atlantic Treaty in a ceremony in Independence, Missouri, in the United States. This marked their formal entry into the Alliance.*
- *16 March 1999. The national flags of the three new member states were raised at a ceremony at NATO headquarters, Brussels.*

*The door to NATO membership remains open to other European countries that are ready and willing to undertake the commitments and obligations stemming from NATO membership and contribute to security in the Euro-Atlantic area. The admission of new democratic members into NATO is itself part of a wider process of greater integration in Europe involving other European institutions.*

*In the 50 years of its existence, the Alliance has played a major part in preserving peace and stability on the territory of its members. The process of enlargement is aimed at extending the zone of security and stability to other European countries.*

*“History will see the accession of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland as a key step towards a Europe of co-operation and integration, towards a Europe without dividing lines”, (Javier Solana, Secretary General of NATO).*

## NATO'S OPEN DOOR POLICY



*“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. (...)”*

*Article 10, The North Atlantic Treaty,  
Washington DC, 4 April 1949*

*Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty reflects the openness of the Alliance to new members. Since the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty, seven countries have joined the initial twelve signatories. Greece and Turkey joined the Alliance in 1952, Germany in 1955 and Spain in 1982. The Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland became members of the Alliance in March 1999.*

*Over the last fifty years, the Alliance has contributed significantly to the preservation of peace and stability on the territory of its members. The process of enlargement is aimed at extending the zone of security and stability to other European countries. It does not threaten any country.*

*Following the end of the Cold War, 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.”*

*NATO Enlargement is part of the process which has been going on throughout the 1990s to end the divisions of the Cold War. The invitation to the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland demonstrated NATO's willingness to erase old dividing lines on the continent. Their accession also reflects the general movement towards greater European integration, alongside the enlargement of the European Union. The door to NATO membership remains open to other European countries that are ready and willing to undertake the commitments and obligations of membership and whose membership contributes to security in the Euro-Atlantic area.*

*NATO is also deepening its cooperative relations with all countries in Europe whether or not they have expressed interest in membership. The creation of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the enhancement of the Partnership for Peace programme, the NATO-Russia Founding Act, and the Charter between NATO and Ukraine are all part of this process.*

*At the 1997 Madrid Summit, when the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland were invited to begin accession talks, Alliance leaders undertook to review the enlargement process at their next meeting in Washington.*

*At the Washington Summit, NATO unveiled a “Membership Action Plan” (MAP), designed to help aspiring countries meet NATO standards and prepare for possible future membership. Participation in the Plan is on the basis of self-selection and self-differentiation.*

*Countries aspiring to NATO membership are expected to continue their active participation in EAPC/PfP. Since its inception in 1994, the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme has had an important role in helping prepare aspirant countries for membership through participation in PfP activities. The PfP programme provided direct assistance to the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland in their preparations. The MAP is designed to provide a programme of such activities from which countries may select those they consider of most value to help them in their preparations for possible future membership.*

*The Membership Action Plan calls for aspirants to submit individual annual national programmes on their preparations. It also provides mechanisms for feedback and advice on progress made by them in implementing these programmes. The MAP includes planning targets specifically covering areas most relevant for nations preparing their forces and capabilities for possible future membership; and annual meetings to ensure that the assistance provided by NATO and its member states is as effective as possible.*

*The Plan does not provide a checklist for countries to fulfil, nor does participation in the programme pre-judge any eventual decision by the Alliance on issuing an invitation to begin accession talks. Such decisions will be made only on a case-by-case basis by all Allies on the basis of consensus.*

*Each year, NATO Foreign and Defence Ministers will consider progress on activities under the Membership Action Plan.*



## ***NATO's Partnership Activities***

**Chairman's Summary of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council  
at Summit Level**

•

**Declaration of the Heads of State and Government Participating  
in the NATO-Ukraine Commission Summit**

•

*Further Development of the EAPC*

•

*Partnership for Peace - An Enhanced and More Operational Partnership*

•

*NATO and Russia*

•

*NATO and Ukraine*

•

*Mediterranean Dialogue*

•

*Civil Emergency Planning in the Framework of the EAPC*

•

*The NATO Science Programme*



# CHAIRMAN'S SUMMARY OF THE MEETING OF THE EURO-ATLANTIC PARTNERSHIP COUNCIL AT SUMMIT LEVEL



Washington D.C, 25 April 1999

1. Heads of State and Government, or their representatives, of the member countries of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), met today in Washington. The Secretary-General of the Western European Union also attended the meeting. This was the second gathering of EAPC Heads of State and Government.
2. Discussion at the meeting focused on the theme of Euro-Atlantic Partnership in the twenty-first century. Heads of State and Government concentrated on the key security challenges that face the EAPC area today, in particular the situation in Kosovo; enhancements to the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme to make it more operational and capable; and ways in which the EAPC can best help to deal with security challenges in the EAPC area.
3. The discussion underlined the importance of the EAPC as a forum for consultation on political and security-related issues and on practical cooperation measures to address those.
4. EAPC Heads of State and Government discussed the situation in Kosovo and expressed support for the demands of the international community. They underlined their sympathy for the refugees and their support for humanitarian relief efforts and for unhindered access by humanitarian aid organizations. They emphasized their abhorrence of the policies of violence, repression and ethnic cleansing being carried out by the FRY authorities in Kosovo.
5. EAPC Heads of State and Government welcomed the work that has been carried out on the further enhancement of the Partnership for Peace since the 1997 Madrid Summit. They noted that these initiatives will serve to increase EAPC capacity to contribute to crisis management endeavours. They endorsed the document on a "Political-Military Framework for NATO-led PfP Operations" and emphasized its importance to the growing operational role of the Partnership. The Political-Military Framework sets out the principles, modalities and other necessary guidance for Partner involvement in political consultations and decision-making, in operational planning, and in command arrangements for future NATO-led operations in which they participate. It is a fundamental document for the future Partnership.
6. Heads of State and Government also welcomed and endorsed the report "Towards a Partnership for the 21st Century - The Enhanced and more Operational Partnership". This report sets out the main elements of the more operational PfP, including the Political-Military Framework, the expanded and adapted Planning and Review Process, and enhanced defence-related and military cooperation. In endorsing the overall report, EAPC members also endorsed an Operational Capabilities Concept for NATO-led PfP Operations, which will be further developed to reinforce PfP's operational capabilities, thereby improving the ability of the Alliance and Partner forces to operate together in the future. Furthermore, in recognition of the key role of training and education, EAPC members endorsed a strategy to develop a comprehensive enhancement programme in this area, with the aim of making best use of the human capital invested in PfP. Heads of State and Government agreed that this package of measures will considerably improve the

effectiveness of the Partnership. They also took note of a compendium of views and experiences on humanitarian aspects of peacekeeping.

7. EAPC Heads of State and Government welcomed the contribution that both EAPC and PfP have made towards enhancing security for all, based on shared values. They discussed how the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council can further increase its effectiveness in enhancing transparency, confidence and cooperation throughout the Euro-Atlantic area. They took note of the various initiatives that have been undertaken by the EAPC in this field. They welcomed work already begun on global humanitarian mine action aimed at complementing and adding value to other international and national efforts in this field. They welcomed the creation of an open-ended ad hoc working group to examine how EAPC might contribute to controlling the transfer of small arms, recognizing the high number of innocent civilian casualties caused by the use of mines and small arms. They also expressed their strong support for efforts to promote greater regional cooperation for security within the wider EAPC context, notably through seminars to this end held and planned in a number of Partner countries. They took note of the Alliance's initiative to promote further regional cooperation in South-East Europe.
8. Heads of State and Government reaffirmed their commitment to a vigorous and dynamic Euro-Atlantic Partnership into the 21<sup>st</sup> century and looked forward to continuing to strengthen multi-faceted cooperation within the EAPC and Partnership for Peace.



# DECLARATION OF THE HEADS OF STATE AND GOVERNMENT PARTICIPATING IN THE NATO-UKRAINE COMMISSION SUMMIT

• • •

Washington, 24 April 1999

1. We, the Heads of State and Government of the 19 member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of Ukraine, met today for our first Summit to review the implementation of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership, which was signed in Madrid in July 1997, and its role in Euro-Atlantic security.
2. NATO Heads of State and Government reaffirmed their support for Ukraine's sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity, democratic development, economic prosperity, and the principle of inviolability of frontiers, as key factors of stability and security in Central and Eastern Europe and in the continent as a whole. In this context they reaffirmed the historic importance of Ukraine's decision to voluntarily remove nuclear weapons from its territory.
3. The President of Ukraine reaffirmed his country's determination to continue its efforts to implement democratic political, economic and defense reforms as well as to pursue its goal of integration in European and transatlantic structures. He affirmed that the recent accession to NATO of Poland and Hungary, two neighbours of Ukraine, together with the Czech Republic, is a significant contribution to stability in Europe.
4. We discussed the evolving challenges facing Euro-Atlantic security, the consequent adaptation of the Alliance and Ukraine's contribution to stability in Europe. NATO Allies reaffirmed their conviction that Ukraine should continue to play an increasingly important role toward improving security in Central and Eastern Europe and in the continent as a whole.
5. We exchanged views on the crisis in Kosovo and on the approaches followed by NATO and Ukraine aimed at reaching our common goal of a long-lasting and just peace in the region. We welcomed the statement by the United Nations Secretary General on 9 April on the crisis, and support the effort to achieve a political settlement in the form of a peaceful, multi-ethnic and democratic Kosovo in which all its people can live in security and enjoy universal human rights and freedoms on an equal basis. NATO Allies acknowledged Ukraine's important contribution to the NATO-led peacekeeping operations in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to the OSCE Kosovo Verification Mission.
6. We welcomed the progress achieved in the implementation of our Distinctive Partnership since the signing of the Charter in Madrid and look forward to the realization of its full potential. We are satisfied with the development of a wide range of consultations and cooperation between NATO and Ukraine, at Summit, Ministerial, and Ambassadorial levels, as well as at the level of appropriate Committees and government bodies such as Ukraine's State Interagency Commission for Relations with NATO.
7. We reviewed Ukraine's participation in the Partnership for Peace Programme and in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, and expressed our common desire to see Ukraine progressively take full advantage of the opportunities offered therein. We noted the progress that has already been made towards the implementation of the NATO-Ukraine Work Plan for 1999. Ukraine's

State Programme of Cooperation with NATO until 2001 outlines potential additional areas for cooperation, and we look forward to further discussions at Ministerial and Ambassadorial level on how to improve and prioritise future Work Plans.

8. We welcome the appointment of the two NATO Liaison Officers in Kyiv. We are confident they will contribute to facilitating Ukraine's work in PfP as well as strengthening contacts between NATO and Ukraine.
9. We are determined to ensure continued support for the NATO Information and Documentation Centre, established in Kyiv in May 1997, which plays an increasingly important role in providing the Ukrainian public with objective and complete information about NATO's role as a factor of stability and security in Europe.
10. We appreciate the meetings of the Joint Working Group on Defence Reform, appropriately followed up at the expert level, as an effective instrument to catalyze the reform of the Ukrainian defense establishment, especially in the areas of civil-military relations, defense budgeting and training.
11. We are convinced that the designation of the Yavoriv Training Area as a PfP training centre provides a useful instrument for joint exercises and training opportunities and we encourage all Partners to take advantage of them. We underlined that multinational peacekeeping units will play an important role in meeting future challenges of European security and therefore welcome and support the creation of the Joint Polish-Ukrainian peacekeeping battalion, as well as other multinational units with Ukrainian participation.
12. We highly value the work of the NATO-Ukraine Joint Group on Emergency Situations. We also appreciate NATO-Ukraine consultations in the context of the Conference of National Armaments Directors and on-going consultation and cooperation in the fields of economic security, defence industrial restructuring, downsizing and conversion and retraining of retired military officers, research and technology as well as scientific and environmental affairs.
13. We requested the NATO-Ukraine Commission in Ambassadorial session to oversee the implementation of the measures embodied in this declaration and the further development of the NATO-Ukraine distinctive partnership under the terms of the Charter.

## FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF THE EAPC

• • •

*The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), set up in 1997 to succeed the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, brings together the 19 Allies and 25 Partners<sup>d</sup> in a forum providing for regular consultation and cooperation. It meets periodically at the level of Ambassadors and Foreign and Defence Ministers.*

*Heads of State and Government of the 44 members can also meet, when appropriate, as they did in Washington in April 1999. The EAPC Summit in Washington was an opportunity for open discussions among the leaders of the 44 member countries on security-related cooperation within the EAPC in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The leaders concentrated on key-security challenges in the EAPC area, in particular the situation in Kosovo.*

*Heads of State and Government endorsed two documents relating to further development of the Partnership for Peace. The first of these, the “Political-Military Framework for NATO-led PfP Operations”, addresses the involvement of Partner countries in political consultations and decision-making, in operational planning and in command arrangements for future NATO-led operations in which they participate. The second document is entitled “Towards a Partnership for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century - the Enhanced and More Operational Partnership”. This outlines the main elements designed to make the Partnership for Peace (PfP) more operational.*

*The EAPC has played a valuable role as a forum for consultation on the crisis in Kosovo. A series of extraordinary meetings was held to keep Partners informed of the status of NATO planning and preparations for possible military options in Kosovo and to exchange views with Partners on developments.*

(4)  
Albania, Armenia,  
Austria, Azerbaijan,  
Belarus, Belgium,  
Bulgaria, Canada,  
Czech Republic,  
Denmark, Estonia,  
Finland, France,  
Georgia, Germany,  
Greece, Hungary,  
Iceland, Italy,  
Kazakhstan, Kyrgyz  
Republic, Latvia,  
Lithuania,  
Luxembourg,  
Moldova,  
Netherlands, Norway,  
Poland, Portugal,  
Romania, Russia,  
Slovakia, Slovenia,  
Spain, Sweden,  
Switzerland,  
Tajikistan, the former  
Yugoslav Republic of  
Macedonia\*, Turkey,  
Turkmenistan,  
Ukraine, United  
Kingdom, United  
States, Uzbekistan.

### BACKGROUND

*EAPC activities are based on a two-year action plan which focuses on consultation and cooperation on a range of political and security-related matters, including regional issues, arms control, international terrorism, peacekeeping, defence economic issues, civil emergency planning, and scientific and environmental issues.*

*Almost all of the non-NATO EAPC members have established diplomatic missions accredited to NATO, expanding contacts between NATO and Partners and increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of cooperation.*

*An important achievement of the EAPC has been the establishment of the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) at NATO headquarters, following a proposal by the Russian Federation.*

*The Centre was inaugurated in June 1998 and was called upon immediately to support the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees in relief efforts in Albania for refugees fleeing from Kosovo. Coordinated humanitarian assistance from NATO and Partner countries has been stepped up in response to the escalating refugee crisis in the region since the end of March 1999. The EADRCC also played a significant role in coordinating humanitarian relief for flood-hit parts of western Ukraine late last year.*

\*Turkey recognises the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name.

*The EAPC also helps to foster practical regional security cooperation through topical seminars which form part of the EAPC action plan. The first such regional cooperation seminar was hosted by Georgia in October 1998. Since then similar events have been held in Lithuania and Slovakia, with two additional seminars planned in Bulgaria and Uzbekistan for 1999.*

*Many ideas for further practical initiatives are being explored, including ways in which the EAPC might support global humanitarian action against mines and ways of controlling transfers of small arms.*

## *PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE – AN ENHANCED AND MORE OPERATIONAL PARTNERSHIP*



*At the Washington Summit, Alliance leaders recognised the successful first five years of Partnership for Peace (PfP). PfP is a process that brings NATO Allies and Partners together in a vast programme of joint defence and security-related activities, ranging from the purely military to defence-related cooperation in areas such as crisis management, civil emergency planning, air traffic management or armaments cooperation. PfP is open and transparent and its activities are open to all Partners and Allies.*

*NATO launched Partnership for Peace in January 1994, with the goal of increasing stability and security throughout Europe. PfP's basic aims, laid out in 1994, continue to be valid. They include the following:*

- *increasing transparency in national defence planning and military budgeting;*
- *ensuring democratic control of national armed forces; and*
- *developing, over the longer term, Partner country forces that are better able to operate with those of NATO members.*

*PfP is now a permanent feature of the European security architecture. The biennial programme, in which Allies and Partners participate, now contains more than 2,000 activities, ranging from large military exercises down to small workshops grouping a handful of people, PfP touches virtually all areas of NATO's activity.*

*Nations choose from the PfP programme activities that support their national policies and meet their specific requirements and in accordance with their financial means, in a process of "self-differentiation", one of the key principles of the programme.*

*The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) acts as a political "roof" for PfP and offers Allies and Partners a forum in which to exchange views on common security issues.*

*The role of the Partners has been considerably increased in the daily work of PfP, particularly with the establishment at several NATO headquarters of Partnership Staff Elements, whereby NATO and Partner officers are integrated in international staff functions on a permanent basis.*

*In 1997, the NATO Allies decided to enhance PfP by giving it a more operational role, providing for greater involvement of the Partners in decision-making and planning, and strengthening its dimension of political consultation.*

*This decision was made partly on the basis of experience gained through the multi-national cooperation that has taken place through the IFOR (Implementation Force) and subsequently SFOR (Stabilisation Force) peace-keeping missions in Bosnia.*

*At the Washington Summit, an "Enhanced and More Operational PfP" was endorsed by Heads of State and Government. This move was built on experience gained so far and provides direction for the operational Partnership of the 21<sup>st</sup> century.*

*The enhanced and more operational PfP is built on the following three elements:*

*A Political-Military Framework for NATO-led PfP operations;*

*An expanded and adapted Planning and Review Process (PARP); and*

*Enhanced practical military and defence-related cooperation covering the full spectrum of cooperation in PfP.*

*Central to this third element is the “Operational Capabilities Concept for NATO-led PfP Operations” initiative, which places increased emphasis on improving the military effectiveness of multinational forces. It aims to increase military cooperation still further to help Partners develop forces that are better able to operate with those of NATO members in future crisis response operations.*

*PfP continues to support the transformation of the Alliance. Various elements of PfP are related to the Alliance’s new roles and missions and support the revised Strategic Concept.*

*PfP continues to evolve, and the Alliance views it as a dynamic process that will progressively draw NATO and Partners closer to each other.*

## NATO AND RUSSIA



*The NATO Allies regretted Russia's decision to suspend cooperation in a number of promising areas because of Allied air operations in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.*

*Much has been achieved in NATO-Russia relations in recent years, to the benefit of stability and security in Europe as a whole. The NATO Allies believe that security in Europe cannot be built without Russia, and that they must seek together with Russia to build trust and cooperation to overcome the divisions of the past, and to handle together security problems of the future.*

*This aim is central to The Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security signed by the Heads of State and Government of NATO member states and Russia in Paris on May 27, 1997. It represents a commitment by the two sides to help build together a stable, peaceful and undivided continent on the basis of partnership and mutual interest.*

*NATO and Russia face common security problems in the Euro-Atlantic region - from regional instability to proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. The benefits of working together to find common solutions to common problems are self-evident.*

*The participation of Russian forces in the NATO-led multinational peacekeeping force in Bosnia (first the Implementation Force (IFOR), and then its successor Stabilisation Force (SFOR)), and the contribution these contingents have made to peace in that region are a powerful example of how NATO and Russia can work together effectively on the basis of shared interests.*

*Since the Paris signing, Russia and NATO have made significant progress in developing their cooperation and fulfilling the aims of the Founding Act.*

*Under the Founding Act, they established the **Permanent Joint Council (PJC)** as a venue for consultations, coordination, cooperation and consensus-building between them and, where appropriate, for joint decisions and joint action on security issues of common concern. The PJC is the principal forum for exchanging views and developing security cooperation on the basis of mutual interest.*

*The Permanent Joint Council met for the first time on July 18, 1997. Its purpose is to develop trust and cooperation between NATO and Russia in order to address, through consultations, joint decisions or actions, security problems of common concern, with both sides retaining the right to take decisions independently of the other. Bringing together the 19 member countries of NATO, and Russia, it has met regularly at various levels - that of Ambassadors, Foreign Ministers, Defence Ministers, Chiefs of the Defence Staff and military representatives. If required, the Heads of State and Government of the NATO Allies and Russia can also meet under the auspices of the Permanent Joint Council.*

*The PJC has held discussions on a wide-range of issues of mutual concern, including the situation in Bosnia-Herzegovina, peacekeeping, non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, arms control, defence conversion, air traffic safety, terrorism and nuclear weapons issues. In February 1999, NATO and Russia had an exchange of views on the updating of Russia's military doctrine and the adaptation of NATO's Strategic Concept. NATO and Russia have also undertaken a range of practical activities. NATO opened the first ever NATO Documentation Centre in Moscow in February 1998. There are also plans for an information centre to help retired Russian military personnel find new jobs in civilian*

*life, to be opened in Moscow under a joint venture enabling Russia to draw on know-how and assistance of NATO countries.*

*Progress has been achieved in armaments-related issues. Joint activities have been undertaken under a Memorandum of Understanding on defence-related scientific cooperation. NATO and Russia also pledged to continue their cooperation to deal with computer problems arising from the Year 2000 phenomenon.*

*In the two years following the signing of the Founding Act, NATO and Russia have been able to move rapidly down the road of cooperation, enhancing not just their own security but that of all the states in the Euro-Atlantic region. The potential of the Russia-NATO relationship remains huge.*

*NATO and Russia held extensive negotiations on the situation in Kosovo. On several occasions during the Kosovo crisis, high representatives of the NATO Allies and Russia met in extraordinary session. They could not agree on how to bring about a political solution to the conflict, although they agreed that a political solution should be based on autonomy for Kosovo, not independence. After the breakdown of the Rambouillet negotiations, the NATO Allies concluded that Belgrade had been negotiating in bad faith and, as in the past, the government of President Milosevic had no intention of complying with UN Security Council Resolutions, nor of respecting agreements which had been reached, nor of engaging in genuine efforts to reach a political solution; there was therefore no alternative but to use force as a last resort to support the political aims of the international community.*

*The NATO Allies regretted Russia's decision to suspend the process of cooperation under the auspices of the Permanent Joint Council at a time of crisis, when close relations and discussion become all the more important. Meeting in Brussels on April 12 to discuss the Kosovo crisis, NATO Foreign Ministers noted that "the Alliance shares a common interest with Russia in reaching a political solution to the crisis in Kosovo, and wants to work constructively with Russia, in the spirit of the Founding Act, to this end." NATO countries recognised their common interest with Russia in reaching a political solution to the crisis and continued to work closely with Russia in the context of diplomatic initiatives to end the conflict.*



## NATO AND UKRAINE



*A Summit meeting between the leaders of the 19 NATO member countries and President Leonid Kuchma of Ukraine was held in Washington on 24 April 1999. This was the first summit-level meeting in the framework of the NATO-Ukraine Commission (NUC) established in 1997. All twenty leaders welcomed the progress achieved in the implementation of the Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine.*

*NATO and Ukraine signed the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership at the Madrid Summit in 1997, an event that moved the NATO-Ukraine cooperative relationship to a qualitatively higher level. The Charter formally recognised the importance of an independent, stable and democratic Ukraine to European development as a whole.*

*At that time, President Kuchma declared that Ukraine had made a “strategic choice of integrating in European and Transatlantic structures.” The NATO Allies, in turn, declared their support for Ukraine’s sovereignty and independence, territorial integrity, democratic development, economic prosperity and its status as a non-nuclear weapon state, all elements which NATO considers to be key to stability and security in Central and Eastern Europe.*

*The Distinctive Partnership, overseen by the NATO-Ukraine Commission meeting at Ambassadorial level or at the level of Foreign and Defence Ministers, has opened up new opportunities for practical cooperation and consultation. Areas identified for joint consultation include civil emergency planning and disaster preparedness, civil-military relations, defence planning and defence conversion by means of seminars, working groups and other cooperative programmes.*

*One important area of cooperation contributing to the reform of the Ukrainian defence establishment is the work of the Joint Working Group on Defence Reform. This has enabled NATO and Ukraine officials and experts to discuss issues such as civil-military relations, budgeting and resource planning and to hold seminars on the retraining of retired military personnel, and military downsizing and conversion. There is also a NATO-Ukraine Joint-Group on Emergency Situations. Cooperation in this field is especially active, as illustrated, for example, by the help provided by NATO and Allied countries to Ukraine at the time of the recent floods in Transcarpathia.*

*In a two-day visit to Ukraine in July 1998 to mark the first anniversary of the signing of the Charter, Secretary General Solana emphasised that strong relations between the Alliance and Ukraine were vital for stability, security and prosperity in Europe. During the same trip he visited the city of Dnipropetrovsk where he made a tour of the Pivdenmash rocket-making complex which, in Soviet times, produced the SS-18 nuclear missile but which now produces a range of goods, mainly for the civilian sector - one example of the country’s defence conversion efforts.*

*The following are some of the other concrete steps that have been taken in the relationship:*

*A NATO Information and Documentation Centre, the first such centre in a Partner country, has been set up in Kyiv under a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed in May 1997. The Documentation Centre disseminates accurate information about NATO and, in so doing, helps correct stereotypes left over from the Cold War era. A new Information Officer has recently been appointed to head the Centre.*

*NATO and Ukraine concluded an MOU on civil emergency planning in December 1997. The MOU provides for cooperation in the field of disaster preparedness and other civil emergencies.*

*A third MOU was signed in December 1998 to provide for the posting of two NATO liaison officers - one civilian and one military - in Kyiv. Their office was opened shortly before the Washington Summit.*

*Progress has been made in other fields. In particular, NATO has publicly applauded steps taken by Ukraine to improve relations with its neighbours, particularly two new NATO Allies Poland and Hungary, and also with Romania and Russia.*

*Ukraine, a prominent member of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, also plays a strong role in Partnership for Peace and is engaged in a programme of PfP activities that is both ambitious and attainable. The two new NATO liaison officers will work closely with the Ukrainian authorities to expand even further Ukraine's participation in PfP. In addition, the NATO Allies have officially designated the Yavoriv defence training area, west of Lviv, as a PfP training centre.*

*Ukraine contributes forces to the multinational SFOR (Stabilisation Force) peacekeeping mission in Bosnia. It also submitted a number of candidates to serve in the Kosovo Verification Mission organised by the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE); and offered its aircraft for use in the air verification mission established in October 1998 to monitor compliance with agreed limitations on the number of Serbian forces in Kosovo and on the scope of their operations.*

*NATO's Political Committee, which consists of representatives of all NATO Member countries, visited Ukraine in February 1999. The Committee met senior members of the country's leadership and heard their views on developing further the relationship between Ukraine and NATO.*

*The Alliance organises regular visits by Ukrainian groups to NATO headquarters as part of its information programme. NATO also publishes and distributes publications in Ukrainian, including an occasional news bulletin called Novini NATO.*

*Ukraine recently published a State Programme for cooperation with NATO until the year 2001, demonstrating the country's intentions to take full advantage of the opportunities offered by PfP and the Charter.*

*“The Ukraine-NATO Charter on a Distinctive Partnership has opened up new avenues for further dynamism in relations between Ukraine and the Alliance in many areas ranging from reform and interoperability of the armed forces to handling ecological emergencies and economic workshops.”*

*(Ukrainian Foreign Minister, Borys Tarasyuk, speaking at the Wehrkunde security conference in Munich, Germany, in February 1999).*

## MEDITERRANEAN DIALOGUE



*NATO leaders meeting at the Washington Summit recognised NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue, (launched in 1994 and currently involving six non-NATO countries – Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia), as an integral part of the Alliance's approach to cooperative security.*

*The Mediterranean Dialogue is aimed at creating good relations and better mutual understanding throughout the Mediterranean, and at promoting security and stability in the region. It reflects the view that security in that region is linked to security in Europe.*

*Political discussions with participating countries provide an opportunity to share views on a range of security issues relevant to the region. Moreover, an annual work programme sets out measures for practical cooperation that focus on building confidence through cooperation on security and defence – related issues in the military field, as well as in the areas of information, civil emergency planning and science.*

*All participating countries are offered the same basis for discussion and activities but the level of engagement varies from country to country. Activities take place on a self-funding basis. This limits the capacity of some countries to participate.*

*In December 1998, NATO Foreign Ministers agreed to explore ways of increasing cooperation with Mediterranean Dialogue countries. At the Washington Summit, Alliance leaders decided to enhance both the political and practical dimensions of the Dialogue, among other things by creating further opportunities for discussion and strengthening cooperation in areas where NATO can bring an added value, particularly in the military field, and where the Dialogue countries have expressed interest.*

*NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue complements other international efforts in the region such as the European Union's Barcelona Process, the Middle East Peace Process, and the Mediterranean initiatives of the Western European Union (WEU) and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).*

### HIGHLIGHTS

*Since 1997, opinion leaders and parliamentarians from each of the six countries have visited NATO for briefings on various aspects of NATO policy.*

*Representatives from Mediterranean Dialogue countries attend courses at the NATO School in Oberammergau on peacekeeping, conventional arms control, environmental protection, civil-military cooperation for civil emergency planning and European security cooperation.*

*International research fellowships have been available to scholars from Mediterranean Dialogue countries since 1998. Five fellowships have been awarded to date, covering topics such as competing concepts of security cooperation in the Arab world, economic aspects of security cooperation in the Mediterranean region, and Eastern Mediterranean security.*

*For 1999, NATO's two major commands (Allied Command Europe and Allied Command Atlantic) have organised 49 military activities involving participation by Mediterranean Dialogue countries. These include the observation of Partnership for Peace (PfP) activities in the fields of search and rescue, maritime safety and medical evacuation, as well as exercises related to peace support and humanitarian relief.*

*Egypt, Jordan and Morocco have participated in both the initial Implementation Force (IFOR) and the subsequent Stabilisation Force (SFOR), led by NATO, thereby helping secure the peace Bosnia and Herzegovina.*

*As of January 1999, NATO designated the embassy of one of its members in each of the Dialogue countries as a contact point embassy, to assist the Alliance's information effort toward these countries and to help foster the Dialogue.*

*A Conference on "The Mediterranean Dialogue and the new NATO", organised by the Spanish authorities in cooperation with NATO, took place in Valencia from 24-26 February 1999. It was the first opportunity for Ambassadors from NATO and the six Mediterranean partner countries to meet to discuss the way ahead for the Mediterranean Dialogue. This was an important step toward greater interaction between NATO and Mediterranean Dialogue countries.*

## CIVIL EMERGENCY PLANNING IN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE EAPC



*In 1992, in support of the United Nations Department of Humanitarian Affairs, NATO hosted an international workshop on the Use of Military and Civil Defence Assets in Disaster Relief. This workshop - in which 20 international organisations and 40 nations participated - provided the foundation for subsequent Civil Emergency Planning (CEP) cooperation activities with Partner countries, primarily in the field of disaster management and response.*

*In 1994, after the launching of NATO's Partnership for Peace programme (PfP), four CEP disaster-related cooperation activities were conducted. Since then, the scope of these activities has broadened to include the entire spectrum of civil emergency planning. Moreover, reflecting the strong interest of Partner countries in this field, CEP activities in the framework of PfP have increased dramatically. With 75 activities in 1999, CEP now constitutes the largest non-military component of PfP.*

*Civil emergency planning is a responsibility touching on all levels of government, to varying degrees. Therefore, from the outset, CEP cooperation activities have been aimed at involving all levels and branches of government in practical cooperation within each country, among NATO and Partner countries, and with other relevant international organisations. Emphasis has been given to the following activities:*

*Transforming the focus from civil defence and wartime mobilisation to an all-hazards approach to CEP and the protection of civilian populations;  
Developing effective crisis management and response capabilities;  
Fostering regional cooperation and interoperability; and  
Promoting civil-military cooperation.*

### ESTABLISHMENT OF THE EADRCC

*In 1998, EAPC Foreign Ministers approved a Russian proposal to create a Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Capability, to serve as the focal point for the coordination of international assistance among member countries of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) in the event of a major disaster within the EAPC region. Inaugurated by NATO Secretary General Solana on 3 June 1998, the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre (EADRCC) is located at NATO and staffed with personnel seconded from EAPC countries, as well as a Liaison Officer from the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UN-OCHA).*

*The EADRCC was immediately called into service. Only days after opening, the Centre received a request for assistance from UNHCR following the large influx of refugees from Kosovo into Albania. In response, the EADRCC arranged an emergency airlift to Tirana - with aircraft provided by Belgium and Norway - involving 16 flights carrying 161 tons of essential humanitarian aid.*

*Subsequently, the EADRCC actively monitored the humanitarian situation in and around Kosovo and, in April 1999, stepped up its coordination of humanitarian assistance from NATO and Partner countries to alleviate the plight of the Kosovar refugees. The EADRCC has subsequently played a pivotal role, at the request of the UN High Commission for Refugees, which has allowed the United Nations, NATO military authorities and the civilian agencies to work together more effectively.*

*In November 1998, UN-OCHA - fully extended in Central America at the time, coping with the effects of Hurricane Mitch - requested that the EADRCC take the lead in carrying out the necessary international coordination in response to extensive floods in western Ukraine, in response to a request by that country. Ten EAPC countries provided prompt assistance.*

## **COOPERATION WITH RUSSIA**

*In 1996, NATO and Russia signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on Cooperation in Civil Emergency Planning and Disaster Preparedness. Russia has actively participated in most CEP activities under PFP and has also organised and hosted a number of major exercises, seminars, workshops and meetings. In 1997, the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee met in Moscow - the first NATO committee to meet in Russia. Also in 1997, under the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council, a joint pilot project was launched on the use of satellite technology in disaster management.*

## **COOPERATION WITH UKRAINE**

*In 1997, NATO and Ukraine signed an MOU on Cooperation in CEP and Disaster Preparedness with emphasis on the Chernobyl Disaster. Under the auspices of the NATO-Ukraine Commission, the NATO-Ukraine Joint Group has also organised and conducted a number of CEP cooperation activities in the aviation, food and agriculture, and medical fields.*

*In 1996, 'Trans-Carpathia 96' - a week-long programme consisting of a command post and field exercise followed by the annual seminar and meeting of NATO's Civil Protection Committee - took place in Lviv. NATO has also coordinated international assistance to Ukraine after floods, once in 1995, and again in 1998 through the EADRCC.*

## **FUTURE DEVELOPMENTS**

### **ALBANIA**

*As provided for in its Individual Partnership Plan, assistance will be given to Albania to develop legislation and implementation arrangements for civil emergency planning and disaster preparedness. Following the recent approval of the new Albanian constitution, and building upon a March 1999 PFP Workshop in Tirana devoted to civil emergency planning, a year-long implementation effort began which will involve Albanian parliamentarians, appropriate ministries, the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and selected NGOs. The most significant aspect of these efforts will be the involvement of those Partner countries who have revised their CEP structures and legislation, following previous workshops and seminars devoted to this subject.*

### **EURO-ATLANTIC DISASTER RESPONSE CAPABILITY**

*Follow-on work includes identifying and committing the various civil and military elements and capabilities - from individual EAPC countries - that will comprise the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit (EADRU). A field exercise involving activation and deployment of selected elements of the EADRU is taking place in 1999, in cooperation with UN-OCHA.*

### **THE FUTURE FOCUS OF CEP**

*The emphasis in the future will be on enhancing and deepening practical cooperation rather than increasing the number of CEP activities. This shift toward improving the qualitative aspects of CEP cooperation with Partner countries centres on meetings of NATO's nine technical CEP planning boards and committees (PB&Cs). A key goal of this process is to transfer the focus of these bodies from issues concerning primarily the 19 NATO member countries to those that concern the 44 EAPC member countries, while maintaining the effectiveness of the planning boards and committees.*

## HIGHLIGHTS

- *CEP is included in the Individual Partnership Plans of all Partner countries;*
- *Each year participants from all 44 NATO and Partner countries take part in CEP cooperation activities;*
- *Partner countries initiate, organise and conduct in their countries the majority of the CEP cooperation activities. The importance to Partners of civil emergency planning is shown by the steady growth of the number of activities, from four in 1994 to 75 in 1999.*
- *To date, there have been more than 12,000 participants, civil and military, from all governmental ministries, from local, regional and central government, as well as non-governmental organisations;*
- *Many other international organisations actively participate in, and, in some cases, jointly organise and sponsor NATO CEP activities.*





## THE NATO SCIENCE PROGRAMME



*The NATO Science Programme encourages scientists from the Euro-Atlantic area to work together for the advancement of science, progress and peace. Collaborative activities are designed to create enduring links between researchers in Partner and NATO countries and stimulate the cooperation essential to progress in science. The Programme also aims to protect the human resources of the scientific community in Partner countries, thereby contributing to overall security. Awards are made on the basis of applications received from individual scientists in EAPC countries. Divided into different sub-programmes, the NATO Science Programme provides the following types of support:*

**Science Fellowships** are available to provide training for young researchers in preparation for their future careers.

**Cooperative Science and Technology grants** initiate research cooperation and establish enduring links between scientists of NATO and Partner countries. Collaborative Linkage Grants fund collaboration on research projects, and other funds are awarded for the organisation of high-level tutorial Advanced Study Institutes and Advanced Research Workshops.

**Research Infrastructure Support** offers help to Partner countries in structuring the organisation of their research and creating the required basic infrastructure for computer networking. The **Computer Networking Infrastructure Grant** falls under this sub-programme.

**Science for Peace** supports Partner countries in applying Research and Development to industry in cooperation with NATO countries.

Further information about these programmes and application forms are available on the NATO Science web site at <http://www.nato.int/science>.

As of January 1999, the NATO Science Programme has been restructured in order to focus all its efforts on funding collaboration between Partner country and NATO country scientists. The Programme no longer supports projects involving collaboration exclusively between scientists in NATO countries. Any application for support must include scientists from Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) countries in order to qualify.

### A FEW FIGURES AND EXAMPLES OF COOPERATION

- Each year about 13,000 scientists from EAPC countries are involved in the NATO Science Programme.
- In 1998, more than 6,000 scientists took part in 104 NATO scientific meetings.
- Almost 1,000 scientists from Russia alone have received grants to carry out work with scientists in NATO countries.
- About 500 Partner scientists have visited the United States with NATO support for scientific collaboration or training.

- A **linkage grant** to pursue research into an ultraviolet laser that can tune over the entire 280-340 nanometre spectral range is under way between research teams from Kazan State University, Russia, and the USAF Wright Laboratory, Ohio, in the United States. The results of this work could have a wide range of applications for jet and internal combustion engines - with direct relevance to problems of the ozone layer and global climate formation.
- An **expert visit** enabled a German and a Polish researcher to work together to achieve a breakthrough in the technology of the destruction of chemical weapons. In what is known as the Bilger process, sodium technology is used to destroy the chemical weapon Adamsite.



## ***Appendices***

*What is NATO?*

•

*The Role of Summits in NATO's History*

•

*NATO Acronyms and Expressions*



## WHAT IS NATO?



*The North Atlantic Treaty, signed in Washington on 4 April 1949, created an alliance of ten European and two North American independent nations committed to each other's defence.*

*Four more European nations joined the Alliance between 1952 and 1982, bringing the number of members to 16. The admission of Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland on March 12, 1999 brought the number of members to 19.*

*NATO'S members are **Belgium, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom and the United States.***

### **THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY**

*The North Atlantic Treaty, itself a very simple document, conforms to the spirit of the Charter of the United Nations and derives its legitimacy from the Charter.*

*In the Treaty, member countries commit themselves to maintaining and developing their defence capabilities, individually and collectively, providing the basis for collective defence planning.*

*Another article of the Treaty provides the framework for consultations between the member countries, whenever one of them feels that its security is at risk. It is this article which underlines the fundamental importance of the wide-ranging consultation process which takes place within the Alliance and explains why the Alliance is undertaking new missions designed to enhance security in the Euro-Atlantic area as a whole.*

*Another article - Article 5 - refers to the right to collective self-defence as laid down by the U.N. Charter. It states that an armed attack on one or more members of NATO will be deemed an attack against them all.*

*The admission of new members to the Alliance is in line with Article 10 of the Treaty which states that other European states in a position to further the principles of the Treaty and contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area may be invited to accede. After the recent accession of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland, Alliance leaders have indicated that the door remains open to other countries in the future.*

*In other articles of the Treaty, each member country undertakes to contribute to the development of peaceful and friendly international relations in a number of ways, including by strengthening their free institutions and promoting conditions of stability and well-being. The Treaty also provides for efforts to eliminate conflict in the international economic policies of member countries and to encourage cooperation between them.*

## **THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE ALLIANCE**

*NATO is an alliance committed to the collective defence of its member countries as the basis for preserving peace and ensuring future security, but, following the momentous changes which occurred in Europe in the 1990s, it has become a catalyst for extending security and stability throughout Europe. The transformation of NATO, following the end of the Cold War and the end of the division of Europe, is aimed at generating a higher degree of cooperation and mutual trust, from which the whole of Europe will benefit.*

*At the core of the Alliance are its member countries. The governments of these countries, meeting together, represent the highest political authorities of the Alliance.*

*The crisis in Kosovo was at the top of the agenda at the Washington Summit in April 1999. NATO leaders assessed the situation with a view to reinforcing the determination of the international community to bring about a lasting political settlement and to create the conditions for the restoration of peace and the safeguarding of the future security of the region.*

*The Summit also marked NATO's 50th anniversary. NATO leaders reaffirmed the enduring value of the transatlantic link and certain fundamental purposes of the Alliance - the safeguarding of the freedom and security of its members, its commitment to the principles of the U.N. Charter, the upholding of democracy and the constant struggle for the peaceful resolution of disputes.*

*The Washington Summit was also an occasion for consolidating the changes that have taken place in NATO in the 1990s as the Alliance has adapted itself to meet the requirements of today's world. These include the enlargement process; the reshaping of the Alliance's military structures to enable it to handle new roles in the field of crisis management, peace-keeping and peace-support in the Euro-Atlantic area; and the strengthening of the European role in security matters.*

*As part of this transformation, NATO is forging a practical partnership with many non-NATO countries with the aim of creating a more transparent Europe in which the scope for misunderstandings and mistrust is reduced.*

*Central to this idea is the "Partnership for Peace" (PfP) programme, which promotes cooperation among the NATO Allies and 24 Partner countries in a vast array of security-related activities.*

*The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), involving 44 countries, including the NATO member countries, provides the political framework for PfP and a forum for discussion on security-related issues. Heads of State and Government from the 44 countries met at the EAPC Summit session in Washington, on the day following the NATO Summit.*

*Over the past few years, Russia and Ukraine have developed special independent relationships with the Alliance, enabling them to pursue, in different ways, cooperative programmes on a wide range of practical security-related issues of benefit to their countries and to Europe as a whole. Both countries are members of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council.*

*Russia suspended its participation in a number of these programmes, following the Alliance's decision to intervene militarily in order to end the conflict in Kosovo. However, despite differences over the use of military force, NATO countries have worked closely with representatives of the Russian government in the context of diplomatic efforts to bring about an end to the conflict in Kosovo and a lasting political solution. NATO is confident that NATO-Russia cooperation in the wider sphere will also resume and will continue to develop positively. Successful cooperation efforts, first in the Implementation Force (IFOR), and then in the Stabilisation Force (SFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as in many other spheres, have been encouraging.*

*A programme of special cooperation is also being pursued, in the context of NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue, with six non-NATO Mediterranean countries (Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco*

and Tunisia). The goal of the Mediterranean Dialogue is to enhance the security and stability in the Mediterranean region. Security and stability in the Mediterranean is linked to security in Europe.

Within NATO itself, committees are responsible for planning ahead in such areas as political consultations, defence planning and operations, armaments cooperation and others. The committees recommend action to the North Atlantic Council - NATO's highest decision-making body - or to NATO's Defence Planning Committee, which deals primarily with questions relating to NATO's integrated military structure.

Consultations also take place on economic questions related to security, including issues such as defence spending and the conversion of defence industries to civilian purposes.

NATO also provides a forum for active cooperation among its member states and its Partner countries in areas such as civil emergency planning, disaster relief and scientific and environmental programmes. Although each nation bears the principal responsibility for its own planning to deal with civil emergencies, NATO works to ensure that the civil resources of the Alliance can be used in the most effective way, when the moment requires.

NATO's role here is often a coordinating one. In November 1998, the Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordinating Centre (EADRCC), inaugurated the previous June, coordinated a relief operation to flood-hit parts of Western Ukraine. Following the deterioration of the situation in and around Kosovo, the EADRCC also played a key role in coordinating humanitarian aid from NATO and Partner countries to alleviate the plight of the Kosovar refugees and assist neighbouring countries.

NATO also runs a number of international exchange programmes relating to scientific and environmental problems of concern to NATO and Partner countries. These programmes provide support for high-level scientific research, encourage development of national scientific and technological resources, and enable cost savings to be achieved through international collaboration. A number of these activities are designed to tackle defence-related environmental problems, affecting neighbouring nations, which can only be resolved through cooperative action.





## THE ORIGINS OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL AND THE ROLE OF SUMMIT MEETINGS IN NATO'S HISTORY



*NATO is an alliance of countries, represented by their governments at levels suitable to the subject to be discussed and the nature of the decisions to be taken. Alliance decisions are based on consensus among member countries and have the same force regardless of the level at which they are taken. NATO Summit meetings are thus exceptional events. There have been 15 such meetings since the founding of the Alliance in 1949. Each of them has taken place at a crucial moment in the evolution of NATO.*

*The presence of government leaders on such occasions does not change the nature of Alliance decisions which have the same force regardless of the level at which they are taken. But their presence does signify the importance which the member countries attach to the occasion and lends weight and visibility to their decisions.*

*The part played by Summit meetings in adapting the policies of the Alliance to changing needs and circumstances reflects the basis for decision-making within NATO as a whole, established by the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949. This remarkably short document created only one formal structure for decision-making, namely the North Atlantic Council. The Council itself was to be responsible for creating any additional structures or forums.*

*When the Council met for the first time on 17 September 1949, each country represented by its Foreign Minister, it set about the task of building a civilian and military framework for implementing the Treaty. It decided to meet annually but convene more frequently if circumstances so required. If any member country felt that its territorial integrity, political independence or security was under threat, and invoked Articles 4 or 5 of the Treaty providing for its Allies to come to its assistance, the Council could of course meet immediately.*

*The Council created two Ministerial level bodies - a Defence Committee and a Defence Financial and Economic Committee - as well as a number of other permanent bodies, including a Military Committee consisting of Chiefs of Staff of member countries.*

*A year after the Alliance came into being, it became clear that infrequent meetings of Foreign Ministers were not adequate to control and supervise the civilian and military bodies which had been set up. A civilian body, known as the Council Deputies, was therefore created to carry out the Council's directives and coordinate the work of its subordinate bodies.*

*In 1951, the structure under the Council was again modified. The Council became the sole Ministerial-level forum within the Alliance. The status of the Council Deputies was enhanced, making this group in effect the working structure enabling the Alliance to take decisions. Simultaneously, an International Staff was created, financed by a common budget to which each member country contributed, to prepare and follow up the work.*

*The present-day North Atlantic Council has its origins in the Council Deputies. In 1952 the Council decided upon a further reorganisation, making the Council Deputies into a permanent body. To enable it to function continuously and to exercise effective powers of decision, each government appointed a permanent representative at the level of ambassador, supported by a national delegation of advisers and experts.*

*The basic structure of the Council's work and its ultimate authority for all NATO decisions has remained unchanged since 1952. The level of representation can vary but this has no significance for the validity of its decisions, which reflect the views of each government and agreement among them to implement and follow up what has been decided.*

*The pattern of Council meetings which has evolved over the years consists of regular weekly, and usually more frequent, meetings of the permanent Council, composed of Ambassadors; meetings at Ministerial level involving Foreign and Defence Ministers at least at six-monthly intervals ; and occasional meetings at the level of Heads of State and Government. A similar pattern applies to other forums which meet under NATO auspices, including the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC), the NATO-Ukraine Commission and the Mediterranean Cooperation Group.*

*The first of the Council meetings to be held at Summit level took place in Paris, in December 1957. For many years no further Summit meetings were held but a second Summit then took place in Brussels in May 1975. Subsequent Summits were held in London (May 1977); Washington D.C. (May 1978); and Bonn (June 1982). The next four meetings took place in Brussels in November 1985, March 1988, May 1989 and December 1989. In July 1990, NATO held its first Summit since the end of the Cold War in London. Three further Summits took place in Rome (November 1991); Brussels (January 1994); and Madrid (July 1997), setting out the basis for the transformation of the Alliance and its adaptation to the new challenges of the post Cold War era.*

*The Washington Summit, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Alliance and marking the admission of three new members, was the second to take place in the United States capital and the fifteenth formal meeting of the North Atlantic Council at the Summit level.*

## **CHRONOLOGY OF SUMMIT MEETINGS OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL**

### **PARIS, 16-19 DECEMBER 1957**

*Reaffirmation of the principles purposes and unity of the Atlantic Alliance. Improvements in the coordination and organisation of NATO forces and in political consultation arrangements. Recognition of the need for closer economic ties and for cooperation in the spirit of Article 2 of the Treaty, designed to eliminated conflict in international economic policies and encourage economic collaboration.*

### **BRUSSELS, 26 JUNE 1974**

*Signature of the Declaration on Atlantic Relations adopted by NATO Foreign Ministers in Ottawa on 19 June, rededicating the member countries of the Alliance to the aims and ideals of the Treaty in the 25<sup>th</sup> anniversary year of its signature. Consultations on East-West relations in preparation for US-USSR summit talks on strategic nuclear arms limitations.*

### **BRUSSELS, 29-30 MAY 1975**

*Affirmation of the fundamental importance of the Alliance and of Allied cohesion in the face of international economic pressures following the 1974 oil crisis. Support for successful conclusion of negotiations in the framework of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) (to result, in August 1975, in the signing of the Helsinki Final Act).*

### **LONDON, 10-11 MAY 1977**

*Initiation of study on long-term trends in East-West relations and of a long-term defence programme (LTDP) aimed at improving the defensive capability of NATO member countries.*

WASHINGTON D.C., 30-31 MAY 1978

*Review of results of long-term initiatives taken at the 1977 London Summit. Confirmation of the validity of the Alliance's complementary aims of maintaining security while pursuing East-West détente. Adoption of 3% target for growth in defence expenditures.*

BONN, 10 JUNE 1982

*Accession of Spain.*

*Adoption of the Bonn Declaration, which set out a six-point Programme for Peace in Freedom. Publication of a statement of Alliance's goals and policies on Arms Control and Disarmament and a statement on Integrated NATO Defence.*

BRUSSELS, 21 NOVEMBER 1985

*Special meeting of the North Atlantic Council for consultations with President Reagan on the positive outcome of the US-USSR Geneva Summit on arms control and other areas of cooperation.*

BRUSSELS, 2-3 MARCH 1988

*Reaffirmation of the purposes and principles of the Alliance and of its objectives for East-West relations. Adoption of a blueprint for strengthening stability in the whole of Europe through conventional arms control negotiations.*

BRUSSELS, 29-30 MAY 1989

*Declaration commemorating the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Alliance setting out Alliance policies and security objectives for the 1990s aimed at maintaining Alliance defence, introducing new arms control initiatives, strengthening political consultation, improving East-West cooperation and meeting global challenges. Adoption of a Comprehensive Concept of Arms Control and Disarmament.*

BRUSSELS, 4 DECEMBER 1989

*Against the background of fundamental changes in Central and Eastern Europe and the prospect of the end of the division of Europe, US President Bush consults with Alliance leaders following his Summit Meeting with President Gorbachev in Malta. While the NATO Summit Meeting is taking place, Warsaw Pact leaders denounce the 1968 invasion of Czechoslovakia and repudiate the Brezhnev Doctrine of limited sovereignty.*

LONDON, 6 JULY 1990

*Publication of the London Declaration on a Transformed North Atlantic Alliance, outlining proposals for developing cooperation with the countries of Central and Eastern Europe across a wide spectrum of political and military activity, including the establishment of regular diplomatic liaison with NATO.*

ROME, NOVEMBER 1991

*Publication of the Alliance's new Strategic Concept, the Rome Declaration on Peace and Cooperation and statements on developments in the Soviet Union and the situation in Yugoslavia.*

BRUSSELS, JANUARY 1994

*Publication of the PfP Framework Document and launching of the Partnership for Peace (PfP) initiative, in which all NACC partner countries and CSCE states are invited to participate. Endorsement of the Combined Joint Task Forces (CJTF) concept. Support for development of the European Security and Defence Identity. Reaffirmation of Alliance readiness to carry out air strikes in support of UN objectives in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Intensification of efforts against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Reaffirmation that the Alliance remains open to membership by other European countries.*

*MADRID, JULY 1997*

*Invitations to Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to begin accession talks. Reaffirmation of NATO's Open Door policy. Recognition of achievement and commitments represented by the NATO-Russia Founding Act.*

*Signature of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine.*

*Decision to update the Alliance's Strategic Concept.*

*Special Declaration on Bosnia and Herzegovina.*

*WASHINGTON D.C., 23-24 APRIL 1999*

*Commemoration of 50<sup>th</sup> Anniversary of the Alliance.*

*Issue of the Washington Declaration.*

*Working sessions and statement on the crisis in Kosovo. Discussion of initiatives relating to the future stability of southeastern Europe.*

*Approval of the Alliance's Strategic Concept. Adoption of the Membership Action Plan. Endorsement of the Enhanced and More Operational Partnership (PfP) and launching of the Defence Capabilities Initiative.*

*Cooperative initiative to address issues relating to Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD).*

## QUICK GUIDE TO KEY NATO ACRONYMS AND EXPRESSIONS

• • •

### AFOR

**Albania Force.** Force designated by the Alliance to support humanitarian efforts in Albania during the Kosovo crisis.

### CFE

**Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty.** The CFE Treaty is a major arms control treaty and a cornerstone of European security. More than 58,000 pieces of military equipment have been destroyed in Europe since NATO Allies and members of the then Warsaw Treaty Organisation signed the CFE in 1990. In March 1999, Russia, NATO and other European states reached agreement on all major CFE issues, opening the way for the adaptation of the CFE Treaty in time for the Summit of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe in Istanbul in November 1999.

### EAPC

**The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council.** Set up in May 1997 as the successor to the North Atlantic Cooperation Council, the EAPC provides the overarching framework for an expanded political dimension to PfP and for closer practical cooperation. It brings together representatives of the NATO Allies and Partners - 44 countries in all. A Summit Meeting of EAPC Heads of State and Government was held in Washington in April 1999, the day after the NATO Summit.

### ESDI

**European Security and Defence Identity.** The aim of developing ESDI within the Alliance is to enable all European Allies to make a more coherent and effective contribution to NATO as an expression of their shared responsibilities, and to reinforce the transatlantic partnership while at the same time enabling them to act together in a European context. ESDI is an essential part of the adaptation of Alliance structures.

### KFOR

**Kosovo Force.** Multinational force established in Kosovo under the auspices of the United Nations, in accordance with UN Security Resolution 1244 of 10 June 1999. An advance enabling force for KFOR was stationed in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup> by NATO in anticipation of a settlement. These troops were placed under the operational control of the Commander of the Allied Command Europe (ACE) Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC) at the start of NATO's air campaign at the end of March. They were subsequently reassigned to humanitarian tasks in response to the escalating refugee crisis. With additional forces sent to the region, these forces fulfilled essential tasks in providing direct support to the refugees in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia<sup>1</sup> as well as assisting the international humanitarian agencies.

### NAC

**North Atlantic Council.** Comprised of representatives of the Alliance's member countries this is the organisation's highest decision-making body. It meets regularly in Brussels at the level of Ambassadors, at least twice a year at the level of Foreign and Defence Ministers and occasionally - as in Washington in 1999 - in summit session at the level of Heads of State and Government.

(1)  
See footnote  
page 15.

## NATO

**North Atlantic Treaty Organisation.** Set up by the Washington Treaty of April 1949 as a system of Western collective defence. Three new members acceded to the organisation in March 1999, bringing to 19 the total number of member countries. Since the beginning of the 1990s, the NATO Allies have made big force reductions and adapted the Alliance's military command structure to carry out new future roles and missions of crisis management, peacekeeping and peace support. They cooperate actively with non-NATO countries in Europe through Partnership for Peace. The NATO-Russia Founding Act was signed with the Russian Federation in May 1997. In July 1997, NATO signed a Charter establishing a Distinctive Partnership with Ukraine. NATO commemorated its 50th Anniversary at the Washington Summit in April 1999.

## NATO-RUSSIA PJC

**Permanent Joint Council.** The PJC was established under the NATO-Russia Founding Act signed in May 1997. The Founding Act provides for regular meetings of the PJC at ambassadorial level as well as bi-annual meetings at the level of Foreign Ministers. Its purpose is to provide a venue for consultation, cooperation and consensus-building in discussions of political and security matters.

Following the beginning of Allied air operations to bring about an end the conflict of Kosovo, Russia suspended its participation in this forum. The Alliance expressed its regret at this decision, recognising its common interests with Russia in reaching a political solution to the crisis in Kosovo. NATO countries continued to work closely with Russia in the context of diplomatic initiatives to end the conflict.

## NATO-UKRAINE COMMISSION.

**The NATO-Ukraine Commission** was established under the terms of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine. The Commission meets at least twice a year to review progress in the development of the relationship between NATO and Ukraine. A Summit session of Heads of State and Government of the Allies and Ukraine was held in Washington on 24 April 1999.

## OSCE

**Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe.** Formerly known as the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), the OSCE was initially a political process setting out fundamental principles governing the conduct of international affairs to ease tension and build confidence among states. It is now an organisation with 55 members including all Europe, and Canada and the United States. The OSCE has overseen the organisation of elections in Bosnia-Herzegovina and organised, in late 1998 and early 1999, an international verification mission in Kosovo, to monitor compliance with U.N. Security Council resolutions on the crisis. OSCE verifiers were withdrawn after the failure in March 1999 of negotiations aimed at a political settlement.

## PARP

**PfP Planning and Review Process.** PARP was established in November 1994 as a separate activity within the Partnership for Peace programme, for those Partner countries wishing to participate. It aims to encourage transparency in defence planning and to develop the interoperability of Partner country forces with those of NATO countries, by developing and reviewing mutually agreed planning targets. Seventeen Partner countries currently participate in PARP.

## PfP

**Partnership for Peace.** Set up in January 1994, PfP offers the Alliance's Partners the opportunity to take part, with NATO, in security cooperation programmes tailored to their individual requirements. These include activities such as military exercises and civil emergency operations. PfP has been enhanced to give Partners greater say in planning and directing future programmes. There are currently 24 PfP countries.

## SACEUR and SACLANT

**The Supreme Allied Commander Europe and The Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic.** SACEUR and SACLANT are the two major commanders responsible for the Alliance's integrated military structure.

### *SFOR and IFOR*

The NATO-led **Stabilisation Force (SFOR)** has been deployed in Bosnia and Herzegovina since December 1996 as part of efforts to underpin the Dayton Peace Agreement in the former Yugoslavia. It replaced the **Implementation Force (IFOR)**, which was responsible for overseeing the fulfilment of the military aspects of the peace agreement. More than 35 NATO and non-NATO countries have contributed forces to SFOR, whose strength totals more than 30,000 troops.

### *SHAPE*

**Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe.** Located near Mons, Belgium, this is the headquarters of Allied Command Europe.

**Strategic Concept.** The Strategic Concept is the authoritative statement of the Alliance's objectives and provides the highest level guidance on the political and military means to be used in achieving them. It sets out the rationale for the Alliance and its activities, and provides the NATO Military Authorities direction for developing military capabilities and preparing for possible operations. The Strategic Concept was first published in 1991. The most recent version of the Strategic Concept was approved and published at the Washington Summit in 1999.

*In addition to taking account of political and military developments since 1991, the Strategic Concept confirms the Alliance's commitment to maintaining collective defence and the transatlantic link.*

### *WEU*

**Western European Union.** The WEU was originally established by the 1948 Treaty of Brussels. It now numbers ten member countries, all of which are also members of NATO. The WEU also has Associate Member countries (non-EU members of NATO), Associate Partners (non-EU and non-NATO countries), and several countries with Observer status. The WEU was reactivated in 1984 with the aim of developing a common European defence identity and strengthening the Alliance's European pillar.

