

18<sup>th</sup> INTERNATIONAL KYIV WEEK

**“RESHAPING NATO’S POSTURE FOR 21<sup>ST</sup> CENTURY CHALLENGES”**

**COURSE GUIDE**

**NATO DEFENSE COLLEGE**

**UKRAINIAN NATIONAL DEFENCE UNIVERSITY**



**NATO SCHOOL OBERAMMERGAU**

**23 – 27 April 2018**

*This document contains educational material for use by personnel of the NATO Defense College, the NATO School and the Ukrainian National Defence University. It does not necessarily reflect the official positions of the NATO Defense College, the NATO School or the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the written permission of the Commandant, NATO Defense College, Via Giorgio Pelosi, 1, 00143 ROMA (Cecchignola).*

Dear Participant,

The NATO Defense College (NDC), in cooperation with NATO School Oberammergau (NSO), has organized the 18th edition of “International Week” at the Ukrainian National Defense University (UNDU). The theme for this important NATO-Ukraine engagement is *“Reshaping NATO’s posture for 21st Century Challenges”*.

The NDC has provided quality education to the officers and civilian officials for more than 65 years. The core mission of the NDC is to prepare senior officers, diplomats and civilian officials to hold positions in NATO, in NATO-related posts in their respective capitals, and in multinational organizations. Fulfilling our mission involves a process of education in strategic thinking, collaborative decision-making and working in multinational environment. Sensitivity to social, cultural and linguistic differences, a respect for and knowledge of national positions and regional perspectives are all a part of the educational process.

This year, we are honoured to have two keynote addresses by H.E Mr Raimundas KAROBLIS, the Lithuanian Minister of National Defence and by Lieutenant General Jan BROEKS, the Director General of the NATO International Military Staff (DGIMS).

I have tasked my staff to prepare a programme that focuses on a younger generation of students, you, the leaders of the future. The International Kyiv Week gives NATO Headquarters to provide strategic messaging to the region, whilst also reaching a wider audience. International Week is one of the NATO Defense College’s most important outreach activities, and we have been tasked by the Military Committee of NATO to concentrate on the NATO Partnership for Peace Programme. We will describe to you the limitations of support from NATO, and explain the tenets of Article 5. We will discuss with you the ways in which NATO nations are able to control their respective armed forces, using the instruments of devolution and decentralization that form the NATO Operations Planning Process.

Although the Military may no longer be on the cutting edge of development of new technology, there is no question that technology is one of the main engines driving the ways in which we interact, how we plan and how we conduct operations. The disproportionate rate of technological development that exists between Allied nations and Partners can create problems in interoperability. The only solution to this is for us all to learn as much we can about new technology. You, the future leaders, must change your mind set and be open to novelty and therefore be in a position to informed decisions about how, when and where to incorporate the appropriate technology into the challenges of the future.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for taking the time out of your busy schedule to lend your support to the partnership and ongoing cooperation between NATO and Ukraine. It is my sincere hope that you will find the 18<sup>th</sup> International Kyiv Week a stimulating, rewarding and professionally enriching experience.

Lieutenant General Chris WHITECROSS

Royal Canadian Air Force

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

1. Programme
2. Introduction
3. Objectives
4. Preparation
5. Senior Speakers & Participants
6. Keynote Speeches
7. Academic Programme & Lecture Synopses
8. Committee Discussion Overview
9. Biographies
10. Enclosures; Article and Selected NDC Research Papers



Time	Topic	Lecturer	Time	Topic	Lecturer
<b>Monday 23 April 2018: Understanding NATO: Today and Tomorrow (GpCapt NOTMAN)</b>			<b>Thursday 26 April 2018: Planning Operational Level / Decentralized Execution (Capt. ALTMEIER)</b>		
09.15-09.25	Administrative Remarks	Capt (N) Peter PAPLER (NDC OPR SVN), Col Andrii CHEBOTARYOV UNDU LO	09.00-09:45	<b>10. The NATO Intro to Operational Planning Process (OPP), Part 1 Q &amp; A Session</b>	LtCol Titel IOVA, (ROU A), NSO JPOD
09.30-09.45	Int. Kyiv Week Opens	LtGen Anatoly N. SYROTENKO Cmdt UNDU	09.45-10:00	<b>11.The NATO Intro to OPP, Part 2 Q &amp; A Session</b>	LtCol Titel IOVA, (ROU A), NSO JPOD
09.45-10:15	Keynote Address	BGen Heinz J. FELDMANN, DAPP NDC Minister of National Defence H.E. Mr Raimundas KAROBUS (LTU)	10:00-10:45	Break	
10:15-11:00	NATO Keynote Address	LtGen Jan BROEKS (NATO/DGIMS-NLD)	10:45-11:00	<b>12. The NATO Logistic for NATO operations / Q &amp; A Session</b>	MajAndreas KERSTJENS, (NLD A), NSO JPOD
11:00-11:30	Press Conference	Cmdt UNDU, DGIMS, DAPP NDC, LTU	11:00-11:15	Lunch break	
11:00-11:30	Break	MinDef, Amb LTU, Dean NSO, DNLO	11:15-12:30	<b>13. Non-Art.5 funding: The NATO-led operations; Q&amp;A Session</b>	Mr Antonios VEZIRTZOLOU (NDC, GRC C)
11:30-12.15	<b>1.NATO-EU cooperation Q &amp; A Session</b>	Mr. Robertas ŠAPRONAS, Defence Policy Director (LTU)	12:30-13:30	Committee work	
12.15-12.30	Lunch Break		13:30-14:30	<b>14.Lecture of Opportunity: NATO Science &amp; Technology Organization</b>	Mr Alan SHAFFER (USA C), NATO STO (For UKR Mil/Civ Science & TechOrgs/Institutes)
12.30-13.15	Break		14.40-15:30		
13.15-14:00	<b>2. NATO Future Role Q &amp; A Session</b>	Dr Guillaume LASCONJARIAS (NDC-FRA C)			
14.00-14.30	Committee Work				
14.30-15.15	Reception LTU Embassy		19.30	NDC Dinner	
18:30					
<b>Tuesday 24 April 2018: Current &amp; Potential Security Issues, Threats &amp; Oppor. (Capt ALTMEIER)</b>					
09.00-09:45	<b>3. The Western perspectives of Russian power Q &amp; A Session</b>	Mr Keir GILES (GBR-C), Chatham House	09.00-10:00	<b>Friday 27 April 2018: Enhancing Future Cooperation (GpCapt NOTMAN)</b>	
09.45-10:15	Break		10.00-10:30	<b>15. NATO Technology Trends for Disruption Q &amp; A Session</b>	Mr Alan SHAFFER (USA C), NATO STO
10:15-11:15	<b>4. Hybrid Threats today and NATO's response; Q &amp; A Session</b>	Mrs Barbara MORONKOVA (NIDC-SVK C)	10:30-11:00	Break	
11:15-11:30	Break		11:00-11:30	<b>Closing Remarks</b>	LtGen Anatoly N. SYROTENKO (UKR A) Cmdt UNDU BGen Heinz J. FELDMANN, DAPP NDC, (DEU A),
11:30-12:30	<b>5. Deterrence and Civil Preparedness; Q &amp; A Session</b>	Dr Guillaume LASCONJARIAS (NDC-FRA C)			
12:30-13:30	Lunch Break		11.30-12.45	<b>Farewell Lunch</b>	
13:30-14.15	<b>6. The NATO Ukraine relation Q &amp; A Session</b>	Prof Grigoriy PEREPELTSIA (UKRC), FPRI			
14.15-14.45	Committee Work		12.50	<b>Departure Airport</b>	
14.55-15:30					
<b>Wednesday 25 April 2018: Political Military Interaction / Control (Col HILL)</b>					
09.00-09:45	<b>7. NATO Crisis Management Q &amp; A Session</b>	Ms Alessandra Procopio, (NATO HQ IS OPS DIV)			
09:45-10:15	Break				
10.15-10.45	<b>8. NATO School Crisis Management Scenario Q &amp; A Session</b>	LtCol Christopher RITTER, (USA F), NSO JPOD			
10:45-11:30	Lunch Break				
11:30-12:00	<b>9. NATO Strategic Response to Exercise scenario Q&amp;A Session</b>	Ms Alessandra Procopio, (NATO HQ IS OPS DIV)			
12:00-13:00	Committee Work				
13:00-13.45					
13.45-14.15					
14.25-15.15					

## 18<sup>th</sup> International Kyiv Week Programme

<b>Monday 23 April 2018</b> <b>“Understanding NATO: Today and Tomorrow”</b> <b>Moderator: Group Captain Scott R. NOTMAN, NDC, Head, Academic Policy Branch (GBR F)</b>		
Time	Topic	Lecturer/Speaker
0915-0925	Administrative Remarks	Capt (N) Peter PAPLER, NDC OPR (SVN) UNDU Liaison Officer
0930-0945	Opening of 18 <sup>th</sup> Intl Kyiv Week	LtGen Anatoly N. SYROTENKO, Cmdt UNDU (UKR A) BGen Heinz J. FELDMANN, Director Academic Planning & Policy Division (DEU A)
0945-1015	Keynote Address	H.E. Mr Raimundas KAROBLIS, Minister of National Defence of Lithuania <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1015-1100	1.NATO Keynote Address	LtGen Jan BROEKS, Director International Military Staff (DGIMS), NATO HQ (NLD A) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1100-1130	Joint Press Conference	H.E. Mr Raimundas KAROBLIS LtGen Jan BROEKS H.E. Mr Marius JANUKONIS, Amb LTU to UKR LtGen Anatoly N. SYROTENKO, Cmdt UNDU BGen Heinz J. FELDMANN, NDC DAPP (DEU A) Col Brian HILL (USA F), Dean NSO Mr Alexander VINNIKOV, Director NLO (NLD C)
1100-1130	BREAK	
1130-1215 1215-1230	2. NATO-EU Cooperation Q&A	Mr Robertas ŠAPRONAS, Director LTU Defence Policy <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1230-1315	LUNCH BREAK	
1315-1400 1400-1430	3. NATO's Future Role Q&A	Dr Guillaume LASCONJARIAS, NDC (FRA C) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1440-1530	Committee Work	
1830	Reception LTU Embassy	Invited Guests ONLY

<b>Tuesday 24 April 2018</b>		
<b>“Current &amp; Potential Security Issues, Threats &amp; Opportunities”</b>		
<b>Moderator: Captain (N) Alfons ALTERMEIR (DEU N)</b>		
<b>Time</b>	<b>Topic</b>	<b>Lecturer/Speaker</b>
0900-0945 0945-1015	4. Western Perspectives of Russia Q&A	Mr Keir GILES, Director Conflict Studies Institute & Fellow of Chatham House (GBR C) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1015-1115	5. Hybrid Threats Today & NATO's Response and Q&A	Ms Barbora MORONKOVA, Director NIDC (SVK C) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1115-1130	BREAK	
1130-1230	6. Deterrence & Civil Preparedness Q&A	Dr Guillaume LASCONJARIAS, NDC (FRA C) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1230-1330	LUNCH BREAK	
1330-1415 1415-1445	7. Ukraine-NATO Relationship Q&A	Prof Grigoriy PEREPELYTSIA, Director Foreign Policy Research Institute (UKR C) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1455-1530	Committee Work	
<b>Wednesday 25 April 2018</b>		
<b>“Political –Military Interaction &amp; Control”</b>		
<b>Moderator: Colonel Brian HILL (USA F), Dean NSO</b>		
0900-0945 0945-1015	8 NATO Crisis Management Q&A	Ms Alessandra PROCOPIO, NATO HQ OPS Div (ITA C) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1015-1030	BREAK	
1030-1115 1115-1200	9 NATO Crisis Management Exercise Scenario / Q&A	LtCol Christopher RITTER, NSO JPOD (USA F) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1200-1300	LUNCH BREAK	
1300-1345 1345-1415	10 NATO Strategic Level Response (to Ex Scenario) / Q&A	Ms Alessandra PROCOPIO, NATO HQ OPS Div (ITA C)
1425-1515	Committee Work	

<b>Thursday 26 April 2018</b> <b>Operational Level Planning / Decentralized Execution</b> <b>Moderator: Captain (N) Alfons ALTMEIR (DEU N), NDC</b>		
0900-0945 0945-1000	11 NATO Operational Planning Process (OPP), Part 1 Q&A	LtCol Titel IOVA, NSO JPOD (ROU A) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1000-1045 1045-1100	12 NATO OPP, Part 2 Q&A	LtCol Titel IOVA, NSO JPOD (ROU A)
1100-1115	BREAK	
1115-1230	13 NATO Logistics for NATO Operations / Q&A	Maj Andreas KERSTJENS, NSO JPOD (NLD A) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1230-1330	LUNCH BREAK	
1330-1430	<b>14 Funding non-At.5: NATO-led Operations / Q&amp;A</b>	Mr Antonios VEZIRTZOGLU, NDC (GRC C) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i>
1440-1530	Committee Work	
1440-1530	<b><u>Lecture of Opportunity:</u> NATO Science &amp; Technology Organization</b>	Mr Alan SHAFFER, NATO STO (USA C) <i>(CV at Annex X, Page Y)</i> <i>Audience: UKR Mil/Civ Scienc &amp; Technology organizations/ institutions ONLY</i>
1930	NATO Defense College Hosted Dinner	By Invitation Only
<b>Friday 27 April 2018</b> <b>Enhancing Future Cooperation</b> <b>Moderator: Group Captain Scott R. NOTMAN, NDC HAPB (GBR F)</b>		
0900-1000 1000-1030	15 NATO Technology Trends for Disruption Q&A	Mr Alan SHAFFER, NATO STO (USA C)
1030-1100	BREAK	
1100-1130	Closing Remarks	LtGen Anatoly N.SYROTENKO, Cmdt UNDU (UKR A) BGen Heinz J. FELDMANN, NDC DAPP (DEU A)
1145-1245	Farewell Lunch	
1300	Event ends/ Departures	

## 2. Introduction

This syllabus provides general information on the academic programme for the NATO Defense College's (NDC) 18<sup>th</sup> International Kyiv Week. The academic objectives will be achieved by the pre-course provision of background reading material, the delivery of lectures and subsequent discussion periods, and the exchange of ideas within small groups (committees).

First, the International Kyiv Week allows participants to experience the NDC's teaching and learning process as if they were in Rome, and next, to assist at lectures and receive first-hand information both from prominent academics and senior officials based at NATO Headquarters, all of whom are directly involved in the formulation of the Alliance's policies. The Faculty Advisors from the NATO Defense College (NDC), the NATO School Oberammergau (NSO) and the Ukrainian National Defence University (UNDU) will provide additional guidance and assistance during the week.

### Objectives

The course was developed to support the requirements of the curriculum of the Ukrainian National Defence University (UNDU). It is devoted to the analysis and discussion of key issues that contribute to shaping the contemporary security environment, and which are of primary importance for NATO's posture and adaptation for 21st century challenges. Moreover, lectures from the operational level are focused on typical NATO School scenarios, and related methods and planning techniques.

The aims of the International Week are:

1. To demonstrate the importance of a strong partnership between Ukraine and NATO
2. To identify (and learn) about the main security challenges faced by NATO and our Partners,
3. To inform Ukrainian National Defence University officers about NATO's past, current and future priorities and adaptation;
4. To improve their knowledge of NATO; its organization and working methods.

### Methodology

The number of participants in this week-long course (and their provenance from the strategic, operational and tactical levels) shape the way the NDC design the programme. This course is composed of four modules, each of which are mutually complementary, and intended to give our participants a greater understanding of NATO's security environment. Each lecture concludes with an interactive Question and Answer (Q&A) session, where participants can develop and consolidate their understanding of the topic under discussion by asking questions of the lecturer or speaker.

With the exception of Day 1, Monday 23 and Friday 27, there is one lecture focused on the strategic level and one on the operational, in order to stimulate and encourage specific discussions of these issues in committee. The purpose of *committee work* is to enable and encourage in-depth discussion of the respective topics of any given day of the Week, thereby allowing contrasting viewpoints to be aired. The idea behind a number of short lectures and committee discussions is to stimulate interest in participants and to encourage

them to ask questions, raise issues and generally be proactive. Given the large number of students attending the 18<sup>th</sup> International Kyiv Week, we plan on there being 12 committees, two of which are "strategic" and whose participants are likely to be colonels and high ranking civilians.

### **Preparation**

We want participants to prepare for the lectures by studying the background material contained in the Course Guide, and by examining the "Required Readings". Participants should attend the lectures and be ready and willing to contribute their thoughts ideas and experience so that the Week becomes a two-way discussion process. We strongly encourage participants to engage in the Q&A sessions and to do this in an environment of complete academic freedom. This is one of the cornerstones of the driving philosophy of NATO.

The programme for the International Kyiv Week will be coordinated and directly supported by Faculty Advisors from the NATO Defense College in Rome, Italy, the NATO School Oberammergau in Germany, and the Ukrainian National Defence University (UNDU).

### **3. Senior Speakers And Participants**

#### **Republic of Lithuania**

H.E. Mr Raimundas KAROBLIS

Minister of National Defence of the Republic of Lithuania

H.E. Mr Marius JANUKONIS

Ambassador of the Republic of Lithuania to Ukraine

Mr Robertas ŠAPRONAS

Director Defence Policy of the Ministry of National Defence of the Republic of Lithuania

#### **NATO Headquarters**

Lieutenant General Jan BROEKS,

Director International Military Staff (DGIMS) (NLD A)

#### **Ukrainian National Defence University (UNDU)**

Lieutenant General Anatolii SYROTENKO

Commandant

Lieutenant General Viktor TARASOV

First Deputy Commandant.

Major General Serhii SALKUTSAN

Deputy Commandant

Colonel Valerii DOBROGURSKYI

Deputy Commandant

Colonel Sergii STETSENKO

Head of the International Cooperation Office

Colonel Ivan KOZINETS  
Associate Professor of Strategy National Security and Defense Department

Colonel Andrii CHEBOTARYOV  
International Cooperation Section & UNDU Liaison Officer

**NATO Defense College**

Brigadier General Heinz-Josef FELDMANN  
Director Academic Planning & Policy Division (DEU A)

Group Captain Scott Ramsey NOTMAN  
Head, Academic Policy Branch (GBR F)

Captain (N) Peter PAPLER,  
Faculty Advisor & Officer of Primary Responsibility International Kyiv Week (SVN N)

Mrs Alexandra NARTOWICZ  
Executive Assistant to OPR (GBR C)

Dr Vira RATSIBORYNSKA  
Visiting Scholar, Academic Assistant ,(UKR C),

Dr Guillaume LASCONJARIAS  
Researcher (FRA C)

Mr Antonios VEZIRTZOGLU  
Deputy Head Budget & Finance Division (GRC C)

Lieutenant Colonel Roberto GIANNICE  
Budget and Finance Branch (ITA A)

**Visiting Speakers**

Mr Alan SHAFFER (USA C),  
NATO Science and Technology Organization (STO)

Mr Keir GILES  
Royal Institute of International Affairs - Chatham House (GBR C)

Professor Grigoriy PERPELYTSIA  
Director, Foreign Policy Research Institute (FPRI), (UKR C)

**NATO Liaison Office to Ukraine**

Mr Alexander VINNIKOV, Director

**NATO Military Liaison Officer**

Colonel Ota ROLENEC (CZE A)

**NATO School Oberammergau (NSO)**

Colonel Brian HILL  
Dean, NSO (USA F)

Lieutenant Colonel Christopher RITTER  
NSO JPOD (USA F)

Ms Alessandra PROCOPIO  
NATO HQ (ITA C)

Lieutenant Colonel Titel IOVA  
NSO JPOD (ROU A)

Major Andreas KERSTJENS  
NSO JPOD (NLD A)

**NATO Information & Documentation Centre (NIDC)**

Ms Barbora MORONKOVA, Director (SVK)

**4. Keynote Speeches**

**Keynote Address**

Speaker: H.E. Mr. Raimundas KAROBLIS (LTU C)  
Minister of National Defence of the Republic of Lithuania  
Date: Monday 23 April 2018

**NATO Keynote Address**

Speaker: Lieutenant General Jan BROEKS, (NLD A)  
Director General International Military Staff  
Date: Monday 23 April 2018

## Dear Participants

Our work in planning the NATO Defense College's curriculum means that we must pre-empt events, and be prepared for them, rather than simply reacting to events as they occur. Broadly speaking, our plan for this, the 18<sup>th</sup> International Week, is to focus on how the NDC and NATO do "business" by means of mission command control.

The challenges that all of us face today are very often the direct consequences of actions taken in the past. On occasion, these actions were taken by people qualified to do so, and sometimes by those who were not. The result is that today we are faced with events whose genesis was a long time ago. However and to a greater or lesser degree, we are all faced with finding solutions. Each of us is a product of the past. By means of education and sharing knowledge we can, to some degree, pre-empt or even anticipate future events. Education and knowledge should allow you, the leaders of the future, to take informed decisions. Knowledge is power.

I am a proponent of active learning and use a variety of methods to encourage discussion about and analysis of the issues presented in this short course. For example, our use of committees replicates the way in which NATO does business. As you know, NATO is a sort of "coalition" where issues are debated and actions are decided only *after* the representatives of 29 nations reach consensus. Committees here in Kyiv allow us to discuss and analyse the topics of the day in smaller groups where it is perhaps easier to share and listen to a variety of viewpoints.

I would like to emphasise once again the exceptional opportunity that this International Week can become for each of you. Please take the time to read, to reflect, to discuss, to share your opinions and to talk openly with each other. Academic freedom is the best and only way for you to reap the full benefit from this event. Used wisely, academic freedom is one of the most important and strongest "weapons" you will ever have. It is the instrument that enables you to attain interoperability. Your willingness to interact will serve as a knowledge multiplier and will benefit all your fellow participants.

It is my sincere hope that you grasp this opportunity and take an active and indeed *proactive* part in the 18<sup>th</sup> International Week. Your feedback and ideas will enable us to make next year's Week even better.

Brigadier General Heinz Josef FELDMANN (DEU A)  
Director  
Academic Planning and Policy Division

## 5. THE ACADEMIC PROGRAMME and SYNOPSES OF LECTURES

### Lecture 1. “NATO-EU Cooperation”

Lecturer: Mr Robertas ŠAPRONAS

Defence Policy Director

Ministry of National Defence of the Republic of Lithuania

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A Session: 15 minutes

#### **Outline of the speech:**

- Preliminary remarks/introduction
- History of the EU-NATO relations (pre-ESDP period; post-ESDP period; working together in the field under “Berlin Plus” arrangements; other areas of cooperation)
- The 2016 Warsaw Summit and EU-NATO relations
- NATO-EU cooperation after the Warsaw Summit
- Next steps
- Discussion

#### **1. Preliminary remarks / introduction.**

- In the current strategic environment, cooperation between the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) is essential. The two organisations are faced with unprecedented challenges emanating from the South and the East.
- A stronger EU and a stronger NATO are mutually reinforcing.
- How have we travelled to where we are now? What have been the main drivers of EU-NATO cooperation so far? And what have been the areas of concrete cooperation?

#### **2. History of the EU NATO Relations.**

##### **2.1. Pre-ESDP period:**

- Cold War – NATO vs Warsaw Pact. The alignment of nearly every European nation into one of the two opposing camps formalized the political division of the European continent. This alignment provided the framework for the military standoff that continued throughout the Cold War.
- The fundamental changes following the end of the Cold War created new opportunities for integration in security and defence policy, while also calling NATO’s purpose into question.
- The breakup of Yugoslavia and subsequent wars in Europe’s backyard showed that the EU was slow to act in unified response to crises, while NATO took the prominent role.
- In 1998, the Saint Malo Declaration was signed by the United Kingdom and France, opening the door to intensifying European integration on defence and security policies in conjunction with NATO.
- However, until 2000 EU and NATO did not have formal relations.

- In January 2001, an exchange of letters between the NATO Secretary General and the EU Presidency formalized the start of direct relations between NATO and the EU. It marks the beginning of institutionalised relations between NATO and the EU with the establishment of joint meetings, including at the level of foreign ministers and ambassadors. Exchange of letters between the NATO Secretary General and the EU Presidency on the scope of cooperation and modalities for consultation.

## **2.2. Post-ESDP period:**

- The "NATO-EU Declaration on ESDP", agreed on 16 December 2002, not only reaffirmed the EU assured access to NATO's planning capabilities for its own military operations, but also reiterated the following political principles of the strategic partnership:
  - effective mutual consultation;
  - equality and due regard for the decision-making autonomy of the EU and NATO;
  - respect for the interests of the EU and NATO members states;
  - respect for the principles of the Charter of the United Nations;
- Following the political decision of December 2002, the "Berlin Plus" arrangements, adopted on 17 March 2003, provide the basis for NATO-EU cooperation in crisis management by allowing EU access to NATO's collective assets and capabilities for EU-led operations.
- **Working together in the field under "Berlin Plus" arrangements:**
- Berlin-plus missions of the EU: Concordia (Macedonia), Althea (BiH-symbolic replacement of NATO's SFOR mission).

## **2.3. Other areas of cooperation:**

- EU and NATO foreign ministers have reaffirmed their willingness to develop closer cooperation to combat terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction.
- Concerted planning of capabilities development and mutual reinforcement between NATO's Prague Capability Commitment (PCC) and the EU's European Capabilities Action Plan (ECAP) have also become part of the NATO-EU agenda.
- NATO experts provided military and technical advice starting from the preparations to the implementation of the ECAP. NATO and EU capabilities planning and mutual reinforcement between the Prague Capability Commitment (PCC) and the ECAP are being addressed in the NATO-EU Capability Group, established in May 2003.

## **3. The 2016 Warsaw Summit and EU-NATO relations.**

- On 8 July 2016 the President of the European Council and the President of the European Commission, together with the Secretary General of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization signed a Joint Declaration in Warsaw with a view to giving new impetus and new substance to the NATO-EU strategic partnership. It outlined seven concrete areas where cooperation between the two organisations should be enhanced:
  - Countering hybrid threats;
  - Operational cooperation including at sea and on migration;

- Cyber security and defence;
- Defence capabilities;
- Defence industry and research;
- Exercises;
- Supporting Eastern and Southern partners' capacity-building efforts.

#### **4. NATO-EU cooperation after the Warsaw Summit.**

- With a view to consolidating progress and ensuring further advances in all areas, on 5 December 2017, the two Councils endorsed a common set of new proposals. The set includes a total of 34 actions for the implementation of the Joint Declaration. They also address new topics, such as counterterrorism, military mobility and women, peace and security.
- As a direct follow-up to the Joint Declaration, the two organisations are opening their activities to each other to gain better knowledge and understanding of each other. Cooperation is now indeed the established norm and daily practice, fully corresponding to the new level of ambition referred to in the Joint Declaration, providing a solid basis for further enhanced interaction.

#### **5. Next steps.**

- The next progress report on implementation is due in June 2018. A written report will be submitted to the respective EU and NATO Councils on modalities for systematic cooperation, engagement and liaison between the staffs of the two Organisations in the implementation of the common proposals.
- EU-NATO cooperation continues to take place on the basis of key guiding principles: openness, transparency, inclusiveness and reciprocity, in full respect of the decision-making autonomy and procedures of both organisations without prejudice to the specific character of the security and defence policy of any Member State.

#### **6. Discussion.**

- Has NATO become more, or less, relevant for peace and security in Europe after the Cold War?
- EU defence initiatives: Where does NATO fit?
- The future of EU – NATO relations: overlapping capacities or successful further cooperation? What can be done in order to develop even deeper/better coordination and ensure combined efforts?

## Lecture 2. “NATO’s Future Role”

Lecturer: Dr Guillaume LASCONJARIAS, (FRA C)

NATO Defense College Researcher

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A Session: 30 minutes

### Objectives

- Discuss how NATO has evolved since 2014 and analyse its relevance in the global collective security landscape.
- Discuss the reintroduction of key concepts in NATO’s vocabulary, such as (re)assurance and deterrence, and discuss the addition of new items.
- Analyse the need for transformation of the alliance, with the global shift of geopolitical power and the issues that affect transatlanticism.

### Introduction

Russia’s aggressive actions against Ukraine have fundamentally challenged NATO’s vision of a Europe “*whole, free, and at peace*”<sup>1</sup>. In a changing security landscape, Europeans have experienced a significant “wake-up call” since Russia’s annexation of Crimea and the start of the conflict in the eastern part of Ukraine, whilst at the same time, coming from the South, large flows of uncontrolled migrants and the rise of terror attacks in some capitals have forced countries bordering the Mediterranean Sea to reconsider their southern neighbourhood.

Facing these numerous challenges, one could argue that all of this combines in a matrix that reinforces NATO’s posture, helping the organization to pursue a path that involves no major departure from its traditional tasks. On the contrary, some might even analyse the crisis as a shift back to (old) “business as usual”, with a greater focus on Euro-Atlantic security. Others, more intent on criticizing the Alliance at all costs, have gone further, pointing out that some in Brussels might have been “glad” about the crisis in Ukraine, as it was “*giving the aging alliance something to do*”<sup>2</sup>. Of course, this has to do with the traditional discussions on NATO’s relevance in a unipolar world and its ability to survive the Cold War and the collapse of its former foe, the Soviet Union.

NATO’s story in the last twenty years could be summarized as a quest for a convincing rationale<sup>3</sup>. The out-of-area missions were a first answer: responding to the famous 1993

---

<sup>1</sup> NATO, *Wales Summit Declaration*, 5 September 2014

<sup>2</sup> Stephen Walt, “NATO Owes Putin a Big Thank-You”, *Foreign Policy*, 4 September 2014 [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/09/04/nato\\_owes\\_putin\\_a\\_big\\_thank\\_you\\_russia\\_ukraine](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2014/09/04/nato_owes_putin_a_big_thank_you_russia_ukraine)

<sup>3</sup> Julian Lindley-French, “NATO’s Post-2014 Strategic Narrative”, *NDC Conference Report*, July 2014, (<http://www.ndc.nato.int/download/downloads.php?icode=418>)

quote by Senator Richard Lugar (“*NATO has to go out-of-area or out-of-business*”), NATO has never been so active as in the last twenty years, engaged in operations in Bosnia and over Kosovo and, after 2001, in Afghanistan, in the Mediterranean Sea, in Iraq, off the Horn of Africa and in Libya. In doing so, NATO has evolved from maintaining an exclusive focus on territorial defence in Europe to overseeing a range of military and crisis management operations across the globe, which translated into a new Strategic Concept in 2010.

“*Then came the Ukraine crisis*”<sup>4</sup>. This turned things upside down in a way no one could have predicted. Despite their sometimes difficult relations, NATO nations and Russia had been discussing issues of common interest through formal arrangements, in a collaborative way. Suddenly, everything fell to pieces as the Russian bear raised its head again. Those who were caught off-guard were those who had firmly believed Russia was a possible partner, with which one could do business. Clearly, in a couple of months, the perception changed as Russian actions prompted a reassessment of a “Cold War déjà-vu”, leading the Alliance to suspend all practical civilian and military cooperation with Moscow<sup>5</sup>.

The Wales and Warsaw Summits thus proved to be crucial turning points, galvanizing international responses to common threats: in short, re-energizing NATO into an Alliance and marking a return to basics, without forgetting its international commitments and its key position as a global security network. The first major outcome was the need to realign NATO’s force structure and send a strong message that NATO could – and would – provide help and assistance if one of its member states were to come under attack. The notion of “assurance” or “reassurance” was the first building block of the Readiness Action Plan (RAP), by which the Eastern European allies could immediately see “more jets in the air and more ships on the sea”. Designed to “*ensure that NATO remains a strong, ready, robust, and responsive Alliance capable of meeting current and future challenges from wherever they may arise*”, the RAP is also a driver of transformation within the Alliance<sup>6</sup>. But above all, the Wales Summit was crucial in reversing the trend of declining defence budgets, with the decision made by the Heads of State and Government to increase their military spending to 2% of each country’s Gross Domestic Product (GDP) over the next ten years<sup>7</sup>. After decades of trimming their defence budget to the bone, Europeans decided to invest more and, especially, try to bridge the lack of critical capacities – already exposed to some extent during the Libyan air campaign back in 2011.

Warsaw brought all of this on the table again, and reinforced the need for NATO to properly deter Russia. But at the same time, to comply with some of the arguments

---

<sup>4</sup> Judy Dempsey, *Why Defense Matters. A New Narrative for NATO*, Carnegie Europe, 24 June 2014.

<sup>5</sup> Roger McDermott, Heidi Reisinger, Brooke Smith-Windsor, “Cold War Déjà Vu? NATO Russia and the Ukraine Crisis”, *NDC Research Report*, March 2014 (<http://www.ndc.nato.int/download/downloads.php?icode=406>)

<sup>6</sup> NATO, *Wales Summit Declaration*, 5 September 2014, paragraph 5

<sup>7</sup> NATO, *Wales Summit Declaration*, 5 September 2014, paragraph 14

presented by influential member states, a new emphasis was placed on not forgetting that NATO's mission was more than just collective defence. The introduction of a (not so new) concept like projecting stability, as we saw in the 2016 Warsaw Summit communiqué and in all the subsequent documents, speeches and meetings, reflects the internal rationale involving Alliance coherence as much as it does the added-value from actual cooperation with states in the region. Some members of the Alliance may believe that, with the strong response to Russian challenges in Northeastern Europe (e.g., Enhanced Forward Presence, forward deployed multinational forces in the Balkans, increased air policing, the creation of new command structures for reinforcements and for the North Atlantic, the enhanced NATO Response Force), the problem with the Eastern frontier is "fixed." With that done, goes the thinking, the Alliance can now turn its attention to the South, and projecting stability seems to be the best way to try and deal with the serious problems arising in the MENA region.

With Russia back in the game, with a still ongoing crisis on the eastern border of Europe, and with areas of instability alongside the borders of some member states, it is no surprise to see the Alliance discussing its courses of action and the necessary steps to be taken. Even if the threat assessment is not shared by all members (Poland and the Baltic States being more concerned than Mediterranean Allies), the past Summits have had the merit of asking the right questions and pushed the Alliance forward in a direction that reinforces its relevance and the ability to carry out its core tasks. Now seems the right time to focus on adaptation, and to understand that sharing resources, or spending a bit more on defence, is needed in order to make Europeans realize that freedom entails costs to be borne: it is not "for free".

### **Suggestions for Committee Discussion**

- Has NATO fully understood the Russian threat? Are reassurance measures enough?
- How should NATO properly balance between its Eastern and Southern strategic directions without lapsing into a regionalized alliance?
- Does the concept of Projecting Stability make sense to partners? What would their expectations be with regard to this concept?

### **Readings**

Bruno Tertrais: Article 5 of the Washington Treaty: Its Origins, Meaning and Future

Jeff Larsen: Time to Face Reality: Priorities for NATO's 2016 Warsaw Summit

Anthony Juarez: Rethinking Deterrence and Assurance - Western Deterrence Strategies: at an Inflection Point?

Alessandra Di Benedetto: NATO's Special Meeting in Brussels Addressing Current Priorities and Restating Core Values

Judy Dempsey: NATO's Eastern Flank and Its Future Relationship With Russia, Carnegie, 2017 (<http://carnegieeurope.eu/2017/10/23/nato-s-eastern-flank-and-its-future-relationship-with-russia-pub-73499>)

Julian Lindley-French: NATO: The Enduring Alliance, London, 2015

### **Lecture 3: "The Western Perspectives of Russian Power"**

Lecturer: Mr Keir GILES (GBR C)

Royal Institute of International Affairs - Chatham House

Date: Tuesday 24 April

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A Session: 30 minutes

#### **Objectives**

- Explain Western views and assumptions on a range of Russian levers of power
- Explain limitations of Western understanding of sources of Russian conduct
- Lay out conceptual differences between Russia and West that further impede this understanding
- Consider options for deterring Russia from military adventurism
- 

#### **Introduction**

The extent to which the Russian view of the world, of history, and even of geography differs from that which is commonly accepted in the West is routinely underestimated by Western leaders and is a root cause of ongoing conflict and confrontation. Russia's geopolitical priorities are founded on assumptions that are unrecognizable to the West, and consequently assessments of the courses of action that may seem normal or rational to Russia are routinely mistaken. Russia's different version of history – now officially enforced as it was during Soviet times – provides an additional layer of miscommunication. This is a major factor in the West being continually taken by surprise by Western actions, even when the precursors to those actions have been clear to experts and analysts focusing on Russia itself.

The mismatch between the mental and political boundaries of Russia leads to conflict, as the Russian view of entitlement to dominion over its neighbours clashes with the Western assumption that small nations, even those bordering Russia, are entitled to make their own foreign policy and security policy choices. Meanwhile the persistent notion that the West is plotting to invade or subvert Russia, and that Russia is a topic of interest to the West at all, is a continual source of bewilderment and confusion to Western leaders who harbor no such intentions. Nevertheless the awareness of this notion is highly damaging, as it leads

the West to self-deter from taking action to defend itself, for fear that this may “provoke” Russia into launching pre-emptive strikes.

NATO nations are fully aware of the depth and extent of military transformation, reorganization and rearmament in Russia over the last decade. However, some of the conceptual arguments that accompany this process have been grossly misrepresented or even fabricated in the West. Phrases like “Russian hybrid warfare” and “Gerasimov Doctrine” have taken deep root in NATO, and serve only to confuse and mislead assessments of Russian options. Meanwhile, real developments in Russian exercise of power, such as the embrace of information warfare, have been until recently largely overlooked. Consequently, Western states and in some cases even their armed forces have been entirely unprepared for Russian information warfare offensives.

Meanwhile, Russian concepts of nuclear warfare provide yet another area of confusion. While it is generally held that Russia sees much wider scope for employment of tactical nuclear weapons than does the West, the exact circumstances under which this might occur give rise to fierce and often evidence-free argument. The notion that Russia plans to “escalate to de-escalate”, using a demonstrative nuclear strike to end a conflict that is going badly for Russia in conventional terms, is firmly embedded in Western thinking about Russian nuclear doctrine, and yet not supported by Russian doctrinal writing in open sources.

Options for NATO nations to exercise deterrence of Russia are hampered by a range of both internal and external influences. Highly successful Russian information campaigns reinforce the apparently mutually contradictory ideas that Russia is not a threat, but that defensive measures to close off opportunities for Russia will trigger an attack. Meanwhile even if the political will is present, long-term defence drawdowns are continuing to eviscerate military power in many NATO nations despite recent small increases in spending. The Western European trajectory toward defence irrelevance remains pronounced, and Russia would be entirely justified in thinking these nations do not in fact treat defence of their or their allies’ territory as a serious subject for investment.

The result is that Russia feels confident that it can undertake a wide range of measures short of war in order to improve its position, with damaging consequences for NATO allies far from the front line.

### **Suggestions for Committee Discussion**

- To what extent does NATO have a clear and unified picture of Russian strategic intentions and priorities?
- What is the solution to the mismatch between Western and Russian mental geography?
- How can NATO more effectively deter Russia from military adventurism?
- What, if anything, would show Russia that NATO’s intentions are not hostile?

#### **Lecture 4. “Hybrid Threats Today and NATO’s Response”**

Lecturer: Ms Barbora MARONKOVA (SVK C)

Director, NATO Information & Documentation Center (NIDC)

Duration: 60 minutes (Q&A Session incl.)

The emergence of hybrid threats in modern warfare has been followed by a series of events in which both state and non-state actors have started using a combination of techniques to achieve both strategic and tactical advantages.

These can be traced back to the launch of asymmetric threats and covert terrorist attacks by Hezbollah, a practice which was taken further by the Taliban in Afghanistan and the so-called Islamic State in Iraq and Syria.

However, the event that has done most to define the current situation regarding hybrid warfare took place in February 2014, when covert Russian military forces (referred to as little green men in the first media reports – a name that was then adopted, wrongly, by many state actors and experts) seized military bases that legally belonged to Ukraine. Within a month, the Russian Federation – through a dubious referendum – had annexed Crimea.

This prompted NATO not only to react politically, but also to review its military readiness to deal with this new form of warfare.

Whilst hybrid warfare is nothing new according to many military historians and experts, and deception has always been part of military strategy, technological advances, globalization and the interconnectedness of key supply chains between countries have greatly enhanced the complexity of threats emanating from use of hybrid techniques.

In its Wales Summit declaration dated 5 September 2014, NATO describes hybrid warfare as a wide range of overt and covert military, paramilitary, and civilian measures employed in a highly integrated design.

During this Summit, NATO’s Heads of States and Governments also clearly identified the organization’s response to hybrid warfare. The Summit Declaration urges the Alliance to develop:

... the necessary tools and procedures required to deter and respond effectively to hybrid warfare threats, and the capabilities to reinforce national forces. This will also include enhancing strategic communications, developing exercise scenarios in light of hybrid threats, and strengthening coordination between NATO and other

organizations, in line with relevant decisions taken, with a view to improving information sharing, political consultations, and staff-to-staff coordination.

So what has NATO achieved so far?

NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg declared the need to be ready to deal with every aspect of this new reality, whatever its source. And that means we must look closely at how we prepare for, deter and, if necessary, defend against hybrid warfare.

To be prepared, NATO must be able to see and analyse correctly what is happening; to see the patterns behind events which appear isolated and random; and quickly identify who is behind them, and why.

NATO has taken steps to improve its situational awareness and sharpen its early warning system. This is about intelligence, expert knowledge and analytical capacity. In this regard, NATO has strengthened its intelligence coordination by creating a dedicated division in NATO HQ in 2016.

At the Warsaw Summit in July 2016, NATO adopted a strategy and actionable implementation plans on its role in countering hybrid warfare. The primary responsibility to respond to hybrid threats or attacks rests with the targeted nation. NATO is prepared to assist an Ally at any stage of a hybrid campaign. The Alliance and the Allies will be prepared to counter hybrid warfare as part of collective defence. The Council could decide to invoke Article 5 of the Washington Treaty.

Hybrid warfare is by default complex and beyond national borders. Its trademark is that it can simultaneously attack various targets – by spreading misinformation, cyber attacks and hacking. And this is why a comprehensive approach is needed, working together with the European Union and other international partners – such as Ukraine.

Another important step was achieved at the Warsaw Summit – the recognition of cyber as a fifth operational domain. This is an important step forward, since one of the key elements of hybrid warfare is the use of cyber attacks.

Cyber defence will continue to be integrated into operational planning and Alliance operations and missions. NATO continues to implement its Enhanced Policy on Cyber Defence, and to strengthen its cyber defence capabilities, thanks to its use of cutting-edge technologies.

NATO Allies have also adopted the Cyber Defence Pledge. This commits the member states to enhance the cyber defences of their national networks and infrastructure, as a matter of priority. Each ally will honour its responsibility to improve its resilience and ability to respond quickly and effectively to cyber attacks, including in hybrid contexts.

NATO has also recognized the importance of its readiness to face any situations, including hybrid attacks. Therefore, complex scenarios are regularly included in NATO exercises – whether these are table top simulations at NATO HQ, where political decision-making is tested, or military exercises on the ground.

Important additional measures are taken by individual Allies, under NATO's guidance, on strengthening the resilience of critical infrastructure and improving national plans for civil emergency and crisis management.

Hybrid warfare is a test of our resolve to resist and to defend ourselves. And it can be a prelude to a more serious attack; because behind every hybrid strategy, there are conventional forces, increasing the pressure and ready to exploit any opening. NATO and our partners need to demonstrate that we can, and will, act promptly whenever and wherever necessary.

## **Lecture 5. “Deterrence and Civil Preparedness”**

Lecturer: Dr Guillaume LASCONJARIAS, (FRA C)

NATO Defense College Researcher

Duration: 60 minutes

### **Objectives**

- Discuss how NATO has rediscovered the concept of resilience and civilian preparedness recently, and how this concept is included in its adaptation scheme.
- Underline the commonalities and differences between the Cold War period, when civilian preparedness was seen as a military necessity, and the present time, when the overall social and economic system has totally changed priorities in this respect.
- Identify the key infrastructure and related priorities for defence and protection.
- Underline the Allies’ and Partners’ priorities, so as to be less vulnerable to hybrid threats.

### **Introduction**

At the Warsaw Summit in July 2016, Heads of State and Government issued an official statement in which they committed themselves to “continue to enhance [...] resilience against the full spectrum of threats, including hybrid threats, from any direction. Resilience is an essential basis for credible deterrence and defence and effective fulfilment of the Alliance’s core tasks.”<sup>8</sup> Seen as a means to “deter, contain, respond, and remain resilient

---

<sup>8</sup> NATO, “Commitment to enhance resilience », issued by the Heads of State and Government, Warsaw, 8 July 2016, ([http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_133180.htm](http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133180.htm))

to the violent, disruptive, or military efforts of others”<sup>9</sup>, resilience is indeed the core skill and quality that a society at large should maintain to allow continuity of government.

Coming from the field of human psychology, the notion of resilience has quickly spread to other dimensions, including the field of security-related studies in the general sense of being able to “bounce back” after a disturbance. Understood as the overall “ability of the community, services, area or infrastructure to detect, prevent and, if necessary, to withstand, handle and recover from disruptive challenges”, resilience therefore applies not only to physical entities – services or infrastructure – but also to individuals and to society at large<sup>10</sup>. Its popularity stems from the emergence of new threats and security challenges, ranging from various natural and technological risks to other threats that are impossible to forecast, or even to imagine. It thus places the accent on being prepared, rather than preventing a possible catastrophe that might never happen.

For NATO, resilience is directly linked to events since 2014. All the discussions about the “new character of war” being waged by Putin’s Russia have insisted on the “hybrid dimension” and “non-linear tactics”, that come into play both on NATO’s frontline and in the heart of our nations’ capitals<sup>11</sup>. After an initial conventional response, NATO has gone back to its traditional understanding of collective defence, focusing on implementing the decisions taken at the Wales and Warsaw summits, from the RAP to eFP, and from the NATO defence spending pledge to the more global adaptation of the command and force structure. This was mandatory to at least create a sense of deterrence.

However, the nations have acknowledged that, against hybrid tactics, their military might not always be the proper tool and that a whole-of-society approach is needed. Especially, some comments have highlighted that, if war has changed, “so must defense. New approaches are urgently needed that extend traditional efforts at territorial protection and deterrence to encompass modern approaches to resilience. [...] Militaries are still relevant, but many critical requirements are civil. Hybrid responses require arrangements that encompass both civil government organizations as well as key private sector entities.”<sup>12</sup> All in all, NATO’s militaries are less resilient to any kind of threat, as they have reduced their autonomy and opened up to the free market, relying more and more on civilian assets.

---

<sup>9</sup> Franklin D. Kramer, Hans Binnendijk, and Daniel S. Hamilton, *NATO’s New Strategy: Stability generation*, Atlantic Council and Center for Transatlantic Relations, Washington D.C., September 2015, ([http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/images/publications/NATOs\\_new\\_strategy\\_web.pdf](http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/images/publications/NATOs_new_strategy_web.pdf))

<sup>10</sup> According to the definition found in the U.K. *Civil Protection Lexicon*, version 2.1.1, revised February 2013 (<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/emergency-res.1.ponder-interoperability-lexicon>)

<sup>11</sup> Guillaume Lasconjarias and Jeffrey A. Larsen (eds.), *NATO’s Response to Hybrid Threats*, Rome, NDC Forum Paper 24, 2015, (<http://www.ndc.nato.int/download/downloads.php?icode=471>).

<sup>12</sup> Franklin Kramer, Hans Binnendijk, and Dan Hamilton, “Defend the Arteries of Society,” *US News and World Report*, 9 June 2015 (<http://www.usnews.com/opinion/blogs/world-report/2015/06/09/russia-ukraine-and-the-rise-of-hybrid-warfare>)

If one considers the possibility of a crisis within a NATO member state, the fact is that today's government and militaries are overwhelmingly dependent on the private sector, and this impacts "the capability to safeguard government and government entities, together with essential services that help to protect the population and guarantee civilian support to military operations"<sup>13</sup>. Again, the past can serve as a precedent, as NATO during the Cold War had not only plans but also policies and agencies to ensure that major military operations could proceed without the risk of the "home front" falling apart. Since 2016, a lot of attention has been focused on this and NATO has laid down the areas in which improvements are needed. However, more has to come, and resilience must now be concretely implemented, with NATO setting the standards and finding which nations are willing to help specify the requirements.

Far from simply being a catchphrase or an additional buzzword, resilience has become a key notion not just among NATO members but also among certain NATO partner countries. Starting from the need to bounce back and recover swiftly after any shock, the concept now addresses the once forgotten issues of being able to continue operating even in difficult situations. This is especially striking when considering that most of the research done recently in the resilience domain limits itself to infrastructure and networks – mainly cyber, but not only. There is agreement on the financial impact for already severely depleted defence budgets, and on the interest of trying to fix things by having the private sector on board. However, few publications mention that these costs in terms of "hardware" might probably be very limited if compared to those dealing with the psychological aspect of resilience, i.e the change of mindset and the harnessing of a new defensive spirit.

### **Suggestions for Committee Discussion**

Does the concept of resilience make sense? Should it be implemented as one of NATO's core tasks?

In times of grey zones and hybrid tactics, can civilian preparedness help a society/ nation recover at full speed from a setback?

What should NATO emphasize with regard to partner nations? Conversely, what can partners bring NATO as lessons learned?

### **Readings**

DHS: What Is Security and Resilience?, 2017 (<https://www.dhs.gov/what-security-and-resilience>)

---

<sup>13</sup> Which is the NATO working definition of resilience.

Uwe Hartmann: The Evolution of the Hybrid Threat, and Resilience as a Countermeasure  
Guillaume Lasconjarias: Deterrence through Resilience - NATO, the Nations and the Challenges of Being Prepared

Myriam Dunn Cavelty, Mareile Kaufmann Kristian Sjøby Kristensen: Resilience and (in)security: Practices, subjects, temporalities, 2015  
(<http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/0967010614559637>)

## **Lecture 6: “The NATO-Ukraine Relationship”**

Lecturer: Professor Grigoriy PEREPELYTSIA, (UKR C)

Director, Foreign Policy Research Institute

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A Session 30 minutes

### **UKRAINE - NATO Relations**

#### **Objectives:**

- Review of Ukraine's strategy in relations with NATO in the context of Russian-Ukrainian conflict.
- Assessment of the current status of cooperation between Ukraine and NATO.
- Determination of the challenges and opportunities of Ukraine's membership in NATO under conditions of joint threats .

#### **Questions:**

- 1. Can Ukraine move closer to NATO membership?**
- 2. The current state of Ukraine-NATO relations and strategy for the future.**

***Lectures of Professor Grigoriy Perepelytsia (Ukraine) on the topic: «UKRAINE - NATO Relations»***

Ukraine's progress towards NATO membership proved to be a rather complicated and controversial process. There were certain changes, obstacles and irreparable losses on this path, with a return to the past. It should be noted that even today, after 24 years of close relations with Alliance, its significance in ensuring national security of the country so far has remained half realized by either the Ukrainian society or its political elite. Consequently, Ukraine's approach to NATO depends on the role that the Alliance can play in ensuring Ukraine's security, as well as in the awareness of society's need for it.

The European integration course of Ukraine and Russian military aggression ultimately raised up the question to the new ruling elite in Ukraine, which came to power on the shoulders of the Maidan, concerning radical review of relations with NATO. The logical answer to this question is Ukraine's accession to the North Atlantic Alliance, as it was done by all the Central European countries that belonged to the communist camp during the Cold War. An important factor in solution of this issue was the radical change in public opinion about NATO membership. First of all, under the influence of the war, supporters of NATO membership in Ukrainian society increased from 15% in 2012 to 47% in 2017.

Political elites in Ukraine were forced to respond to such changes in public opinion. Therefore, at the legislative level, a number of important documents were adopted, confirming the foreign policy course of Ukraine aimed at NATO membership. On June 8, 2017, the Verkhovna Rada made some legislative changes in the part of the Euro-Atlantic integration of Ukraine, which defined, in particular, "the acquisition of membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization" as a foreign policy priority of the country. In the text of the National Security Strategy of Ukraine was introduced regulation concerning necessity for membership in NATO. At the same time, Ukrainian President P. Poroshenko assured that "Ukraine has a clear schedule or «road map» of what needs to be done in order to meet the criteria by 2020». Thus, the official vector of Kyiv's policy concerning Euro-Atlantic integration was gradually transformed in accordance with actual changes in public sentiments and set of public opinion.

NATO appropriately recognized such changes and on March 10, 2018, the North Atlantic Alliance recognized Ukraine's aspirations to gain full membership in the organization.

Ukraine was officially included in the list of four countries that declared their intentions to become NATO members in the future. Thus Ukraine officially acquired status of «**aspirant country**», which means recognizing it as a candidate for NATO membership.

Despite the significant intensification of cooperation with NATO, Ukraine faces a challenging road concerning gaining membership in this organization. As Vice Prime Minister of Ukraine for European and Euro-Atlantic Integration Ivanna Klimpush-Tsintsadze, noted, «There is a long way from recognition of ambitions to membership, consisting primarily of internal work, but we can make it successfully if we will be focused on changing the country in accordance with NATO's democratic, social, economic, political and, of course, military principles and approaches».<sup>14</sup> Consequently, not declarative, but real reforms in Ukraine are a guarantee of Ukraine's membership in the Alliance.

### **Questions for discussion:**

- 1 What is “aspirant country” and how it differs from the status of "candidate country" of NATO member.
2. Is Ukraine's membership in NATO possible under the conditions of the Russian-Ukrainian war?
3. Is referendum is mandatory for gaining membership in NATO?
4. Is NATO capable to defend its members from Russian military aggression in conditions when decisions in the Alliance are taken by consensus?

### **LIST OF RECOMMENDED LITERATURE**

1. Brezhneva T., Yizhak O., Shevtsov A. Euro-Atlantic integration of Ukraine: military-political aspects: Monograph / Ed. akad .. NAS V.P. Horbulina - Dnipropetrovsk: Porohy, 2003. - 160 p.
2. Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine Committee on European Integration: "On Ukraine's Relations with Ukraine and NATO": Parliament proceedings. / Zarubinskiy O.O., Mysyk I.I., Dvornik C.O. and others– K, 2003. – 286 p.
3. Ukraine-NATO Relations: Economic Aspects / Ed O.I. Soskin. – K.: Publishing house «ITC», 2003. – 120 p.
4. Demchyk P.O. International relations and problems of Euro-Atlantic integration. Tutorial. – K.: PPP, 2004. – 264 p.
5. NATO Directory. - Brussels, 2001. – 608 p.

---

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.kmu.gov.ua/ua/news/pivnichnoatlantichnij-alyans-oficijno-viznav-za-ukrayinoyu-status-krayini-aspiranta>

6. Pros and cons: Debate on Euro-Atlantic security issues. - NATO Public Diplomacy Division.
7. Partnership Ukraine-NATO. – K.:Ltd. VRA „Vizkom”, 2002. – 32 p.
8. Poltoratsky O.C. NATO in Modern Euro-Atlantic Relations: Initial Guide. K., 2005. – 226 p.
9. Todorov I.Y. Ukraine on the way to the European and Euro-Atlantic community: Monograph. – Donetsk: DonEU, 2006. – 268 p.
10. Ukraine-NATO: the future in the hands of the past. / Razumkov Center – K.: Publ.„Zapovit”, 2004. – 176 p.
11. Ukraine on the path to NATO: through radical reforms to membership / Ed. H.M. Perepelytsia. – K.: Publ. „Stilos”. 2004. – 400 p.
12. The Path to NATO: Dimension of Security. The leaders of the opinions - about the Euro-Atlantic integration of Ukraine / V.V. Badrak, S.G.Zgurekts, M.M. Samusy, O.O. Nabochenko. – K., 2006. – 222 p.
13. Borawski John, 1957 – 2000. NATO after 2000: the future of the Euro-Atlantic Alliance. London, Preager, 2001. – 161p.
14. Bilinski, Yaroslav. Endgame in NATO’s enlargement: the Baltic States and Ukraine/ London, Preager, 1999. – 148p.
15. Yost David. NATO transformed: the Alliance’s new roles in international security. Washington DC, United States Institute of peace, 1998. – 450p.
16. Peacekeeping activity of Ukraine: cooperation with NATO and other structures of European security. K.: "Stilos", 2002.
17. Ukraine-NATO: Partnership Diagnostics. K., Institute of World Politics. 2015. – 42p.

## **Lecture 7. “NATO Crisis Management”**

Lecturer: Ms Alessandra Procopio (ITA C)

NATO HQ International Staff OPS Division

Date: Wednesday 25 April 2018

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A Session: 30 minutes

### Objectives

- Present and discuss NATO’s role, as a political-military alliance, in the management of international crises

- Discuss NATO's structures and procedures that enable the Alliance to effectively contribute to the broader effort of the International Community in addressing crises
- Discuss NATO's cooperation with partners and other International Organisations when carrying out the crisis management task

### Background

NATO, as an intergovernmental political and military alliance, has as its essential purpose to safeguard the freedom and security of its member through political and military means.

The Strategic Concept, adopted by Heads of State and Government at the NATO Summit in Lisbon in 2010, identified NATO's three core tasks: collective defence, crisis management and cooperative security.

With the crisis management task, the Alliance is committed to standing ready, based on decisions taken by consensus, to continuously monitor and analyse the international environment, to anticipate crisis and, where appropriate, take active steps to prevent them from becoming larger conflicts. Where conflict prevention proves unsuccessful, NATO will be prepared and capable to manage ongoing hostilities. To this end, the Alliance has developed robust consultation procedures, crisis management arrangements and military capabilities.

An increasingly important part of the effectiveness of NATO's crisis management tasks is its distinct contribution to efforts by the wider international community to preserve or restore peace and prevent conflict. In this context, NATO has offered to support, on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with its procedures, peacekeeping and other operations under the authority of the United Nations (UN) Security Council or the responsibility of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), including by making available Alliance resources and expertise. Moreover, the lessons learned from NATO operations, in particular in Afghanistan, the Western Balkans and Libya, make it clear that a comprehensive political, civilian and military approach is necessary for effective crisis management.

In future crises, NATO may be in the lead or may play a supporting role, but, when it is involved, it is likely to make an important and distinct contribution to successful conflict management and resolution. As a matter of course, NATO should continue to collaborate effectively in accordance with its own procedures and agreed decisions with partners, the UN and other relevant International Organisations, Non-Governmental Organisations and local actors in planning and conducting operations.

NATO's policy of partnerships, dialogue and cooperation is of strategic relevance for the effectiveness of the Alliance's crisis management task, as well as for the other two core tasks. NATO has fostered strong relationships with countries of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), the Mediterranean Dialogue (MD), and the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative (ICI), as well as partners across the globe. NATO's partnerships have an enduring value, contributing to stability and security across the Euro-Atlantic area and beyond.

In an effort to continue to project stability beyond its borders, at the Wales Summit in 2014, NATO Heads of State and Government launched the Interoperability Platform to work with partners on enhancing interoperability and preparedness for future crisis management. Since then, a roadmap was outlined to increase opportunities for NATO and its partners to cooperate to project stability.

#### Suggestions for Committee discussion

- What type of role would you see for NATO in dealing with crisis management?
- What are the main challenges for NATO's interaction with partners and other International Organisations when addressing the same crisis situation? What mechanisms should be in place to facilitate cooperation?
- Which other actors from the International Community would NATO interact with and how? How would they share responsibilities?

#### Readings

- Washington Treaty [https://www.nato.int/cps/ic/natohq/official\\_texts\\_17120.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/ic/natohq/official_texts_17120.htm)
- NATO's Strategic Concept [https://www.nato.int/cps/ic/natohq/topics\\_82705.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/ic/natohq/topics_82705.htm)
- Warsaw Declaration [https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official\\_texts\\_133169.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_133169.htm)

### **Lecture 8: "NATO School Crisis Management Exercise Scenario"**

Lecturer: Lieutenant Colonel Christopher RITTER, (USA F)

NATO School Oberammergau, Joint Plans and Operations Department (JPOD)

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A Session: 30 minutes

#### **Objectives**

- Describe the origin of the scenario.
- Discuss the background, region and actors involved.
- Analyse the threats to regional stability.

- Describe recent events and their correlation to the region.

## **Introduction**

The Zoran Sea scenario was created by NATO in 2000 in order to train General Officers how to plan and lead joint military operations. It was adopted by several organizations throughout the years, including NATO's Joint Warfare Centre and NATO School Oberammergau. Even though several organizations have superseded this scenario, NATO School Oberammergau continues to use and update it.

The scenario focuses on fictitious countries located on the continent Constellatia. The evolving history of this continent resulted in a convergence of different cultures, ethnicities and religions. This convergence has resulted in regional instability, conflict and violence with competing countries and ethnicities vying for limited land. In addition, large energy reserves have been located in the area, leading to large-scale infrastructure investment from several major European companies.

The country of Sagitta is the only NATO Member country in the area. Perseus is the only NATO Partner country in the area. Other major countries include Vulpecula, Auriga and Aquila, each having their own set of strategic dilemmas and political objectives. Of immediate concern is the Batari Liberation Army (BLA), which is attempting to create an autonomous state within Auriga. The BLA receives support from neighbouring Vulpecula and relies on violence to advance their agenda.

The United Nations (UN) is present within Perseus and Auriga and has established camps for persons displaced by the violence. The BLA has also attacked these camps as well as the UN convoys delivering aid to these camps, further exacerbating the humanitarian crisis in Perseus and Auriga. Vulpecula has offered to move into Auriga in order bring an end to the fighting however Auriga does not want Vulpeculan intervention and Aquila has stated it will enter the conflict militarily if Vulpecula moves into Auriga. This creates the risk of widening the conflict across the continent.

In response to the continued violence, the UN issued several Security Council Resolutions, culminating with Resolution 1655, which, "Authorizes States... to use all necessary means to restore as soon as possible peace and security in Auriga."

## **Suggestions for Committee Discussion**

- What countries or organizations could be called upon to assist in this situation?
- What is the core issue which is causing instability in the region?
- How should this core issue be addressed?
- How long will it take to restore stability to the region?

## **Lecture 9: “NATO Strategic Response to Exercise Scenario”**

Lecturer: Ms Alessandra Procopio (ITA C)

NATO HQ International Staff OPS Division

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A session: 30 minutes

### Objectives

- Present NATO crisis response system and its NATO Crisis Response Process element

- Discuss NATO strategic level response to the exercise scenario, in accordance with NATO Crisis Response Process
- Discuss how NATO partners can interact with NATO throughout the crisis life-cycle

### Background

Should it be requested to address a crisis emerging either within its territory or beyond its borders, NATO needs to activate its mechanisms to consider potential response options and, if necessary, actively respond to such crisis.

In every circumstance, a successful NATO approach to crisis prevention, management and/or resolution will necessitate the development, consideration and, possibly, use of a range of discrete and calibrated response steps. These should be underpinned by timely and effective decision-making, adequate crisis management structures, procedures and arrangements, and military capabilities effective under the full range of foreseeable circumstances.

A decade after the end of the Cold War and after the events of 9/11 in the United States, the international security environment fundamentally changed. The Alliance was faced with a number of new, multifaceted security threats, which required an adaptation of the Alliance's crisis management tools adopted until that moment. Accordingly, in 2001 the North Atlantic Council approved policy guidelines with a view to developing a single, fully integrated NATO Crisis Response System (NCRS).

The NCRS is effectively a guide to aid decision-making within the field of crisis management. Its role is to coordinate efforts between the national representatives at NATO Headquarters, capitals and the Strategic Commands. It does this by providing the Alliance with a comprehensive set of options and measures to prepare for, manage and respond to crises. It complements other processes such as operations planning, civil emergency planning and others, which exist within the Organization to address crises. It was first approved in 2005 and is revised annually.

One of the core components of the NCRS is the NATO Crisis Response Process (NCRP). The NCRP breaks down a crisis situation into different phases, providing a structure against which military and non-military crisis response planning processes should be designed. It is flexible and adaptable across the whole range of the Alliance's Article 5 and non-Article 5 circumstances. While the type, scale and geographic location of a rapidly evolving crisis is not always predictable, the existence of the NCRP enables the Alliance to rely on a process to address the crisis, which can be described and planned with reasonable confidence. The NCRP facilitates grand strategic political-military decision-making by capitals, through the North Atlantic Council, early in an emerging crisis, as well as throughout its life-cycle.

As a crisis emerges, NATO will also consult regularly with international actors, mainly through staff-to-staff coordination, in order to build confidence and comprehensive mutual understanding of the crisis and to develop modalities for better cooperation.

NATO periodically exercises procedures through scheduled crisis management exercises (CMX) in which the Headquarters (civilian and military) and capitals participate, including partners and other bodies who may be involved in a real-life crisis.

#### Suggestions for Committee discussion

- What are the challenges and, on the other hand, the added value for NATO and its partners to cooperate in addressing a crisis situation?
- In which phases of the NATO Crisis Response Process could the Alliance enhance cooperation with regional partners to maximise the effect of its effort to manage and/or prevent a conflict?
- In the context of the Zoran Sea scenario, at which point during the crisis would NATO contribution be most appropriate?

#### **Lecture 10: “The NATO Operational Planning Process (OPP) Part 1**

Lecturer: Lieutenant Colonel Titel IOVA (ROU A),

NATO School Oberammergau, Joint Plans and Operations Department (JPOD)

Date: Thursday 26 April 2018

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A session: 15 minutes

#### **And**

#### **Lecture 12: “NATO OPP, Part 2”**

Lecturer: LtCol Titel IOVA (ROU A)

NATO School Oberammergau, Joint Plans and Operations Department (JPOD)

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A session: 15 minutes

1. **Objectives**

2. Describe the main characteristics of NATO's operations planning system.
3. Describe the main characteristics of phases 1-6 of NATO's operations planning process at operational level.

4. **Summary**

5. Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive (COPD) is the main tool describing the planning process at strategic and operational level. As a doctrinal document it is descriptive and not prescriptive, therefore guiding a structural thinking and not imposing a strict way of conducting the planning process within the planning entities from NATO Command Structure.
6. COPD is adherent to the principles of Mission Command philosophy and requires professional personnel at every level of command and in every responsible planning entity. Mission command style of command is allowing the commanders (COM) to remain focused on the received mission, while their supporting staff and planning cells are detailing the COM's plan. Moreover, mission command is allowing the subordinate commanders to benefit of their freedom of action, by receiving only the necessary details to run their operations focused on "what" they have do and not describing the "how" part.
7. There are three major levels of planning in NATO: strategic, operational and component level as described by COPD. Those levels refer to ways of thinking military operations and not to sizes of units.
8. COPD is describing the phases of planning focused on the strategic and operational level. There are 6 phase of concurrent and cooperative operations planning. The phases are directed by North Atlantic Council formal decisions to move forward through planning, execution and termination of a NATO operation.
9. **Phase one: Initial situational awareness of potential/ actual crisis** has the purpose to share the initial understanding of an emerging crisis and to enable the appropriate preparation as guided by the COM.
10. **Phase two** described at the operational level as: **Operational evaluation of the strategic environment** is conducted to understand the strategic situation / nature of the problem / desired end state / strategic objectives and to identify the best suitable response option that incorporate the military instrument of power.
11. **Phase three, Operational estimate** is further divided into two sub-phases: **3a- Mission analysis** and **3b Courses of Action development**. Phase three initiate planning for a military response to an emerging crisis and refers to a detailed analysis of the mission,

concluding with a Mission Analysis Brief to the Commander (3a) and Development of Courses of Action (COA), concluded with a Staff recommendation during COA Decision Brief (3b). There are a number of planning steps to be conducted in support of a complete understanding of the “what” question (3a): factor analysis, actor analysis (centers of gravity analysis), and operational framework. All the mentioned planning steps are mirrored by the development of the comprehensive preparation of the operational environment and the “red picture” by the J2 staff. At the end of the Mission analysis sub- phase, the COM will be informed on all the necessary details to enable him provide guidance for COA development. Sub-phase 3b, based on the COM’s guidance and the estimates from 3a is seeking to develop, test, improve and recommend the most suitable COA which will form the basis of the operational plan.

12. **Phase four, Operational plan development**, is subdivided, as well into two sub- phases: **4a- t Operational concept of operations development** and **4b- Operational OPLAN development**. **Operational concept of operations** symbolizes an evolution of the planning product and has to be nested within the Strategic CONOPS. It comprises a main body and a number of mandatory relevant annexes. Together with the CONOPS, a number of different requirements are submitted for approval to the strategic level: ROEREQ, manpower SOR, TCSOR, CJSOR, reflecting the necessary types and sizes of troops, staff, and rules of engagement. **4b- Operational OPLAN development** aim is to produce a timely, adequate plan. Everything from the CONOPS still applies, but it is further developed with the required annexes and incorporates the supporting plans and the strategic level observations and adjustments.
13. **Phase five, Execution** is triggered (as all the previous phases) by NAC formal decision. The plan is transitioned from J5 Plans to J3 Operations. During the execution, the COM has 2 powerful tools to assess and adjust the running operation: Joint Assessment Board and Joint Coordination Board. The first address the assessment of operational effects and actions on short term and the second is reviewing the accomplishment of the operational objectives and mission on long term. Based on their recommendations, the COM can steer the plan through fragmentary orders (FRAGOs) or new planning process which will lead, after approval to new plans.
14. **Phase six, Transition** is overlapping with the previous phase and is the subject to a new plan in itself, therefore sending the planner to a new operational estimate. The focus is on exiting the operational area without creating a vacuum of power and without creating the conditions for a new crisis. It enhances the Commander’s ability to direct and guide development of the (disengagement) OPLAN. The burden is on the logistical planning of redeployment and handing over the operational area to follow on forces.
15. **Suggestions for Committee Discussion**
16. How does it apply the mission command philosophy in your military?
17. What is important in the selection of factors for factor analysis?
18. What are the connections between critical capabilities, critical requirements and critical vulnerabilities in COG analysis?

19. **Bibliography**

20. AJP 01D, Allied Joint Doctrine, ed. 2017

21. AJP 3 (B), Conduct of the operations, ed. 2011

22. AJP 5 Allied Joint Doctrine for operational level planning, ratification draft

23. Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive interim version 2.0, ed. 2013

**Lecture 12: “NATO Logistics for NATO Operations”**

Lecturer: Major Dré KERSTJENS, (NLD A),

NATO School Oberammergau, Joint Plans and Operations Department (JPOD)

Duration: 45 minutes (Q&A Incl)

**Objectives**

The aim of this Lecture is that the participants gain an understanding of: How NATO operational logistics support NATO mission. The NATO Joint Logistic Support Group concept, Multinational logistic solutions and give them a broad overview operational logistics.

To provide an overview of Fundamental NATO Logistics doctrinal terms and concepts, in relation to NATO Planning & Operations

After the lecture participants are able to:

- Understand concept of NATO operational logistics in relation to Operational Planning.
- Understand concept of Strategic Deployment, Reception Staging Onward Movement (RSOM) and its Command and Control challenges
- Understand the different modes of Multinational Logistic support solutions
- Be aware of the challenges and way ahead of NATO logistics

### **Introduction**

The lecture covers:

NATO Operational Logistics

- a. An overview of NATO Operational Logistics, how is it related to Operational Planning.
- b. What are the Logistic Concepts NATO is using.
- c. Modes of Multinational Logistics Support
- d. Challenges and way ahead of NATO Logistics

How is NATO going to support their Operational Missions?

“NATO Operational Logistics” is to present the main features of NATO Operational Logistics, together with how the logistic system is set up for an operation and what it has to cover, moreover the necessity of the ways and modes of increasing efficiency of use of resources and avoiding overlapping situations in providing logistic support. It will have the Joint Logistic Support Group as a starting point

The “Modes of Multinational Logistics Support” covers which MN modes are implemented into NATO operation in order to increase an efficient use of different national owned resources, decreasing costs, avoiding competition over all kind of resources as well as maintaining a reduced logistics footprint. It will explain concepts as Single lead Nation; Role Specialist nation, Host Nation and Contracted Support to Operations.

The last part, which is the core “Challenges and way ahead of NATO Logistics” presents the Logistics Vision and Objective as well as the new developments in this respect.

The briefing will be followed by a 15 minutes Q&A session.

Links to read:

NATO LOGISTICS Handbook

[http://www.nato.int/docu/logi-en/logistics\\_hndbk\\_2012-en.pdf](http://www.nato.int/docu/logi-en/logistics_hndbk_2012-en.pdf)

**Lecture 13: “Non-Article 5 Funding: NATO-led Operations”**

Lecturer: Mr Antonios VEZIRTZOGLU,(GRC C)  
NATO Defense College Budget & Finance Division  
Duration: 60 minutes (incl. Q &A session)

**Objectives**

Discuss how NATO uses and funds resources.

Discuss funding arrangements for non-Article 5 NATO-led operations and missions.

What do we mean by the term “resources”? It is money, but not just money: also involved are people, armaments and ammunition, vehicles, aircrafts, ships, tanks, guns, missiles, radars, spare parts, workshops, buildings and many more ...

Due to the global economic crisis, resources are scarce and under a lot of pressure. NATO, as a political and military organization, is obliged to maximize efficiency and effectiveness. The key word for achieving that is coherence.

There is a growing tendency to adopt multinational approaches in response to the pressure created by cuts in resources, where nations have to look at ways of being more efficient, avoiding duplication or triplication of their efforts.

We can distinguish the following kinds of funding:

Multinational; Joint; Common; Contributions in kind (a very topical issue nowadays); and Trust funds, an increasingly important component of NATO's business.

#### Multinational funding

This is funding outside NATO structures. The funding mechanisms and funding levels are entirely in the hands of the nations concerned. In many cases NATO isn't even aware of these.

#### Joint funding

It is still the nations' call: it is still the nations who decide what they are going to do, when they're going to do it, and how they're going to do it.

#### Common funding

Here, the defence budgets of the Allied nations contribute to NATO, which is in the driver's seat: it is NATO authorities that set the requirements and priorities.

#### Contributions in kind and trust funds

A contribution in kind is defined as participation in activities or programmes in non-monetary ways, or by providing capabilities as opposed to money.

#### Trust funds

The definition could be: “voluntary financial contributions” for a given aim, entrusted to an existing entity for applications outside the normal budget of that entity.

Common funding is provided to cover the requirements of:

- the civil budget;
- the military budget; and
- the NATO Security Investment Programme.
- Civil budget (2017: 234.4 mio)

This part of common funding is to provide and support NATO Headquarters (in Brussels). NATO HQ has international staff, interpreters, translators and all the necessary personnel, in an environment where the 29 member nations and another 17 partner nations sit together and work together.

Military budget (2017: 1,291.5 mio, of which 253 mio is for Ops/missions)

The military budget consists of about 40 separate budgets, paid from the MOD budgets of the member nations. The overall budget corresponds more or less to the financial needs of the Alliance's command structure/military structure.

There is the Military Committee and the International Military Staff; the two Strategic NATO Commands, in Belgium (Mons) and in the USA (Norfolk, VA); the Allied Joint Force Commands, in the Netherlands (Brunssum) and in Italy (Naples). There are also the subordinate Land, Air and Maritime Commands, where the Alliance's defence planning, operational planning and logistic planning take place.

NATO Security Investment Programme (NSIP) (2017 655 mio)

NATO does not invest in things that nations should be doing themselves. It invests in capacities and brings national capabilities together. Logistic support is a limited amount of key facilities, spread throughout the Alliance as a reinforcement measure.

#### Contributions

Each member nation contributes to NATO budgets in accordance with its Gross National Income (GNI).

Funding arrangements for non-Article 5 NATO-led operations and missions"

These arrangements, which are unanimously agreed, define in detail eligibility for each and every requirement covered by common funding.

Phases 2 and 3 are strategic: high-level political and military decisions have to be taken and submitted to the North Atlantic Council for approval.

In Phase 3, the operational and support planners do their work. Close to the end of Phase 3, the Joint Logistics Support Group is the first to deploy in the Operations area.

This Group has to:

- define the APOD and SPOD, together with other airfields and ports to be used during the operations;
- define the location of in-theatre HQs;
- define the location of the other support facilities, such as billeting, medical, mess, etc.
- proceed with the necessary contracting for buildings and utilities, and payment of all common obligations for the mission.

Having done the above, the staff (military and civilian) can man the HQs and start performing their duties.

The forces, as described in the force structure, can then move to the Operations Area, be deployed and act in accordance with the Operational Plans

Phases 4 and 5

During operations, the HQs and the multinational forces function as foreseen.

And Phase 6

Finally, once the Operation is finished and the forces have departed, the Closing Joint Logistics Support Group will take care of the return of equipment to its prior location, deal with any compensations for damaged property, manage settlement of the last bills, turn off the lights, close the doors and depart!

The primary funding mechanism for NATO-led operations remains that nations absorb any and all costs associated with their participation in such operations (“costs lie where they fall”)

#### Suggestions for Committee discussion

What do we mean by the term “resources”?

Discuss the complexity of funding arrangements for non-Article 5 NATO-led operations and missions.

#### **Lecture 14: “The NATO Science & Technology Organization:**

Lecturer: Mr Alan SHAFFER (USA C)

Director of the NATO Collaboration Support Office

NATO Science and Technology Organization

Duration: 50 minutes

***This Lecture of Opportunity intended for an audience of representatives of UKR Military /Civilian Science & Technology Organizations & Institutions, and UNDU hierarchy (Students will be in Committees at this time)***

- The NATO Science and Technology Organization has three executive bodies: The Office of the Chief Scientist in Brussels, the Center for Maritime Research and Experimentation (CMRE) in La Spezia, Italy, and the Collaboration Support Office (CSO) in Paris.
  - The CMRE is the in-house physical NATO laboratory; the CSO manages all collaborative projects between NATO Nations—to become a project, there must be four NATO Nations who agree to work on a project. The total program is called the Collaborative Program of Work (CPoW).
- The CSO seeks to be the provider of choice for international science and technology projects between NATO nations and partner nations (including the Ukraine); CSO currently manages over 250 separate activities (projects) with a network of roughly 5,000 scientists and engineers.
- Within the CPoW, the CSO attempts to balance the work between projects that make existing platforms operate better, longer, or more interoperable with projects that attempt to improve the overall military capability of member nations. For improving the military capability, the work is typically divided into two pillars:
  - NATO “Themes”, which are military capabilities that encompass many technical disciplines. We currently have three themes: Autonomy; Military Decision Making using Artificial Intelligence and Big Data; and Operations in a Contested Urban Environment.
  - Emerging Science or Capability Areas, which include discrete scientific disciplines, such as electronic warfare and cyber defense, as well as new, emergent scientific disciplines such as quantum science, application of biology to military problems, advanced cognition, and so forth.
- Technical work is divided into seven technical disciplines (Panels): Applied Vehicle Technology, Human Factors and Medicine, Information Systems Technology, Modeling and Simulation, Sensor and Electronics, System Analysis and Studies (Operations Research), and System Concepts and Integration (Systems Engineering). 75% of the work is done in research task groups—which are three year-long activities.

## **Lecture 15: “NATO Technology Trends for Disruption”**

Lecturer: Mr Alan SHAFFER (USA C)

Director of the NATO Collaboration Support Office

NATO Science and Technology Organization

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A session: 30 minutes

- The NATO Science and Technology Organization (STO) has just published its first Technology Trends Report, available at

[https://www.google.fr/search?q=NATO+tech+trends+report+2017&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&client=firefox-b-ab&gfe\\_rd=cr&dcr=0&ei=60p8WrmNE4Pb8AeP9oKACQ](https://www.google.fr/search?q=NATO+tech+trends+report+2017&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&client=firefox-b-ab&gfe_rd=cr&dcr=0&ei=60p8WrmNE4Pb8AeP9oKACQ)

- Rather than provide the list of Tech Trends contained in this report, I would like to focus on several new areas of science.
  
- Some of the more significant capability disruptions of the past have occurred roughly 25 years after a scientific area went through explosive growth—three prominent examples followed the development of the internal combustion engine (1876), which led to mechanized armour and tanks and airplanes; the second was the explosive growth in Physics from 1910-1925, which led, in part to nuclear weapons; the third was the growth in semiconductors and microelectronics from 1955-1965, which led to global positioning systems, infrared focal planes, and embedded computers.
  
- This third revolution came to total prominence in the First Gulf War, and led to military dominance of the west over the past 25 years. Nations have begun to be able to counter or take away many of these capabilities. It is time to ask: what is next?
  
- Predicting the future is very hard, but there are several technical areas that are currently undergoing explosive capability growth—the next major revolution in military capabilities is likely to come from:
  - Quantum sciences with potential application in very precise local time keeping, ultra-precise remote sensors, and secure communications
  - Biology with potential applications in soldier protection, very advanced sensors, and decision making
  - Artificial Intelligence and Big Data with potential applications in accelerated decision making and predictive intelligence, and
  - Cyber-physical micro-mechanized systems
  -
  
- Two other potential advanced disruptive technologies must also be followed: Directed Energy Weapons (lasers and pulsed microwave and RF weapons) and hypersonic systems.

## **Lecture 16 RESERVE: “NATO’s Partnerships”**

Lecturer: NSO

Duration: 45 minutes

Q&A session: 15 minutes

### **Objectives**

- Describe how different partnership projects have started, evolved and changed from the end of the Cold war until today. Where is the relevancy for “both sides”, NATO and partner nations?

- Explain and discuss the most important NATO's existing partnerships formats today.
- Explain and discuss the main phases that countries have to pass through in order to become NATO member country.
- Analyse Ukrainian case, identify the challenges and prospects of the NATO Ukraine relationship

## **Introduction**

NATO partnership policy and relations with partner nations are directly linked with the last Strategic Concept "Active engagement, Modern defence" identifying the cooperative security as one of "three essential core tasks" to be achieved in part "through a wide network of partner relationships with countries and organizations around the globe".

But whole process has his roots in the very turbulent and challenging period of the end of the Cold war era. Until that time, NATO had collective defense as its "raison d'etre". The collective defence approach has greatly lost in importance for the next almost 25 years becoming merely residual function until Crimea crisis erupted in 2014.

The 90's were the years of the first diplomatic connections established between the countries of the former Warsaw Pact and more substantive programs of cooperation and collaboration through NATO – EUPC and Partnership for Peace frameworks. The relations between former adversaries were moving from confrontation to cooperation.

These two programs were never explicitly been identified as institutions that prepare countries for full NATO membership. Their functional proximity to NATO's policy of enlargement in Central Eastern Europe was nevertheless obvious. The reasons and interests to upgrade cooperation and move towards new memberships were different. First of all, newly democratic countries of Europe wished to fully integrate into European institutions such as NATO. This was also kind of clear demonstration that they left their communist past behind. On the other hand, the West wanted to expand the area of liberal democracy and market economy to the East and to increase international stability. For the first decade of the partnership relations we can say it was about reaching out to former adversaries, first partnerships and the new members on the board.

Later one, the existing formats have further evolved offering new tools to partners and at the same time enlarging the territory of the NATO alliance. Both, NATO and partners also expanded the areas of cooperation moving more towards crisis management. Partners become more relevant from the operational point of view, today it not any longer about what the NATO can do for partners only but also about partners' operational relevancy to the NATO led operations.

Ex. During the ISAF mission at some point only four NATO countries had bigger footprint on the ground than Georgia. Ukraine was the only partner nation since the relations with NATO have been established to contribute the all NATO CR missions.

The most important existing partnership formats today are bilateral (in most of the case tailored) relations between NATO and individual countries. In addition to that NATO has

institutional relations with UN, EU, OSCE and African Union but also formats of regional cooperation with Mediterranean dialogue and Istanbul Cooperative Initiative.

### **Suggestions for Committee Discussion**

- Managing expectations to reflect the reality on the ground instead of setting the membership as a goal with fixed near-term date (that will not be met)? Possible reasons for possible negative attitudes toward the government and toward NATO?
- Completely fulfilling a less ambitious plan rather than again falling short with more ambitious one is win-win for all? Could this help keeping Ukraine on a Westward trajectory? Goal to become more modern and resilient European state? Making a convincing membership bid when the opportunity arises? “Not now” is not “never”.
- What is enough in general to keep partners “hot” for the future cooperation with NATO, interoperability only or open door policy is still the most attractive option for them?
- Priorities for NATO dealing with partners in the future?
- Restructuring the existing formats for cooperation with partners or adapting the existing frameworks?

### **READINGS**

1. Will Ukraine join NATO? A course for disappointment, PIFER, S. (25 July 2017). Brookings Institution  
<https://www.brookings.edu/blog/order-from-chaos/2017/07/25/will-ukraine-join-nato-a-course-for-disappointment/>
2. Relations with Ukraine  
[https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics\\_37750.htm](https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_37750.htm)
3. Here’s what a realistic Ukraine settlement may look like  
<https://www.euractiv.com/section/europe-s-east/opinion/heres-what-a-realistic-ukraine-settlement-may-look-like/>
4. How Ukraine Got Caught Between East and West  
<https://newrepublic.com/article/145685/ukraine-got-caught-east-west>
5. Is NATO doing enough to pressure Russia over Ukraine? <http://www.dw.com/en/is-nato-doing-enough-to-pressure-russia-over-ukraine/a-41286391>
6. NATO and the Partnership for Peace, Frank Boland | Effective, Legitimate, Secure: Insights for Defense Institution Building | November 20, 2017  
<http://cco.ndu.edu/DIB-ELS/Article/1375910/11-nato-and-the-partnership-for-peace/>
7. Strategic trends 2017, Key Developments are Global Affairs, Center for Security Studies ETH Zurich <http://www.css.ethz.ch/content/dam/ethz/special-interest/gess/cis/center-for-securities-studies/pdfs/ST2017.pdf>

## **Lecture 17 RESERVE: “NATO Mission Command”**

Lecturer: Captain (N) Peter Papler P.hD (SVN N)

### **Objectives**

- Discuss how the command system developed over the centuries.
- Discuss the 21st century command system challenge.
- Analyse results of Mission Command and related consequences of attributing command responsibilities in peace and in battle.

### **Introduction**

Command may be defined as a function that has to be exercised, more or less continuously, if the army is to exist and to operate.

Planning is an essential and significant part of the broader field of command and control; so is mission command. We can even argue that planning constitutes half of command and control, which includes influencing the conduct of current developments and planning future ones.

Commanders must recognize both the benefits and the potential pitfalls of planning. The first mistake is attempting to forecast and dictate events too far into the future. The second is trying to plan/decide in too much detail. The third is the tendency to use planning / decision-making as a scripting process that tries to prescribe friendly, or even enemy, actions with precision. The last error commonly made is the tendency for institutionalized planning /decision-making methods to lead to inflexible 'padlocked' thinking, and for planning and plans to become rigid and overly emphasize procedures.

The communist concept of command, considered by some to be an institutionalized decision-making method, continues to spread throughout Central and Eastern European armed forces. It inhibits the orderly delegation of command, the consistent creation of defence capabilities, and the professional development of commanders and managers; it also hinders these armed services from adopting the concepts of authority, accountability, and responsibility—concepts taken for granted in Western defence institutions. Similar practices occur with adaptation of the concepts of accountability and responsibility to their own organizations.

By far the most successful example of command, as it was organized in the period before 1800 (the so-called 'Stone Age'), was that of Ancient Rome: it owed its cohesiveness to the fact that the means of communication hardly changed at all over a period of centuries. Napoleonic warfare should be looked at next, because it appears to constitute the greatest single revolution ever wrought in the art of command – and one, moreover, that owed little to technological advances. It is also interesting to look at command as exercised by the German General Staff, the first (and for a long time the best) among such organizations, which used the telegraph. Afterwards, we focus on the problems of command in WWI, paying particular attention to the effect of machine warfare on wire-bound communication systems. In modern mobile warfare, as exemplified by some of its best practitioners, the IDF are taken into account. Lastly, we attempt to assess the influence of modern organizations on command, as exercised by the US in Vietnam. The significance of the technological revolution for problems of command is made even clearer when we see that the last three decades have produced, for the first time in history, artificial devices capable of reproducing or amplifying the functions not merely of a man's limbs and sensory organs but, increasingly, those of his brain as well.

The best system of command, to caricature Clausewitz' dictum on strategy, is always to have a genius in charge, first in general and then at the decisive point. However excellent in principle, this advice is less than useful in practice, the problem consisting precisely in the inability of military (and non-military) institutions to achieve certainty, either in producing a steady supply of geniuses or in identifying the decisive points into which, once available, they should be put.

The fact that, historically speaking, the armies which were most successful were those which did not turn their troops into automatons, did not attempt to control everything from the top, and allowed subordinate commanders considerable latitude, has been abundantly demonstrated. The Roman centurions, Napoleon's marshals, Moltke's army commanders, Ludendorff's storm detachments, and Gavish's Divisional commanders are examples, each within its own stage of technological development, of the way things were done in some of the most successful military forces ever.

### **Suggestions for Committee Discussion**

- NATO mission command system?
- National mission or task-related Command system?

Recommended bibliography:

1. Martin van Creveld. On Command in War
2. Legacy Concepts. A Sociology of Command in Central and Eastern Europe, Thomas-Durell Young, Parameters 47(1), Spring 2017
3. Department of the Navy; Headquarters United States Marine Corps, Washington, D.C. 20380-1775, 21 July 1997. Planning
4. David Hambling. Swarm Troopers: How small drones will conquer the world. Kindle Edition, Swarm Troopers.com, 2015

## **6.Committee discussion Overview**

**Questions to facilitate committee discussion:**

**Objective of the discussion:** To improve knowledge on NATO-EU cooperation and NATO's adaptation; NATO's military, political and institutional evolution.

**Time of discussion:** 30 minutes according to the agenda.

**Daily academic assessment feedback:**

1. Please assess today's lecturers (content-wise, educational relevance, academic delivery). How did this specific lecturer cover the subject of the day?

Excellent / Very Good / Good / Average

2. Did the content of the lecture meet your expectations?

Yes / No

3. What was the most useful lecture of the day to your professional development?

**Day 1: Topic of the discussion: NATO today and tomorrow; NATO-EU cooperation; future of NATO**

Question for the discussion:

1. How do you see the complementarity of the EU-NATO approach towards Ukraine?
2. What steps should be undertaken by the EU and NATO in order to strengthen their shared capacity of action against Russian hybrid warfare?
3. What is your prognosis for the future of NATO? NATO-EU relations and NATO-EU-Ukraine relations?

**Day 2 : Topic of the discussion : Hybrid warfare; Ukrainian perspectives of Russia**

Question for the discussion:

1. To what extent does NATO have a clear and unified picture of Russian strategic intentions and priorities?
2. From your point of view, what could be possible tools and mechanisms that NATO could use in order to deter hybrid warfare against Ukraine?
3. What have Ukraine's armed forces learnt with regard to countering Russia's hybrid warfare that you think NATO could learn from?
4. What is the future of relations between Russia and Ukraine?
5. Can Ukraine get closer to NATO membership?
6. How could NATO contribute to countering Russian Anti-NATO propaganda within the Ukrainian population (and also armed forces)?

**Day 3: Topic of the discussion: NATO crisis management**

Question for the discussion:

1. What is the core issue which is causing instability in the region?
2. How should this core issue be addressed?
3. Managing expectations to reflect the reality on the ground instead of setting the membership as a goal with fixed near-term date (that will not be met)? Possible

reasons for possible negative attitudes toward the government and toward NATO?

4. What is your understanding of NATO's crisis management? How Ukraine does handle the crisis management response? What are the lessons learnt from Ukrainian side?
5. What do you think have been the biggest achievements with regard to reforms in the Ukrainian armed forces since the beginning of the confrontation with Russia?

#### **Day 4: Topic of the discussion: Planning operational level**

##### **General assessment feedback:**

- Did the Kyiv week improve your knowledge of NATO, its organization and working methods? And how? Did you learn a lot?
- How do you assess the value of the Kyiv week to your academic program at the National Defence University of Ukraine / or to your military career? Make an assessment in couple of sentences.

Excellent / Very Good / Good / Average

- What do you think should be improved in the future? Your recommendations to organizers.

##### **Question for the discussion:**

1. What is Ukraine's operational planning process? How to make NATO and Ukrainian operational planning process compatible?
2. How is use COG analysis in Ukrainian Army decision making process?
3. What would be the most efficient way to raise the combat readiness of Ukraine?

#### **8. Enclosures: Article and Selected NDC Research Papers**

Reading the suggested article and NDC Research Papers participants could get in advance perception about NATO Defence College strength and weaknesses in order they could better understand NDC and our way of doing education; in addition, article and papers point out main NATO limitation related to Article 5 of Washington Treaty, NATO approach to crafting the strategy with example of NATO strategy for Black Sea Region from academic point of view; and finally, to stress the importance of NATO official philosophy of command, Mission Command, their strength and limitations along with challenges related to Mission Command Concept implementation.

## **NDC Research Papers Links;**

[Tacit Expertise: How the NATO Defense College nurtures an international hub of security knowledge through education](#)

By VILLUMSEN BERLING, TrineEisenhower Paper n 5 - January 2016

[Article 5 of the Washington Treaty: Its Origins, Meaning and Future](#)

By TERTRAIS, BrunoResearch Paper n 130 - April 2016

• [NATO in the Black Sea: What to Expect Next?](#)

By ADZINBAIA, ZviadResearch Paper n 141 - November 2017

## **Selected Article**

MISSION COMMAND:  
STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Legacy Concepts: A Sociology of Command  
in Central and Eastern Europe

Thomas-Durell Young

*©2017 Thomas-Durell Young*

ABSTRACT: Elements of the Communist concept of command continue to ramify throughout Central and Eastern European armed forces. They inhibit the orderly delegation of command, the consistent creation of defense capabilities, and the professional development of commanders and managers; they also impede these armed services from adopting the concepts of authority, accountability, and responsibility—concepts taken for granted in Western defense institutions.

An optimistic view of military leadership in the defense institutions of Central and Eastern European post-Communist countries prevails among Western officials and influences many of their decisions to support new allies in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Since most of these European countries have deployed forces in combat and peace-support operations with NATO after the Cold War, and many have received positive reviews, these assumptions are understandable.<sup>1</sup> Many Western leaders also presume commanders of post-Communist nations who have been exposed to Western philosophies of command during combined operations and the introduction of modern Western combat platforms and systems will naturally adopt similar practices of accountability and responsibility in their own organizations. This article examines the contrast of such contemporary expectations in the context of a trinity of Communist legacy command concepts: collective decision-making to avoid personal responsibility; conflating leadership, command, and management; and hypercentralized decision-making.<sup>2</sup>

Leaders in Central and Eastern Europe have yet to appreciate the effects of this trinity on the adoption of delegated decision-making on the development of a merit-based officer and noncommissioned officer corps and on the sustentation of Central and Eastern European military capabilities when they assess the viability of their armed forces under the shadow of Russia's new adventurism. Interest also piques when discerning the challenges that have occurred during recent modernization

Dr. Thomas-Durell Young, the program manager Europe at the

Naval Postgraduate School Center for

The views expressed in this article are solely those of the author and do not reflect the policy or Civil-Military Relations, views of the Naval Postgraduate School, Department of the Navy, or the Department of Defense. The writer would like to express his sincere gratitude to Glen Grant, Vladimir Milenski, and Bence Nemeth for their superb comments on earlier versions of this manuscript

for professional and

as well as *Anatomy of*

*Post-communist European Defense Institutions:*

*The Mirage of Military Modernity* (New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017); Thomas-Durell Young, "Impediments to Reforming European Communist Legacy 'Logistics'," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 29, no. 3 *The Mirage of Military* (2016): 352–70, doi:10.1080/13518046.2016.1200376; and Thomas-Durell Young, "Impediments to Reform in European Post-Communist Defense Institutions: Addressing the Conceptual Divide," *Problems of Post-Communism* (2016): 1–14, doi:10.1080/10758216.2016.1220256.

(New York, 2017).

efforts. With some exceptions such as Yugoslavia's republic-based territorial defense forces, post-Communist defense organizations come from a conceptual legacy whereby all decision-making was highly centralized and quite different from Western mission command philosophies.<sup>3</sup> Thus, integrating Western weapons systems and platforms, designed to require critical thinking and decentralized operation, is formidable. The Polish Air Force provides an apt example: they acquired F-16s in 2006, declared them operational in 2012, deployed them on operations for the first time during the summer of 2016, and scheduled their first Baltic Air Policing mission for May 2017.<sup>4</sup>

The omission of similar Central and Eastern European defense institutions' preparedness to absorb more Western equipment, training, and exercises, let alone effectively use such resources, is not fully appreciated by Western leaders. In March 2016, for instance, US Air Force General Philip M. Breedlove, who was then commander of the US European Command, presented a comprehensive review of the state of security and defense in Europe to the US Senate Armed Services Committee.<sup>5</sup> Yet, his testimony in no way suggested a need to address the conceptual and philosophical foundations of these defense institutions. Thus, one can only conclude US planning and managing of military and defense advice and assistance to these critical allies is premised on the unchallenged, and indeed dubious, assumption that these organizations hold Western philosophies of command and governance.

The anatomy of post-Communist defense institutions in the context of organizational sociology, however, reveals strong political, institutional, cultural, and indeed, sociological influences that inhibit the adoption of basic Western concepts of defense governance. These legacy practices produce organizational pathologies which prevent delegating command authority in a planned and predictable fashion, producing defense capabilities, and developing commanders and managers at all levels. Although, these challenges cannot be solved using Western technical and educational programs alone, ignoring these command pathologies perpetuates Central and Eastern European military weaknesses and makes them vulnerable to opportunistic Russian mischief.

---

3 For more on mission command, see Headquarters, US Department of the Army (HQDA), *Commander and Staff Organization and Operations*, Field Manual (FM) 6-0 (Washington, DC: HQDA, 2015).

4 Lukáš Dyčka and Miroslav Mareš, "The Development and Future of Fighter Planes Acquisitions in Countries of the Visegrad Group," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 25, no. 4 (2012): 544–46, 555, doi:10.1080/13518046.2012.730370; Remigiusz Wilk, "Polish F-16s Deploy for First-Ever Combat Operation," IHS Jane's 360, July 7, 2016, <http://www.janes.com/article/62046/polish-f-16s-deploy-for-first-ever-combat-operation>; and Jacek Siminski, "Polish F-16s Prepare To Take Part in NATO Baltic Air Patrol Mission for the Very First Time," *Aviationist*, February 23, 2017, <https://theaviationist.com/2017/02/23/polish-f-16s-prepare-to-take-part-in>

-nato-baltic-air-patrol-mission-for-the-very-first-time/.

5 *Hearing to Receive Testimony on Department of Defense Security Cooperation and Assistance Programs and Authorities, Before the US Senate Committee on Armed Services Subcommittee on Emerging Threats*, 114th Congress (March 9, 2016) (statement of General Philip M. Breedlove, commander US Forces Europe); and *Examining DOD Security*

*Cooperation: When It Works and When It Doesn't Before the US House of Representatives Committee on Armed Services," 114th Congress (October 21, 2015).*

Table 1. Understanding Western and Communist Legacy Command Concepts<sup>6</sup>

Mission Command	Versus	Detailed Command
Unpredictable	Assumes war is	Predictable
Disorder/Uncertainty	Accepts	Order/Certainty
Decentralization Informality Loose rein on subordinates Self-discipline Initiative Cooperation Ability at all echelons Higher tempo	Tends to lead to	Centralization Formality Tight rein on subordinates Imposed discipline Obedience Compliance Ability only at the top Stasis
Implicit Vertical/Horizontal Interactive and Networked	Types of communications	Explicit Vertical Reactive and Linear
Organic Ad hoc	Organization types fostered	Hierarchic Bureaucratic
Delegate	Leadership styles	Disempower and Direct
Art of war	Appropriate to	Science of war

## Collective Decision-Making

Communist governance separated decision-making from accountability via collectivization. Various ministries actualized this managerial practice by forming collegia. These groups were perfect ideological expressions of collectivization as they removed an individual from any responsibility for the collegium's decisions. In addition to removing the principle of individual accountability from governance and management, these bodies facilitated anonymous, arbitrary meddling at the expert level. In contrast, Western organizations encourage staffs to consult, coordinate, and recommend, while only senior officials, or commanders, make decisions.

Despite their dubious political provenance, collegia such as Ukraine's military collegium and Moldova's military council persist throughout former Soviet republics.<sup>7</sup> Rarer in former Warsaw Pact defense institutions, such governing organizations existed until recently in Slovakia and Hungary, and arguably still exist in Bulgaria.<sup>8</sup> These bodies still

<sup>6</sup> I am indebted to Major General Walter Holmes, Canadian Army (Ret), for permission to use the chart he developed, which also appears in Young, "Impediments to Reform."

<sup>7</sup> Ben Lombardi, "Ukrainian Armed Forces: Defence Expenditure and Military Reform," *Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 14, no. 3 (2001): 32, doi:10.1080/13518040108430487.

<sup>8</sup> A Slovakian think tank advocated for regular consultations between the president and the chief of defense, as well as the minister of defense's collegium to enable more informed decision-making. See Jaroslav Naď, Marian Majer and Milan Šuplata, *75 Solutions for Slovakia's Defence* (Bratislava: Central European Policy Institute, 2015), 2; and Réka Szemerényi, *Central European Civil-Military Reforms at Risk*, Adelphi Paper 306 (Oxford: Oxford University Press / International Institute for Strategic Studies, 1996), 13, 15. The Collegium of the Minister began during the Communist period. As the membership of that body and the current defense council remain essentially the same, arguably, its purpose to depersonalize decision-making and escape from responsibility has not changed.

function extensively, sometimes under disguise or mutation as in the former Yugoslav Republics.<sup>9</sup>

In Serbia, for instance, matériel requirement proposals are reviewed by the minister of defense's collegium. In the case of Macedonia, its collegium comprises the chief of the general staff, his deputy, the director of the staff, and the heads of staff directorates and can include representatives from units and, at one point, even the resident NATO training team. Moreover, many of these countries practice joint meetings of the collegia of the ministry of defense and general staff or, alternately, the chief of defense or chief of the general staff attends the minister of defense's collegium either regularly or by invitation.

Although not secretive, these bodies obscure senior-level decision-making and thereby violate basic Western governance concepts such as the alignment of authority with accountability. Despite their prevalence, printed details regarding the constitution of these bodies is difficult to find, which could explain why some collegia, such as Montenegro's do not formally exist by law. Yet, one can gain an appreciation of the scope of these bodies' responsibilities in the case of the General Staff collegium of the Vojska Srbije i Crne Gore (Armed Forces of Serbia and Montenegro), circa 2002, which were based on the practice of the Yugoslav People's Army:

- Analyze the outcome of the general staff's monthly work plan.
- Analyze combat readiness and determine causation of shortcomings.
- Assess the regional intelligence and security situation and determine implications for the country.
- Assess the regional security situation of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and analyze its possible implications for the combat readiness of the armed forces and the defense of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.
- Analyze the financial situation in the armed forces.
- Determine whether there is a need for organizational changes within the armed forces.
- Manage personnel issues:
  - Regulate the condition in the service, promotions, termination of service, and retention in the service for professional soldiers of the general's rank.
  - Review and approve the colonel's promotion list.
  - Select candidates for professional military education courses.
  - Assign postings of officers completing professional military education.
  - Assign postings of colonels and lieutenant colonels.
  - Manage regular promotion in the rank of colonel and all extraordinary promotions for all professional soldiers.

---

<sup>9</sup> While the title collegium is eschewed, Slovenia continues using boards or committees, some of which are related to the collegia functions in all but name.

- Oversee the condition of the service for colonels who are assigned to mobilization units.
  - Determine who should be retained in service as distinguished experts who meet the requirements for retirement.
  - Approve release from service.
  - Analyze the personnel management of the armed forces.
- Propose other issues for the attention of the chief of the general staff at his request.<sup>10</sup>

Based upon interviews with officials from numerous defense institutions throughout the region, these terms of reference clearly represent the responsibilities of their own collegium, or defense councils. When examining the strengths and weaknesses of these bodies, an inevitable explanation for their continued utilization is that they provide useful coordination in the absence of the chief of staff concept yet to be fully embraced throughout the region. Another argument is the group's ability to obviate subjectivity, which is important to decision-making such as assignments and promotions.

What should surprise and disturb Western observers is the power *collegia* continue to hold over essentially all aspects of planning and managing Central and Eastern European armed forces. Notably, decision-making is limited to colonels and general officers; the views of others, no matter how well-informed, are not considered. Also vexing is the continued domination of these ranks in human resource management decisions, which violates Western defense governance principles. Coming from a tradition of conscription and an oversized officer corps based on mobilization, those transitioning and newly formed defense institutions lack centralized or integrated human resource structures. Except for the Yugoslav People's Army, these services also lack noncommissioned officers with leadership responsibilities.<sup>11</sup> Unsurprisingly, these factors contribute to the legacy practice of using *collegia* for personnel decision-making that extends from individual units up to the general staffs and the ministries of defense.

Fundamentally, this form of collective decision-making undermines commanders' authority to provide professional advice on individuals' performance and prospects for growth and promotion—inherent responsibilities of commanders in Western armed forces. In the West, commanders' recommendations weigh heavily in independent selection board processes to mitigate against favoritism, let alone nepotism. Moreover, as Central and Eastern European defense institutions continue to struggle to adopt Western concepts of defense governance, *collegia* have not been identified for elimination. By continuing the practice of collective decision-making, they release senior officials from accountability and responsibility for their decisions.

One should never underestimate the strength of bureaucratic inertia, and clearly *collegia* are unlikely to be retired without considerable

---

10 General Staff of the Armed Forces of Yugoslavia, *Order on Authorities of the Organizational Units of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of Yugoslavia* (Belgrade: Sector for Manning, Mobilization and Systems Issues, March 20, 2002), section IV (nota bene, translated text).

11 Robert Niebuhr, "Death of the Yugoslav People's Army and the Wars of Succession," *Polemos* 7, no. 13/14 (January 2004): 93.

political pressure. Perhaps a first step would be to assess the function of, and justification for, collegia—for example, Macedonia adopted the chief of staff principle, which should enable objective evaluation of the effectiveness of the director of staff function thereby removing a justification for the continued use of its collegia.

A final concern with collegium is most Western officials and analysts are unaware of their existence, which leads to misunderstandings of the decision-making process, particularly regarding key human resource management functions. As the underlying organization's sociology of decision-making remains misunderstood, Western officials have misdiagnosed the human resource management challenges faced by these organizations. By superficially defining weak personnel structures and processes as the challenges, Western officials and analysts have missed the key organizational sociology cause. The reason human resource management directorates appear to be underperforming by Western expectations is due to these relatively new bureaucratic bodies existing in a parallel bureaucratic universe where power continues to be exercised by collegia.

Accordingly, human resource management directorates concern themselves with administration and the exercise of negative control with hardly any consistent, constructive influence on personnel decisions. Thus, when reforming this key aspect of management, officials need to identify collegia as a reality that can only be addressed within the political context of democratic defense governance. In other words, a bottom-up, technical approach without strong, supportive messaging from national leaders will always be stillborn. Within the legacy of detailed command structures, a directive approach is likely to be much more effective than using Western national models and modeling delegation.

Even more pressing, Western and allied officials must acknowledge the deleterious effect collegia have on developing commanders. The importance of basing performance assessments on the objective assessments by field commanders should be incorporated in efforts to develop leadership, command, management, and decision-making capabilities of partner nations. These efforts should encourage serving in units as a necessary step toward overcoming the current professional strategy of seeking permanent postings on staffs, where decisions are made and power over personnel management decisions is highly concentrated. These current incentives are so misaligned that in some countries, such as Hungary, officers serving on the general staff are better paid than those commanding units.<sup>12</sup> This perverse incentive discourages officers from serving in units, ensuring an institutional disconnect among the general staff, units, and commanders.

## Conflating Command and Management

Defense institutions which continue the legacy practice of collective decision-making suffer from another institutional lacuna within the context of the Western concept of defense governance. Whereas all of the Baltic States' divided leadership and command from management—the ministries of defense adopted posts for permanent under-secretaries

---

12 Act CCV of 2012 on the Status of Military Personnel, Hungarian Civil Code, 5th Appendix, [http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy\\_doc.cgi?docid=A1200205.TV](http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/hjegy_doc.cgi?docid=A1200205.TV) (accessed October 27, 2016).

and the armed forces have directors of staff—this practice is rare, even in Western-leaning Georgia.<sup>13</sup>

By conflating leadership and command with management, it is essentially impossible for a policy framework that drives defense institutions to develop. Rather, power is concentrated in a small body of officials, thereby precluding critical thinking, effective coordination, and consensus-building. Due to centralized decision-making without a designated official whose sole function is to optimize daily functioning of civilian or military organizations, these organizations are also all but incapable of performing effective staff work when judged by Western standards. As James Sherr of Chatham House so presciently observes:

As in other post-communist states, few and far between are those who ask themselves how policies, programmes and directives should be implemented. The vastly safer and almost universal practice is to await orders about how orders should be implemented. If directives are not to become conversation pieces, their authors must walk them through the system themselves. Not surprisingly, the result is a system overmanned, overworked and largely inert.<sup>14</sup>

As a result, there is no consistent management to ensure staff coordination, press decision-making downwards, and allow only the most critical policy issues to be addressed at the minister or the chief of defense level. By allowing, and indeed encouraging, all decision-making to remain with the minister, the chief of defense, and within their collegia, no decision is too minor to be raised to them and modern command and management concepts cannot take hold.

Even the widespread practice of designating deputy ministers and deputy chiefs of defense to run the organization still breaks this principle. These individuals cannot be honest brokers in the staffing process while being members of the leadership team. On the military side of the equation, even the seemingly advanced and reformed Polish defense institution has yet to embrace this concept: two deputies support the Polish chief of defense, but there is no chief of staff. This inability to divide command from management in Poland is remarkable considering it was a key reform principle identified as early as 1992.<sup>15</sup> Confusing hybrid models, such as the Czech armed forces who have both a first deputy chief of defense as well as a deputy chief of defense and chief of staff, also exist.

Conflating these two responsibilities produces yet another practice whereby commanders and staff officers are not allowed to develop properly. While the concentration of power may suggest an illusion of control, in reality, the system incentivizes officers to become micromanagers. Officers are taught by examples of senior officers to focus inward

---

13 Regarding the Lithuanian Ministry of Defense see, Vaidotas Urbelis and Tomas Urbonas, "The Challenges of Civil-Military Relations and Democratic Control of Armed Forces: The Case of Lithuania," in *Democratic Control of the Military in Postcommunist Europe: Guarding the Guards*, eds. Andrew Cottey, Timothy Edmunds, and Anthony Forster (London: Palgrave, 2002), 117–18. For more on Georgia's structure of the ministry of defence and joint staff, see Ministry of Defence of Georgia, *Georgia, Strategic Defence Review, 2013–2016* (Tbilisi: Ministry of Defence, 2013), 22, 23.

14 James Sherr, "Civil-Democratic Control of Ukraine's Armed Forces: To What End? By What Means?," in *Army and State in Postcommunist Europe*, eds. David Betz and John Löwenhardt (London: Frank Cass, 2001), 74.

15 Andrew A. Michta, *The Soldier-Citizen: The Politics of the Polish Army after Communism* (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1997), 50–53.

on the organization as opposed to looking outward and thinking critically and creatively.<sup>16</sup> These expectations cripple strategic-level thinking, thereby inhibiting thoughts of creating a future for the organization and dooming the armed services to live always in the past.<sup>17</sup>

### Centralizing Financial Decision-Making

When the Cold War ended, every former post-Communist country found itself in a state of economic crisis. Strong pressure to decrease defense spending was accompanied by an outbreak of conflicts in Yugoslavia, the Caucasus, and Bessarabia, which further stressed defense budgets. None of these defense institutions, with the exception of the Yugoslav Territorial Defense Force, found themselves with a heritage of a modern defense planning nor a financial management system that would enable them to conduct even the most rudimentary defense planning.<sup>18</sup>

With a universal focus on effecting civilian control and shrinking bloated Communist-era defense budgets, the fastest way to seize civilian control of the armed forces was by removing budget responsibilities from general staffs. Newly elected political leaders and civilian defense officials centralized all financial decision-making within ministries of defense. In the case of the Yugoslav armed forces, whose commanders possessed their own budgets and spending authorities, the subsequent centralization of finances constituted a major step backwards. Conversely, the Czech defense budget circa 1993 was almost incomprehensible to civilian government officials who were challenged to ascertain actual spending. In 1996, then-Czech Minister of Defense Vilem Holan launched a major reform that included the introduction of the “revolutionary” concept of double-entry bookkeeping management.<sup>19</sup>

Thus, the immediate task confronting early democratic reformers was to find effective financial management methods to stop defense institutions from spending public funds needed elsewhere. What began in the early years of democracy to make defense “fit” its budget has become an all but impossible task. Notwithstanding reductions in force structure and personnel, retaining needless infrastructure continues to waste money. To appreciate the enormity of this task, upon independence from the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 2006, Montenegro took possession of 12,000 tons of munitions and 242 pieces of real estate and 1,450 buildings it still owned in 2013.<sup>20</sup>

Established with Western technical assistance, planning, programming, and budgeting system directorates placed unrelenting pressure on centralizing financial decision-making that has only increased following

---

16 Agnieszka Gogolewska, “Problems Confronting Civilian Democratic Control in Poland,” in *Civil-Military Relations in Europe: Learning from Crisis and Institutional Change*, eds. Hans Born, Marina Caparini, Karl W. Haltiner, and Jürgen Kuhlmann (New York: Routledge, 2006), 101.

17 The author is indebted to retired Colonel Vladimir Milenski, Bulgarian Army, for suggesting this most insightful observation.

18 See Glenn E. Curtis, ed., *Yugoslavia: A Country Study* (Washington, DC: Federal Research Division, Library of Congress, 1992), 252; and Milojica Pantelic, “The System and Organization of National Defense,” *Yugoslav Survey* 10, no. 2 (1969): 6.

19 Jeffrey Simon, *NATO and the Czech and Slovak Republics: A Comparative Study in Civil-Military Relations* (Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, 2004), 35.

20 Montenegro Ministry of Defence, *Strategic Defence Review 2013* (Podgorica: Ministry of Defence, 2013), 19.

the 2008 crisis—for example, Slovenia’s defense budget was savaged by a 34.6 percent reduction from 2007 to 2015.<sup>21</sup> Historically, these directorates have effectively maintained their own bureaucratic autonomy, though they have been particularly ineffective at translating any existing defense policy priorities and plans into measurable defense outcomes.<sup>22</sup> This hypercentralized financial decision-making has produced practices in which the general staffs of such nations as Poland, Slovenia, Ukraine, and Serbia conduct force planning absent financial inputs.

It is not surprising that few of these defense institutions have been capable of producing or executing viable defense plans. Thus, a unique managerial pathology has emerged throughout the region: ministries of defense not only manage all aspects of finances but also do so without considering whether outcomes are achievable. Instead, salaries, pensions, military hospitals, and social welfare benefits—such as spas and even a ski resort in Bulgaria—have become default priorities that have produced under-staffed units, limited flying hours, and reduced ship days at sea.

## Undermining Commanders

The confluence of the Communist trinity of legacy concepts inhibits armed forces from developing leaders and fostering an environment for encouraging well-rounded, professional commanders to emerge. Even in reformed defense institutions, such as in Slovenia, the chief of defense controls no more than five percent of the force’s budget and the midterm defense program restricts battalion commanders’ abilities to manage finances to meet assigned missions and tasks.<sup>23</sup> Thus, junior leaders are not expected nor groomed to understand the relationship between fiscal management and force outcomes necessary for mid- and senior-grade postings.

Ministries of defense even determine personnel numbers and present them to chiefs of services as de facto decisions as well as regularly prohibit these senior leaders from moving money from one category to another to produce outcomes. Even worse, commanders who should have the best appreciation of which leaders have both performed well in stressful command postings and have the potential for succeeding in more challenging command environments are not permitted to influence personnel management decisions comparable to Western practices.

Such decision-making, again, is highly centralized in general staffs and ministries of defense. Arguably, the authority of the chief of defense in Slovenia is diluted since his list of officer promotion recommendations is first vetted by the Intelligence and Security Service before being forwarded to the human resource management directorate, a practice one Slovenian general associates with control mechanisms and an ignorance of military advice. Legislation even enables untrained and

---

21 Slovenia Ministry of Defense, *NATO Defence Planning Capability Review 2015/16*, ANNEX 1. AC/281-WP(2016)0024 (R), (Ljubljana: Ministry of Defense, n.d.), 1–4. For more on US assistance programs in the area, see US Department of Defense, *FY 2010 Annual Report on Cost Assessment Activities* (Washington, DC: DoD, 2011), 20, appendix 2.

22 Thomas-Durell Young, “Is the US’s PPBS Applicable to European Post-Communist Defense Institutions?,” *RUSI Journal* 161, no. 5 (October–November 2016): 68–77, doi:10.1080/03071847.2016.1253382.

23 Branimir Furlan, “Civilian Control and Military Effectiveness: Slovenian Case,” *Armed Forces and Society* 39, no. 3 (2012): 442, doi:10.1177/0095327X12459167.

unqualified individuals to become commanders or take staff postings thereby undermining the basic concept of military professionalism.<sup>24</sup>

This pervasive practice of negative civilian control undermines the professional growth of the officer corps by denying demanding command and staff postings. Equally, these practices preclude officers from acquiring a full appreciation of all aspects of the operation of the armed forces, particularly their financial implications and realities. In short, *management* of the armed forces is really a misnomer while *administrating* is clearly observable in the absence of experienced, professional military advice. The persistence of the Communist trinity of legacy concepts is nothing short of scandalous.

Despite the claim that such legacy practices constitute “national business” exempt from allied discussions, these practices produce senior leaders who have not been exposed to the same professionally challenging assignments as their Western counterparts: this fact ultimately creates problems in allied commands and multinational forces. Succinctly, the alliance should be interested in developing senior commanders who are capable of controlling the financial and human resources necessary for combined operations.

To be sure, there are always exceptions to the rule, but one cannot ignore the possibility that limiting these officers from the same professional challenges enjoyed by their Western counterparts produces an officer corps with stunted professionalism. Equally, in lieu of healthy civil-military relations, one finds an unbalanced relationship substituting uninformed and risk-adverse administration for military professionalism.

## Implications and Solutions

Arguably, Western and legacy command concepts are antithetical; however, the Communist trinity of legacy concepts—collective decision-making; conflating leadership, command, and management; and hypercentralized decision-making—undermines the very basis of the Western definition of command. Absent a change in alliance policy and the selection of allied commanders, only time will tell how the stark conceptual rift between Western and residual legacy practices will affect the ability of commanders from these armed forces to operate within the alliance’s integrated military command structure. How have 25 years of cooperation with NATO and its nations’ armed forces missed addressing this important challenge? Answers to this question are more easily found in both Western and Eastern *policy* failures.

The Western approach of providing assistance to new partners and allies has stressed technical solutions, often using Western models that have failed to address the two antithetical concepts of command. Moreover, Western nations’ training and professional military educational courses, which expose students to modern warfare, leadership, and management approaches, have only been partially successful. Appreciation (and one wonders, recognition) that this knowledge is highly contextualized and cannot easily be exported to different national and organizational environments has been lacking. As David Ralston

---

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, 441–42.

writes in the context of exporting European army models in the nineteenth century, “The reformers were to learn, often to their dismay, that the introduction of European forms and methods into their military establishments would sooner or later oblige their societies to undergo internal adjustments which were by no means trivial.”<sup>25</sup>

Simply put, the conceptual difference between Western and Eastern defense and military concepts are so antithetical the adoption of the former is all but impossible without retiring the entire conceptual basis of legacy defense institutions. Even when legacy armed forces adopt some key Western-influenced reforms, junior and noncommissioned officers voice complaints that NATO procedures are faithfully followed during operations but legacy concepts prevail at home. Many young officers and NCOs, including many with operations experience, chafe at this reality.

The existence of this major differentiation in the concept of command clearly needs wider understanding and attention by all NATO nations. The traditional solution of “reform” needs to be rethought. Like it or not, past assistance policies and programs have neither identified this conceptual command divide nor produced any effective methods to address it. This challenge to the Western alliance simply cannot be addressed at the technical level alone. To be sure, Western training and professional military education courses have their place. What needs to be acknowledged by senior officials in both Western and Eastern capitals is the conceptual divide in command, as well as other areas, is due to subtle factors that can only be addressed with a deep understanding of organizational sociological, conceptual, and political characteristics.

To be blunt, only Eastern allies at the level of presidents and prime ministers—officials who need to accept the urgency of effecting changes in how commanders are groomed, are selected for stressful and growing assignments, and are expected to command—can successfully address the contrast. After all, in any military organization, command is the “coin of the realm” and changing its basic characteristic will strike at the very institutional soul and enabling culture of an armed force. Such an initiative will not be easily accepted, particularly in the more profound legacy-leaning defense institutions where Western and legacy concepts of professionalism are antithetical and therefore incapable of coexisting (see table 2).<sup>26</sup> Thus, senior Western political and military officials need to be prepared to exert sharp and consistent political pressure on their counterparts for the comprehensive exculpation of legacy concepts and assumptions as well as their replacement with modern Western concepts. Assuredly, these will be politically painful, fundamental changes.

---

25 David B. Ralston, *Importing the European Army: The Introduction of European Military Techniques and Institutions into the Extra-European World, 1600–1914* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1900), 173.

26 Michael H. Clemmesen, “Integration of New Alliance Members: The Intellectual-Cultural Dimension,” *Defense Analysis* 15, no. 3 (December 1999): 261–72, doi:10.1080/713604685; and Marybeth Peterson Ulrich, *Democratizing Communist Militaries: The Case of the Czech and Russian Armed Forces* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), 108–53.

Western concepts	Eastern concepts
Practical	Theoretical
Critical thinking is required	Iron discipline rules
Decentralized execution	Centralized execution
Commanders are empowered	Commanders only execute
Results oriented	Process oriented
Future oriented	Past obsessed
Low social context	High social context
Serve the troops	Mistreat soldiers (Dedovshchina)
Low power distance	High power distance
Low uncertainty avoidance	High uncertainty avoidance
Lying is unacceptable	Lying is not a sin
Failure is part of learning	Failure is never an option, but a shame and disgrace

## Conclusion

In summary, command as defined and practiced in many Central and Eastern European defense institutions, and expressed as a Communist trinity of legacy concepts, could not be more foreign and antithetical to Western approaches. This premise should come as no surprise since communism’s absolute centralization of power never entrusted lower officials with decision-making authority. Bereft of responsibility and accountability, the legacy definition of command constitutes absolute power over individuals, which likely explains why most newly independent republics systematically compromise commanders’ abilities to command. Largely absent in the region is a timely evolution of laws, policies, incentives, and control mechanisms that ensure the responsible exercise of command.

Yet, these concepts and practices are too limited by the continued practices of collective decision-making; conflating leadership, command, and management; and hyper centralized decision-making to be effectively adopted, particularly regarding financial authorities and human resource management. Overcoming these legacy concepts and comprehensively replacing them with their Western counterparts presents no small challenge. An encouraging first step would be NATO nations’ universal and honest acknowledgement of the challenge and their commitment to addressing these atavistic legacies with deliberate and systematic new methods to effect change.

The only way to undertake this challenge is to place the solution where it belongs, at the highest political level. Thus, the default of long- standing policies and programs that address defense reform as a military problem addressed via technical assistance programs alone needs to be fundamentally reviewed to develop new approaches based on a deep understanding of individual cultures and organizational sociologies. The solution to reforming legacy command concepts will be found in growing and empowering commanders.

---

<sup>27</sup> Adapted from Young, “Impediments to Reform.”

