



NATO Summit 2010

Standard Note: SN/IA/5788

Last updated: 2 December 2010

Author: Claire Taylor

Section International Affairs and Defence Section

The NATO Heads of State and Government Summit took place in Lisbon on 19-20 November 2010. As expected the primary focus of the summit was on the launch of the Alliance's new strategic concept; the progress of the military campaign in Afghanistan; capabilities development and reform of the Alliance; and NATO's relations with Russia, including an agreement over co-operation on missile defence.

This note examines the main conclusions of the summit in relation to each of these issues.

This information is provided to Members of Parliament in support of their parliamentary duties and is not intended to address the specific circumstances of any particular individual. It should not be relied upon as being up to date; the law or policies may have changed since it was last updated; and it should not be relied upon as legal or professional advice or as a substitute for it. A suitably qualified professional should be consulted if specific advice or information is required.

This information is provided subject to [our general terms and conditions](#) which are available online or may be provided on request in hard copy. Authors are available to discuss the content of this briefing with Members and their staff, but not with the general public.

Contents

1	Background	2
2	New Strategic Concept	3
2.1	Core Tasks and Principles	3
2.2	Security Context	4
2.3	Meeting those Challenges	4
	Reactions	7
3	Afghanistan	9
3.1	Transition of Security Responsibilities	10
3.2	Declaration on Enduring Partnership	11
4	Relations with Russia	12
4.1	Missile Defence	13
5	Capabilities and Reform	14

1 Background

As expected the primary focus of the summit was on the launch of the Alliance's new strategic concept; the progress of the military campaign in Afghanistan; capabilities development and reform of the Alliance; and NATO's relations with Russia, including an agreement over co-operation on missile defence.

The following sections examine those outcomes in more detail; while the documents referred to are available online at:

- [Lisbon Summit Declaration](#)
- [Strategic Concept 2010](#)
- [Declaration by NATO and the Government of Afghanistan on an Enduring Partnership](#)
- [Declaration by the nations contributing to ISAF](#)
- [NATO-Russia Council Joint Statement](#)

The next NATO Heads of State and Government Summit will take place in the United States in 2012.

2 New Strategic Concept

At the Strasbourg/Kiehl summit in April 2009 NATO leaders agreed to draft a new Strategic Concept for the Alliance. Intended to replace the original Strategic Concept of 1999, the new document would provide updated strategic guidance on the future purpose, role, and capabilities of the organisation.

A group of experts, under the chairmanship of Madeleine Albright, was duly convened to begin examining the key questions facing the Alliance. The analysis and recommendations of that group, which were published in May 2010 were subsequently intended to assist the NATO Secretary General in drafting a new Strategic Concept for submission to NATO leaders in Lisbon.¹

The Lisbon Summit Declaration subsequently stated:

We have adopted a new Strategic Concept that lays out our vision for the Alliance for the next decade: able to defend its members against the full range of threats; capable of managing even the most challenging crises; and better able to work with other organisations and nations to promote international stability. NATO will be more agile, more capable and more cost-effective, and it will continue to serve as an essential instrument for peace.²

Entitled *Active Engagement, Modern Defence* the new strategic concept places emphasis on NATO's stabilising influence in an uncertain and changing world; on developing new capabilities and maintaining and establishing new partnerships in order to meet those challenges. The fundamental purpose of NATO as a security alliance was never expected to change in the new Strategic Concept. What was regarded to be of greater importance was a recognition of the evolution of the strategic environment since the last Strategic Concept was formulated in 1999 and how NATO would respond to those challenges, particularly in times of financial austerity.

2.1 Core Tasks and Principles

At the heart of the new Strategic Concept, therefore, is a renewed commitment to three essential core tasks:

- Collective defence – a firm and binding commitment to Article V of the Washington Treaty. The document states that “NATO will deter and defend against any threat of aggression, and against emerging security challenges where they threaten the fundamental security of individual Allies or the Alliance as a whole”.
- Crisis Management – NATO will actively employ an appropriate mix of political and military tools to help manage developing crises that have the potential to affect Alliance security before they escalate into conflict; to stop ongoing conflicts where they affect Alliance security; and to help consolidate stability in post-conflict situations where that contributes to Euro-Atlantic security.
- Cooperative Security – NATO will actively engage to enhance international security through partnership with relevant countries and other international organisations; by contributing to arms controls, non-proliferation and disarmament; and by maintaining

¹ A copy of that report is available online at: <http://www.nato.int/strategic-concept/expertsreport.pdf>

² *Lisbon Summit Declaration*, 20 November 2010

an open door policy to all European democracies that meet NATO standards for membership.

In order to meet the core tasks of the Alliance, the concept re-emphasises the need for NATO allies to engage in a continuous process of “reform, modernisation and transformation”.

2.2 Security Context

While, the new Strategic Concept accepts that, at present, the threat of a conventional attack against NATO territory is low, it nevertheless acknowledges that the strategic challenges to NATO remain prolific. In line with the threat assessments of individual Allies,³ the new Strategic Concept identifies the following potential threats to Alliance security:

- The acquisition of substantial, modern military capabilities by many countries in the world, in particular the proliferation of ballistic missile technologies.
- The proliferation of nuclear weapons and other WMD, and their means of delivery. Over the next decade the new Strategic Concept concludes that proliferation will be the most acute in some of the world’s most volatile regions.
- Terrorism poses a direct threat both to the security of citizens of NATO countries, and to international stability more generally. Extremist groups continue to spread to, and in, areas of strategic importance to the Alliance; while modern technology increases the threat and potential impact of terrorist attacks, for example WMD-related terrorism.
- Instability or conflict beyond NATO borders which can directly threaten Alliance security through the fostering of extremism, terrorism and trans-national activities such as arms, drugs and people trafficking.
- Cyber attacks against government administrations, business, economies and potentially against critical infrastructure.
- Energy security and the increasing dependence of some NATO countries on foreign energy suppliers and energy supply and distribution networks.
- A number of significant technology-related trends, including the development of laser weapons, electronic warfare and technologies that impede access to space, have the potential to impact on NATO military planning and operations.
- Key environmental and resource constraints, including health risks, climate change, water scarcity and increasing energy needs that are likely to shape the future security environment in areas of concern to NATO; while also having the potential to affect NATO planning and operations.

2.3 Meeting those Challenges

In order to meet those challenges, and in doing so define the roles of the Alliance, the Strategic Concept makes the following observations and recommendations:

³ See for example the UK’s [National Security Strategy](#) which was published in October 2010.

- NATO does not consider any country to be its adversary. However, NATO's resolve should not be in doubt if the security of any of its members is threatened.
- Deterrence, based on an appropriate mix of nuclear and conventional capabilities, will remain a core element of NATO's overall strategy. As long as nuclear weapons exist, NATO will remain a nuclear alliance.
- NATO will maintain the full range of capabilities necessary to deter and defend against any threat. Therefore the Alliance will collectively:
 - Maintain the ability to sustain concurrent major joint operations and several smaller operations for collective defence and crisis response, including at strategic distance.
 - Develop and maintain robust, mobile and deployable conventional forces to carry out both Article V responsibilities and expeditionary operations, including through the use of the NATO Response Force.
 - Carry out the necessary training, exercises, contingency planning and information exchange for assuring defence against the full range of conventional and emerging threats.
 - Ensure the broadest possible participation of Allies in collective defence planning on nuclear roles, in peacetime basing of nuclear forces and in command, control and consultation arrangements.
 - Develop the capability to defend NATO populations and territory against ballistic missile attack as a core element of collective defence (see below).
 - Further develop NATO's capacity to defend against the threat of WMD.
 - Develop NATO's ability to prevent, detect and defend against cyber attacks.
 - Enhance the capacity to detect and defend against international terrorism.
 - Develop the capacity to contribute to energy security, including protection of critical infrastructure and transit areas and lines, increased cooperation with partners and consultation among Allies on the basis for strategic assessments and contingency planning. An interim report on the progress achieved in the area of energy security will be prepared by December 2011 and a further report for consideration at the next NATO Heads of State and Government Summit.
 - Ensure the Alliance is at the forefront of technological advancements and that military planning takes into account the potential threat posed by emerging technologies.
 - Sustain the necessary levels of defence spending. In order to ensure resources are used efficiently the new Strategic Concept also commits NATO allies to a programme of reform and transformation that will maximise the deployability of forces and their capacity to sustain operations in the field; ensure maximum coherence in defence planning in order to reduce duplication and focus capability development on modern requirements; and maximise the joint development and operation of capabilities.

- Continue to review NATO's overall posture in deterring and defending against the full range of threats to the alliance. Essential elements of that review include the range of strategic capabilities required, including NATO's nuclear posture, missile defence and other means of strategic deterrence and defence.
- NATO will engage, where possible, and when necessary, to prevent crises, manage crises, stabilise post-conflict situations and support reconstruction.
- The lessons learnt from the Balkans and Afghanistan demonstrate that a comprehensive political, civilian and military approach is necessary for effective crisis management. NATO will, therefore, engage actively with other international partners before, during and after a crisis to encourage collaboration in the planning and conduct of activities on the ground.
- In order to be more effective across the crisis management spectrum, NATO will therefore:
 - Enhance intelligence sharing within NATO to better predict when crises might occur and how they can be best prevented.
 - Further develop doctrine and military capabilities for expeditionary operations, including counter insurgency, stabilisation and reconstruction.
 - Form an appropriate civilian crisis management capability to interface more effectively with civilian partners and potentially plan, employ and coordinate civilian activities until conditions allow for the transfer of those responsibilities and tasks to other actors.
 - Enhance integrated civilian-military planning.
 - Develop the capability to train and develop local forces in crisis zones, so that local authorities are able, as quickly as possible, to maintain security without international assistance.
 - Identify and train civilian specialists from Member States, available for rapid deployment on selected missions and able to work alongside military personnel and civilian specialists from partner countries and institutions.
 - Broaden and intensify political consultation among Allies and partners at all stages of a crisis.
 - The Comprehensive Approach Action Plan, agreed at the Bucharest summit in 2008, will be updated for discussion at the NATO Foreign Ministers meeting in April 2011.

The Strategic Concept also set out NATO's role in promoting international security through co-operation, specifically with partners, other international organisations and by supporting international measures on issues such as arms control. On the latter issue, the Strategic Concept fully commits NATO to seeking to create the conditions for nuclear disarmament, in a way that promotes international stability and is based on the principle of undiminished security for all. As such, NATO will seek to create the conditions that would allow future reductions in the number of nuclear weapons stationed in Europe and its reliance on nuclear weapons in NATO strategy. In doing so, however, the Concept acknowledges that Russian

agreement on increasing transparency on its nuclear weapons in Europe and the relocation of such weapons away from the territory of NATO member states should be a key aim; while taking into account the disparity between the number of short-range nuclear weapons held by NATO and the larger stockpile held by Russia.

With regard to partnerships, the new Strategic Concept reiterates NATO's open door policy for all "European democracies which share the values of our Alliance, which are willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, and whose inclusion can contribute to common security and stability". The Lisbon Summit Declaration also reiterated NATO's intention to extend an invitation for membership to the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia as soon as a mutually acceptable solution has been reached, within the UN framework, over its name; while also supporting the membership aspirations of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Georgia.

The new Strategic Concept also commits NATO to enhancing its partnerships both within, and beyond, existing frameworks. Specifically the Concept sets out the willingness of NATO to develop political dialogue and practical co-operation with any nations and relevant organisations that share a common interest in "peaceful international relations"; consult with any partner country on security issues of common concern; and give partner nations a structural role in shaping strategy and decisions relating to NATO-led missions to which they contribute. NATO relations with the UN and the EU, in particular the EU's defence policy, are highlighted as priorities, along with existing mechanisms such as the Mediterranean Dialogue, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council, the Partnership for Peace initiative, the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative and importantly, NATO's relationship with Russia. The Strategic Concept firmly states:

NATO-Russia cooperation is of strategic importance as it contributes to creating a common space of peace, stability, and security. NATO poses no threat to Russia. On the contrary: we want to see a true strategic partnership between NATO and Russia, and we will act accordingly, with the expectation of reciprocity from Russia.

As such, the Concept sets out the determination to enhance political consultation and practical cooperation with Russia in areas of shared interest such as missile defence, counter terrorism, counter narcotics, counter piracy and the promotion of international security; and use the full potential of the NATO-Russia Council to achieve those aims (see below).

The Lisbon Summit Declaration also outlined the intention to reform NATO's partnership initiatives in order to make the dialogue and co-operation conducted through them, more meaningful. In pursuit of that aim, the declaration sets out the decision to streamline NATO's partnership tools in order to open all cooperative activities and exercises to partners and to harmonise NATO's partnership programmes; develop more flexible formats for discussing security challenges with partners and enhance existing fora for dialogue; while also building on improvements in NATO's training mechanisms. The North Atlantic Council has subsequently been tasked with developing a more efficient and flexible partnership policy for discussion at the April 2011 Foreign Ministers meeting.

Reactions

Reactions to the new Strategic Concept have been mixed. For many, the wide-ranging nature of the objectives and roles of the Alliance as set out in the concept represents an

attempt to “paper over” the differences of opinion between NATO allies on the fundamental purposes of the Alliance.⁴ An assessment in *Strategic Comments* also notes:

Nor did leaders address the potential mismatch between the wide-ranging goals set in the Alliance’s new Strategic Concept and the decline in resources that member nations are expected to allocate to defence as budgets are tightened.⁵

Several arms control organisations have also criticised the inability of the Strategic Concept to adequately address the difference of opinion on the nuclear issue, and specifically the basing of US tactical nuclear weapons in several European countries.⁶ Paul Ingram, Executive Director of BASIC commented:

In an astonishing demonstration of weakness, NAsTO Heads of State have failed to tackle the Cold War legacy of the deployment of US nuclear gravity bombs in Europe, threatening the credibility of NATO member’s claims to be interested in non-proliferation and global disarmament.⁷

Daryl Kimball of the Arms Control Association also argues that “NATO’s decision to link reductions of US tactical nuclear bombs in Europe to future Russian action on its tactical nuclear stockpile is a formula for inaction”;⁸ while the Federation of American Scientists expressed the view that “to begin now to argue that the size of the US arsenal in Europe is linked to Russia after all resembles the Cold War policy when NATO looked to Russia for sizing the US arsenal in Europe”.⁹ Yet, other analysts have suggested that linking NATO actions in this area to those of Russia is a positive step. Recognising that Russia is seeking equality on many issues, commentators such as *NATO Monitor* argue that the purpose appears to be getting “Russia engaged in future arms reductions talks beyond the new START treaty” and that “this send Russia a very positive signal that NATO wishes to engage it as a partner”.¹⁰

Other analysts have been largely positive about the content of the Strategic Concept more generally. Nick Witney, writing for the European Council on Foreign Relations suggested that:

NATO’s Lisbon summit has successfully drawn a line under a fractious period in the alliance’s existence [...] In the run-up to the summit transatlantic relations have been strained by European perceptions of diminishing US interest; by American perceptions of diminishing European commitment and by corrosive effects of the floundering campaign in Afghanistan. A year ago, the alliance seemed locked in a crisis of identity: was its primary purpose to undertake crisis management operations ‘out of area’, or should it re-focus on its core task of guaranteeing the security of Europe? Or would new threats such as cyber or missile attack provide its primary reason for being?

These various circles have been skilfully squared in the new Strategic Concept [...] It answers the questions about NATO’s point and purpose by simply saying yes to all of the above. The mix is garnished with talk of partnerships with other international

⁴ See “NATO: more consensus, but challenges remain”, *Strategic Comments*, November 2010

⁵ *ibid*

⁶ An examination of this debate and the differences of opinion that have existed between NATO allies is available in Library Research Paper RP10/42, *Progress towards nuclear disarmament*, June 2010

⁷ “Experts call NATO strategic concept ‘missed opportunity’”, Arms Control Association, 19 November 2010

⁸ *ibid*

⁹ “NATO strategic concept: one step forward and a half step back”, *Federation of American Scientists*, 20 November 2010

¹⁰ “Nuclear weapons aspects of the Strategic Concept”, *NATO Monitor*, 20 November 2010

players, and or reform. The result is a well-balanced and plausible, with something for everyone.¹¹

The assessment in *Strategic Comments* particularly welcomed the linkage between emerging threats, such as cyber attacks, to the mutual defence commitment which lies at the heart of the Alliance; an issue which has previously divided Member States.¹² It suggested that:

By emphasising and adapting the idea of collective defence, the Concept thus avoids leaning too far towards those member states that had demanded a more expeditionary outlook, but equally does not signal retrenchment from engagement in crisis-management missions beyond collective defence, a position that some member states had suggested.¹³

Like many others, however, that article concluded with the view that “implementation of all these agreements will be challenging” and that the intra-Alliance tensions over NATO’s functions and emphasis that were exposed in the formulation of the new Strategic Concept are likely to persist”.¹⁴

3 Afghanistan

At a meeting of NATO Foreign Ministers at the end of April 2010 agreement on a common roadmap for progressive security transition to the Afghan authorities, beginning in late 2010, was reached. However, in reaching a draft agreement the NATO Secretary General cautioned:

We need to be clear about what transition means and doesn’t mean. Transition means that Afghan authorities take the lead, and we move into a supportive role. But it doesn’t mean a rush for the exit.¹⁵

Few details of that draft plan were released with the expectation that a roadmap would be developed in conjunction with the Afghan government for endorsement at the security conference in Kabul on 20 July 2010. Indeed, the Communiqué agreed at the Kabul Conference reiterated the support of the international community to the objective “that the Afghan National Security Forces should lead and conduct military operations in all provinces by the end of 2014”. The plan for transition agreed at that conference set out the following principles:

- Transition would be a conditions-based process and any recommendations would be based on conditions on the ground.
- Transition would not signify a withdrawal of ISAF forces but a gradual shift to a supporting role as the capabilities of the Afghan National Security Forces developed. As circumstances dictate, the international community’s civilian and military representatives would gradually shift toward a supporting, then mentoring, then

¹¹ Nick Witney, “NATO’s self-cancelling summit”, *European Council on Foreign Relations*, 23 November 2010

¹² The cyber attacks on Estonia in 2007 led many NATO allies to call for cyberwarfare to be acknowledged as an article V issue, a view not shared across the Alliance.

¹³ “NATO: more consensus but challenges remain”, *Strategic Comments*, November 2010

¹⁴ *ibid*

¹⁵ NATO press release, 23 April 2010

enabling and finally a sustaining role across all three pillars of security, governance and development.

- Transition would involve key Afghan institutions and functions as well as geographic areas, and would include the evolution of the ISAF Provincial Reconstructions Teams (PRTs) towards a mainstream developmental model. ISAF Headquarters would remain even as forces drawdown.

The criteria for transition was defined thus:

Successful transition of security responsibility requires that Afghan National Security Forces, under effective Afghan civilian control, will be capable of tackling existing and new security challenges, with continued support from ISAF. Transition assessments will also consider the ability and authority of the Afghan government to provide the rule of law and manage public administration at sub-national and local levels; and the capacity of an area to sustain socio-economic development. Transition must be irreversible.¹⁶

Assessment of each province's readiness for transition was to be undertaken by the Joint Afghan-NATO Inteqal Board, with its recommendations to be submitted to the Afghan Cabinet for approval. Any provinces identified as falling short of transition criteria would be the focus of an Action Plan specifically geared towards addressing those shortfalls.

The Kabul Communiqué went on to conclude that "the Government of Afghanistan and NATO/ISAF are to assess jointly the provinces with the aim of announcing by the end of 2010 that the process of transition is underway".¹⁷ At the time the intention was to launch that process in time for the Lisbon summit.

3.1 Transition of Security Responsibilities

The Lisbon Summit Declaration subsequently identified the ISAF mission in Afghanistan as "the Alliance's key priority" and confirmed that a new phase in the Afghan mission would now begin, with the process of transition to Afghan security responsibility starting in early 2011 in certain districts and provinces "following a joint Afghan and NATO/ISAF assessment and decision". Transition will be conditions-based, "not calendar-driven" and "will not equate to withdrawal of ISAF troops" which will remain in a supporting role, but would result in Afghan forces gradually assuming full responsibility for security across the whole of Afghanistan by the end of 2014. The declaration did not, however, pinpoint which districts and provinces would be the first to transition.

More specifically, the Declaration by the nations contributing to ISAF set out the following:

- The agreed process of transition will be jointly carried out.
- Assistance with Afghan national priority programmes will be better aligned.
- As transition proceeds, ISAF's profile and reconfiguration will be adjusted, with military assets reinvested, as necessary and appropriate, to meet critical security, training and mentoring requirements.

¹⁶ NATO Factsheet, [NATO's role in Afghanistan](#)

¹⁷ *Kabul International Conference on Afghanistan Communiqué*, 20 July 2010

- Afghan security capabilities will be further strengthened as ISAF gradually moves away from combat to an increasingly supporting role.
- The international civilian effort, including the work conducted through the Provincial Reconstruction Teams will continue to evolve and enable greater Afghan capacity and leadership, while also preparing for longer-term development assistance.

That document also reiterated the importance of the Afghan security forces training mission to the process of transition, and emphasised the challenge of meeting the requirements for “trainers, mentors and critical enablers for 2011 and beyond”. It went on to welcome measures for reconciliation and reintegration, recognising them as “a key part of achieving lasting stability in Afghanistan” and expressed continued support for Afghan-led efforts through the Peace Jirga, the High Peace Council and the Afghan Peace and Reintegration Program. The declaration did, however, state that “corruption remains a central challenge to be addressed” and called on the Afghan government to fully implement the Kabul commitments on improving governance, strengthening the rule of law and ensuring sustainable economic growth. Co-operation with regional partners was also welcomed.

A discussion of the ISAF mission and the current status of contributing nations, including any plans for withdrawal, is available in Library Standard Note SN/IA/5678, [Afghanistan: Towards a handover of security responsibility?](#)

3.2 Declaration on Enduring Partnership

NATO leaders and the Afghan government also agreed a *Declaration on an Enduring Partnership* which seeks to establish long term partnership arrangements between NATO and the Afghan government beyond the scope of the current ISAF mission, and in line with broader UN-led international efforts. Centred around the Comprehensive Approach, that declaration commits to developing effective measures of co-operation that will provide sustained practical support to Afghan security institutions in the longer term. Specifically, those measures could include:

- Mechanisms for political and military dialogue.
- Continuing use of NATO trust funds in support of capacity building of Afghan government security institutions.
- A continuing NATO liaison in Afghanistan to assist in the implementation of the declaration with a common understanding that NATO has no ambition to establish a permanent military presence in Afghanistan or to use its presence in Afghanistan against other nations.
- Continuation of the NATO Afghan training mission, reconfigured as necessary, and with the approval of NATO leaders, to meet the Afghan government’s evolving security needs.
- An individual programme of additional co-operation activities derived from, and incorporating, the existing Afghan Co-operation Programme along with other initiatives. Such activities could include assistance with the development and reform of security ministries and other national institutions; helping build professionalism and capacity of the Afghan National Security Forces in areas such as counter terrorism and counter narcotics; and providing tailored access to NATO courses, institutions and military and civilian expertise.

NATO and the Afghan government are now expected to consult over the scope of such a partnership agreement with any resulting co-operation programme approved by NATO and the Afghan government on a regular basis through a jointly-owned process. The declaration specifically commits all parties to review the declaration and the programme of co-operation resulting from it, at a senior political level and at intervals of no more than three years. It also confirms that discussions between the Afghan government and NATO on a Status of Forces Agreement will be initiated within the next three years. In the meantime, the application of the current Military Technical Agreement will continue to be monitored and reviewed by the Joint Coordinating Body. With the joint approval of NATO and the Afghan government, third parties may contribute to the activities resulting from this declaration, although any bilateral assistance between the Afghan government and such nations will remain outside of its purview.

4 Relations with Russia

Long standing tension over the enlargement of the Alliance into Russia's 'near abroad', US proposals for a missile defence interceptor site in Eastern Europe; and concerns over a resurgent Russia following the conflict in Georgia in 2008 had led to a well publicised breakdown in relations, including the suspension of the NATO-Russia Council (NRC) and the suspension of Russian participation in the *Conventional Forces in Europe Treaty*. However, efforts to 're-set' US relations with Russia under the Obama administration have also been echoed within the NATO alliance over the last few years. The Lisbon summit was therefore regarded as a key opportunity for advancing this new rapprochement in NATO-Russian relations.

Indeed, a statement issued by the NRC on 20 November set out several key areas for political dialogue and practical co-operation going forward, based on the first ever NATO-Russian Joint Review of 21st Century Common Security Challenges, which was launched in 2009. Labelled "a new stage of cooperation towards a true strategic partnership"¹⁸ those practical measures include co-operation on counter-terrorism, the fight against piracy, non-proliferation of WMD and their means of delivery and disaster response.

The NRC also agreed on measures to assist in the stabilisation of Afghanistan, including broadened transit arrangements through Russian territory for non-lethal ISAF goods, expansion of the NRC counter narcotics training project to provide further direct assistance to institutional capacity building, and the establishment of an NRC Helicopter Maintenance Trust Fund in 2011.¹⁹

For the future, the Lisbon Summit Declaration also stated:

We will also want to discuss in the NRC, a range of other topics, including Afghanistan; implementing OSCE principles; military deployments, including any that could be perceived as threatening; information sharing and transparency on military doctrine and posture, as well as the overall disparity in short-range nuclear weapons; arms control; and other security issues. We look forward to discussing all these matters in

¹⁸ [NATO-Russia Council Joint Statement](#)

¹⁹ The Afghan air force largely operates a Russian-sourced helicopter fleet.

the NRC, which is a forum for political dialogue at all times and on all issues, including where we disagree.²⁰

The NRC did not reach any decisions, however, on Russian suspension of the CFE treaty and subsequently, the Lisbon Summit Declaration, while reaffirming the commitment of NATO allies to the CFE treaty regime, went on to state that “the current situation, where NATO CFE allies implement the treaty while Russia does not, cannot continue indefinitely”.²¹

Summing up the conclusions of the NRC meeting, the NATO Secretary General, Anders Fogh Rasmussen, stated:

We have agreed together, on which security challenges NATO nations and Russia actually face today. What’s most significant is what’s not on the list: each other. The NATO nations and Russia have, today, agreed in writing, that while we face many security challenges, we pose no threat to each other. That alone, draws a clear line between the past and the future of NATO-Russia relations.²²

German Chancellor Angela Merkel also welcomed the decisions reached at the NRC, suggesting that “the fact we are talking to Russia about common threats and the chance to cooperate with Russia on missile defense is an extremely important step. That could be proof that the Cold War has finally come to an end”.²³

However, many analysts have argued that, while progress in the NATO-Russia relationship is to be welcomed, its longevity remains uncertain, based seemingly on a convergence of mutual interests rather than a fundamental realignment of strategic priorities. James Sherr at Chatham House suggests that “despite the menu of common interests, Russia remains unreconciled with NATO’s place in Europe and the world. Whereas NATO seeks cooperation, Russia seeks equality”.²⁴ The article in *Strategic Comments* also observed that while “Russia seems likely to insist on being treated as an equal partner...it is by no means certain that all NATO allies are ready to go that far”.²⁵

An editorial in *The Financial Times* also argued that “though Russia is keen to shake hands now, this too could change after its 2012 presidential election”;²⁶ while *The Economist* has noted that “if the Obama administration fails to get the new START missile treaty ratified by the Senate because of Republican opposition, Russia could well revert to its hostility towards the alliance’s plans for missile defence”.²⁷

4.1 Missile Defence

After several years of discussion, and disagreement, NATO allies agreed at the Lisbon summit to develop, as part of its core task of collective defence, a missile defence capability that would protect all NATO European populations, territory and forces from the increasing threat posed by the proliferation of ballistic missiles. Therefore, the command, control and communications capabilities of NATO’s current Active Layered Theatre Ballistic Missile Defence programme, hitherto largely concerned with the defence of deployed forces, will be

²⁰ Lisbon Summit Declaration, 20 November 2010

²¹ Lisbon Summit Declaration, 20 November 2010

²² [NATO press release](#), 20 November 2010

²³ “NATO leaders agree to new start with Russia”, *The New York Times*, 21 November 2010

²⁴ James Sherr, “NATO and Russia: ‘refresh’ but no transformation”, 19 November 2010

²⁵ “NATO: more consensus, but challenges remain”, *Strategic Comments*, November 2010

²⁶ “The new NATO pact”, *The Financial Times*, 23 November 2010

²⁷ “Harmony – for now”, *The Economist*, 25 November 2010

expanded.²⁸ The US proposals for a European-based ballistic missile architecture are regarded as a “valuable national contribution”, along with other possible contributions by allies. The North Atlantic Council has now been tasked with drafting an action plan to implement the missile defence capability for discussion at the NATO Defence Ministers meeting in June 2011.

In “a spirit of reciprocity, maximum transparency and mutual confidence” the option of cooperating in that programme was also extended to Russia. As such, the NRC subsequently agreed on a joint ballistic missile threat assessment and to continue dialogue in this area. The NRC also agreed that Theatre Missile defence cooperation exercises would resume and that a comprehensive Joint Analysis of the future framework for broader missile defence cooperation would now be developed. The progress of that analysis is expected to be assessed at the June 2011 meeting of NRC Defence Ministers.

The Lisbon Summit Declaration also makes clear that the Alliance would be prepared “to engage with other relevant states, on a case by case basis, to enhance transparency and confidence and to increase missile defence mission effectiveness”.²⁹

President Obama welcomed progress with Russia stating “we agreed to cooperate on missile defence, which turns a source of past tension in to a source of potential cooperation against a shared threat... we see Russia as a partner, not an adversary”.³⁰

5 Capabilities and Reform

The development of military capabilities and measures to address capability shortfalls has been on the agenda of the Alliance consistently since the end of the Cold War. Various initiatives, including co-operative measures with the EU, have been established over the years, yet capabilities development still remains a largely unfulfilled priority.

Thus having adopted the new Strategic Concept, NATO leaders also agreed on the need to develop Political Guidance for the further transformation and improvement of defence capabilities and forces in order to implement the objectives of that new concept. Allies also agreed the ‘Lisbon package’ of the alliance’s most pressing capability needs in order to provide renewed focus on delivering against these capability shortfalls. Priority areas identified were those associated with meeting the demands of ongoing operations, and emerging threats, including counter-IED capabilities, increasing the availability of heavy lift helicopters, collective logistics for medical support, key enabling capabilities such as intelligence sharing and information systems for more effective decisions making and command and control, theatre missile defence and defence against cyber attacks.

On that latter point, and in recognition of the changing nature of warfare, NATO allies agreed to enhance their cyber defence capabilities, in particular the ability to detect, assess, prevent, defend and recover from a cyber attack against systems of critical importance to the Alliance. NATO’s Computer Incident Response Capability will be accelerated with a view to achieving Full Operational Capability by 2012; while all NATO bodies will be brought under centralised cyber protection. The summit declaration also set out the intention to incorporate the cyber

²⁸ Further information on NATO’s theatre missile defence programme is available at: http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_49635.htm

²⁹ Lisbon Summit Declaration, 20 November 2010

³⁰ “NATO leaders agree to new start with Russia”, *The New York Times*, 21 November 2010

dimension of modern conflicts into NATO's doctrine and use NATO's defence planning processes to promote the development of Allies' individual cyber defence capabilities and to assist information sharing, collaboration and interoperability. The North Atlantic Council is subsequently tasked with drawing up a NATO cyber defence policy by June 2011 and to prepare an action plan for its implementation.

Further conceptual work on multinational approaches and other innovative ways to achieve cost effectiveness and avoid duplication is expected to be taken forward by March 2011, including measures for cooperation with the EU.

In order to meet the essential core tasks of the new Strategic Concept, the Lisbon Summit also recognised the need to adapt the institutional structures of the Alliance, and as such called for "an ambitious and coherent package of reform measures". Those measures include a review of the NATO Command structure and reform of NATO's agencies, and headquarters, in addition to the Secretary General's current initiatives to streamline existing civilian and military structures within NATO and improve the management of resources. A framework for the new NATO Command structure was subsequently agreed which will significantly reduce the number of headquarters from 11 to seven, and provide a manpower saving of 35% (5,000 posts or more) to a total of approximately 9,000 personnel. A final decision on the new command structure, including its geographic footprint is expected to be taken no later than June 2011. Decisions were also taken to consolidate the number of NATO agencies from 14 to three. An implementation plan is expected to be presented in March 2011 with decisions on geographical location again taken in June 2011.

On this latter point of institutional reform, Dr Jonathan Eyal of RUSI has observed that:

Although there was a cull in the number of various committees and 'councils' which have proliferated inside the alliance, there was no assessment on whether this would result in a leaner and more efficient organisation. Nor was there any serious debate about the central funding requirements of NATO, or about the defence expenditure of its member states. All these questions were deemed either too politically sensitive or too remote from the main business of the summit, which was to convey the image of an organisation which is no longer bickering, and which knows what it is doing.³¹

He concluded that the consensus achieved at the summit on many of the issues which had previously divided the alliance, "remains fairly superficial; the alliance may no longer be suffering from a crisis of identity, but it is still beset by serious problems".³²

³¹ Dr Jonathan Eyal, "NATO's summit: great on presentation, less good on substance", *RUSI Commentary*, November 2010

³² *ibid*