



NATO Summit Wales 2014

Standard Note: SN06947

Last updated: 25 July 2014

Author: Louisa Brooke-Holland

Section: International Affairs and Defence section

The UK will host the next NATO summit in Newport, Wales, between 4 and 5 September 2014. The Summit will focus on three broad themes: the end of combat operations in Afghanistan and NATO's post-2014 role; collective defence and NATO's response to the Russia-Ukraine crisis; the transatlantic relationship and the level of spending on defence by NATO members.

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 Introduction 3**
 - 1.1 New Secretary General 3
 - 1.2 Expected outcomes 3
 - 1.3 Chicago Summit 4
 - 1.4 Parliamentary Assembly pre-summit meeting 4
- 2 Key themes 5**
 - 2.1 Afghanistan 5
 - 2.2 Collective defence and the Russia-Ukraine crisis 7
 - Is the credibility of NATO at stake? 7
 - A Readiness Action Plan and the Connected Forces Initiative 8
 - 2.3 Transatlantic relationship and defence spending 9
 - 2.4 Enlargement and Partnerships 12
- About NATO 13**
 - Resources 14

1 Introduction

The UK will host the 2014 NATO Summit. It will be held at Celtic Manor resort near Newport in Wales between 4 and 5 September 2014. It is the first summit to be held in the UK since the 1990 London summit. The Alliance's heads of State and Government last met in Chicago in 2012. The official theme for the summit is: *Building Stability in an Unpredictable World*. Heads of State and Government from NATO's 28 member states will attend the Summit.

The Summit will focus on three key themes:

1. *Afghanistan*. The NATO-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission officially ends on 31 December 2014. NATO took command of ISAF in August 2003.
2. *Collective security and Russia*. The core purpose of the Alliance is the commitment to the collective defence of its members. The situation in Ukraine has prompted a renewed focus on how the Alliance provides for the collective security of all of its members and how it responds to Russia.
3. *Transatlantic relationship and defence spending*. Renewing the transatlantic relationship is a recurring theme at Summits and this is no exception, particularly since the Obama administration announced its 'pivot to Asia' in 2011. The number of countries who reach NATO's target of 2% of GDP on defence spending is expected to be discussed. Only the UK, US and two other countries reached this target in 2013

Beyond those broad themes, the summit is also likely to discuss a wide-range of issues, ranging from cyber-defence and missile defence to strengthening relationships with partner countries.

The Defence Committee will publish its report *Towards the next Defence and Security Review: Part 2 – NATO* on 31 July 2014. It will be available on the committee's website.

Tobias Ellwood is the Prime Minister's parliamentary adviser for the NATO Summit. He was appointed Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in July 2014.

1.1 New Secretary General

Anders Fogh Rasmussen will remain as Secretary-General of NATO for the duration of the Summit. His term ends at the end of September and he will be succeeded by Jens Stoltenberg on 1 October 2014. Mr Stoltenberg has been Prime Minister of Norway twice and is the leader of the Norwegian Labour Party. He will be the first Norwegian to serve as Secretary-General.

1.2 Expected outcomes

Some of the outcomes of the Summit have already been hinted at. These include, but are not confined to:

Afghanistan and Operation Resolute Support: Resolute Support is the name given to NATO's post-2014 presence in Afghanistan. The NATO-led International Security Assistance Force will end its mission in Afghanistan at the end of 2014. NATO will continue in a 'train, advise and assist' role. This is, however, entirely dependent on whether NATO and Afghanistan sign

a new Status of Forces Agreement. The US and Afghan governments put off signing a Bilateral Security Agreement until after the Presidential election. Both candidates have committed to signing the BSA soon after taking office (the Presidential inauguration is slated for 2 August). If the BSA is signed, a similar NATO Status of Forces Agreement is expected to follow. Without one, no Western forces will remain in Afghanistan.

Transatlantic Declaration: NATO's Deputy Secretary General expects a formal "Transatlantic Declaration" in which allies will reaffirm their mutual commitment to each other's security and agree to do more to share the burden of security more equitably.¹

Cyber-defence policy and Article 5: An explicit statement that the cyber realm is covered by Article 5 has reportedly been approved by defence ministers and is expected to be endorsed at the summit. NATO official Jamie Shea said that NATO will say "for the first time" that Article 5 will cover the cyber realm, although it will remain vague about the circumstances of or what the threshold of a cyber-attack might be to warrant the invocation of Article 5 (which has only been invoked once in NATO's history, in response to 9/11).² NATO published its [Cyber-Defence policy](#) in June 2011 and has reportedly revised it for approval at the Summit. There may also be an explicit recommitment to Article 5 to serve as both reassurance to Allies bordering Russia and to deter Russia from any action against NATO members.

Readiness Action Plan: a plan to improve the speed with which European militaries can respond to crisis and any threat against a member of the alliance. Rasmussen said NATO is looking at how forces are deployed for defence and deterrence, and considering reinforcement measures, such as the designation of bases and prepositioning of equipment and supplies. This may also involve an updated exercise schedule. Ongoing exercises would allow NATO to place troops on the ground on a non-permanent and rotating basis. NATO is reportedly looking at Central Europe³, possibly Poland, and in the Baltic states.

1.3 Chicago Summit

The last summit was held in Chicago in May 2012. Leaders agreed a general Summit Declaration as well as separate declarations on Afghanistan, defence capabilities and counter-terrorism. NATO also published its *Deterrence and Defence Posture Review* which included a review of its nuclear posture. All are available on the NATO website: [official texts from the Chicago summit 2012](#).

1.4 Parliamentary Assembly pre-summit meeting

The NATO Parliamentary Assembly will meet in London on 2 September 2014, ahead of the summit.

Hugh Bayley has been President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly since 2012. Mr Bayley authored a report in June 2014 articulating "a parliamentary case for strengthening the transatlantic pillars of the Alliance." Mr Bayley called on NATO governments and parliaments to:

- Reaffirm their commitment to a strong alliance;

¹ "Looking towards the Wales Summit", NATO, 13 June 2014

² "[NATO Updates Policy: Offers Members Article 5 Protection Against Cyber Attacks](#)", *Atlantic Council*, 30 June 2014

³ "Is Germany's framework nations concept a 'substantial NATO compromise?'", *Jan Techau, director of Carnegie Europe, Atlantic Council*, 17 June 2014; "NATO will look east for new HQ", *The Times*, 24 July 2014

- Maintain and develop the Alliance's capabilities by getting better value from the resources we spend and doing more jointly;
- Reverse the current downward trend in defence spending and address current imbalances in the respective contributions of Allies to our common defence;
- Continue to develop NATO's network of partners, and integrate those nations that aspire and are ready to join the Alliance.⁴

The Parliamentary Assembly is institutionally separate from NATO. It has no formal decision-making authority. The Assembly is a collection of parliamentarians from across the 28 member states of NATO. Members of the NATO PA meet the NATO Secretary-General at least three times a year and hold a joint session with NATO's decision-making body, the North Atlantic Council, every year.

2 Key themes

The key themes of the summit were outlined by David Lidington, Minister for Europe, in a written statement on 16 July 2014:

First, we will discuss the situation in Afghanistan as the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission draws to an end, and decide how we will continue to support the Afghan government.

[...]

Second, we need to agree on the long-term implications of the Russia-Ukraine crisis and how the Alliance will continue to provide for the collective security of all Allies.

[...]

Third, we must agree how NATO will adapt itself to address the new risks and challenges from an unstable world of failed states, regional conflicts, terrorism and cyber-attacks.⁵

2.1 Afghanistan

NATO took command of the International Security Assistance Force in August 2003. The 2014 deadline for the end of combat operations in Afghanistan was set by NATO at its Chicago summit in May 2012, building on a previous commitment made at the 2010 Lisbon summit. Until the crisis in Ukraine erupted, this summit was expected to focus heavily on Afghanistan, looking back at key experiences and lessons learnt, and towards the future and the next stage in NATO's presence there.

Allies have already agreed a post-2014 non-combat mission in Afghanistan that will focus on training, advising and assisting the Afghan security forces.

However NATO needs to agree a Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) with the Afghan Government to govern the presence of NATO troops in the country from 2015 onwards. Discussions between NATO and the Afghan Government formally began in December 2013 but the SOFA is dependent on the signing of a US-Afghan Bilateral Security Agreement. No agreement was secured with President Karzai. Both candidates in the recent Presidential

⁴ Hugh Bayley, "Why NATO matters: A parliamentary case for strengthening the transatlantic pillars of the Alliance", *NATO Parliamentary Assembly*, June 2014, p26

⁵ HC Deb 16 July 2014 c65-76WS

election committed to signing the BSA but electoral disputes over the results of the election have delayed any signature.

Without a Status of Forces Agreement, no Western forces will remain in Afghanistan. Anders Fogh Rasmussen warned of this in February 2014:

If the Bilateral Security Agreement is not signed, we cannot conclude the Status of Forces Agreement. And without the necessary legal framework, there simply cannot be a deployment after 2014. No security agreement. No troops and trainers. These are the hard facts.⁶

He repeated this at the June 2014 NATO Foreign Ministers meeting:

Our goal is to launch a new mission to train, advise and assist the Afghan security forces from the start of next year. Today, we endorsed the detailed operational plan for that new mission, called Resolute Support. But it is the Afghans who must take the next step. The necessary security agreements must be signed soon. Otherwise, we will not be able to keep any troops in Afghanistan from next year.

Let me be very clear. This is not what we want. That is not what both presidential candidates have said they want. But unless we have the agreements in place, it will be the only option available.⁷

Philip Hammond, then Defence Secretary, explained earlier this year that “we cannot operate without a status of forces agreement that will protect our own forces from exposure to Afghan judicial processes. We must be able to deal with forces’ discipline issues ourselves, and to assure any forces we put into theatre that they will not be subject to local jurisdiction; without that, we will not be able to operate.”⁸

This has implications for the timetable to withdraw troops currently deployed in Afghanistan.

The UK is planning on withdrawing the vast bulk of its forces by the end of 2014, though some will remain in either a training or logistical capacity. The UK is the lead nation for the Afghan National Army Officer Academy and anticipates having some personnel deployed in a training and advisory capacity.

However, Philip Hammond told the Defence Committee that without a Status of Forces Agreement every single British soldier must be out of Afghanistan on or before 31 December 2014. He said in order to do that “we would have to have the bulk of the current force out by the end of October to deal with the logistics tail, packing up the last kit and extracting our last presence in the Kabul and Kaga area.”⁹ He said a plan exists to enable that to happen and that plan will only be stood down when the Afghan Government has signed the Status of Forces agreement. When asked when a decision has to be made, Mr Hammond said “If we get to the middle of September and we still have not got clarity that the SOFA will definitely be signed, it will start to become very difficult.”¹⁰

The UK has steadily decreased its force level from around 9,000 at the beginning of 2013 to 4,100 in June 2014. There will be no British personnel in a combat role in Afghanistan by the

⁶ “ISAF Ministers discuss Afghan mission progress and post-2014 planning”, *NATO News*, 27 February 2014

⁷ [NATO Secretary-General press conference](#), 25 June 2014

⁸ HC Deb 10 February 2014 c591

⁹ Defence Committee, *Towards the next Defence and Security Review: Part two*, 9 July 2014, HC358, q318

¹⁰ *Ibid*, q 319

end of 2014. 453 British forces personnel have died while serving in Afghanistan, as of 27 June 2014.

Further analysis on Afghanistan is available in House of Commons Library Research Paper [Prospects for Afghanistan as ISAF withdrawal approaches](#), 19 March 2014. All Library material on Afghanistan can be found on the Library's [website](#).

2.2 Collective defence and the Russia-Ukraine crisis¹¹

Russia's actions in Ukraine have turned the spotlight back on NATO's *raison d'être*: collective defence. Anders Fogh Rasmussen describes Russia's aggression against Ukraine as a "wake-up call" while NATO's deputy Secretary-General, Ambassador Vershbow, says there is a need to "go back to basics" to reemphasise the original purpose of the Alliance.

From its inception in 1949 and through the Cold War, NATO looked eastwards to the Soviet Union. That focus shifted in the 1990s to military engagement in Europe and, in this century, to out of area operations in Afghanistan, Libya and at sea off the Horn of Africa. With a diminished appetite among members for further expeditionary operations, and a resurgent Russia, the focus has once again turned towards Moscow and NATO's core purpose.

NATO's perception of Russia changed dramatically after the collapse of the Soviet Union. Over the last 20 years NATO has, from its perspective, worked for closer cooperation and trust with Russia. NATO and Russia signed the 1997 NATO-Russia Founding Act and in 2002 established the [NATO-Russia Council](#) with representatives from all members of the Alliance. NATO suspended all practical cooperation between NATO and Russia including in the NATO-Russia Council in April 2014 in response to events in Crimea.

Hugh Bayley, President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, has called on Allies to "revisit their partnership with Russia [...] business as usual has become unacceptable." He's said Allies must "do their utmost to prevent any further aggression. They should reaffirm their support for the territorial integrity and political independence of partners and the right of all nations to choose their security alliances and priorities freely."¹²

Is the credibility of NATO at stake?

Has Russia's actions in the Ukraine damaged NATO's credibility? And if so, how should NATO respond? Edward Lucas, from the Economist, told the Defence Committee that he believed Russia's actions *has* damaged NATO's credibility and NATO needs to reassure its members, particularly those in the Baltic States and Eastern Europe, of its commitment to collective defence: "As a defence alliance, if we cannot defence our members, we might as well pack up and go home."¹³

On a similar vein, though not in the context of the Russia/Ukraine crisis, Graeme Herd and John Kriendler said in a recent book on NATO: "for NATO to survive and flourish it must advance the interests of its members. It will survive only as long as it accomplishes things allies wish at an acceptable cost."¹⁴

¹¹ General information about Russia and Ukraine can be found in House of Commons Library Standard Note [Russia and Ukraine – update June 2014](#), 26 June 2014, SN06923

¹² Hugh Bayley, "Why NATO matters: A parliamentary case for strengthening the transatlantic pillars of the Alliance", [NATO Parliamentary Assembly](#), June 2014, p34

¹³ Defence Committee, *Towards the next Defence and Security Review: Part two*, 24 June 2014, HC358, Q158-168

¹⁴ Graeme P. Herd and John Kriendler ed, *Understanding NATO in the 21st Century*, Routledge 2013, p1

The former Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Sir Richard Shirreff, told the Defence Committee "the bottom line remains that NATO must demonstrate strong capability as an alliance and ensure above all that the alliance is protected first and foremost, because that is the purpose of the alliance."¹⁵

A Readiness Action Plan and the Connected Forces Initiative

Ukraine is not a member of NATO. However Russia's actions in Crimea has provoked deep concern among NATO members, particularly the Baltic States and former Warsaw Pact countries. Poland, for example, requested a meeting of the North Atlantic Council under article 4 of the Washington Treaty, which was held in early March 2014.

In mid-April 2014 NATO announced a package of military measures to "reinforce our collective defence and demonstrate the strength of Allied solidarity."¹⁶ This included increasing the number of aircraft involved in the Baltic Air Policing Mission (the UK contributed Typhoon aircraft) and additional fighter aircraft in Poland and Romania.

Foreign Ministers agreed on 25 June to develop an Alliance Readiness Action plan. Anders Fogh Rasmussen had previously outlined the contours of such a plan:

We are looking to strengthen the ability of our NATO Response Force and Special Forces to respond quickly to any threat against any member of the Alliance, including where we have little warning.

We are also reviewing our threat assessments, intelligence-sharing arrangements, early-warning procedures, and crisis response planning to take into account a more unpredictable security environment.

We are examining our Connected Forces Initiative to make our exercises more frequent, more demanding, and more visible.

These are some of the strands of a Readiness Action Plan that we are considering at the moment. They are all defensive measures. They are in line with our international obligations. And in line with a changed security landscape, where - more than ever - we need to be ready, prepared and flexible.¹⁷

NATO Defence Ministers agreed in February 2013 that the [NATO Response Force](#) will be at the core of the *Connected Forces Initiative* "to maintain NATO's readiness and combat-effectiveness." They also agreed to hold a major live exercise in 2015 involving the NATO response force, and draw up a comprehensive programme of training and exercises for 2015-2020. NATO held its largest exercise since 2006 last autumn, Steadfast Jazz. Allied nations commit forces to the NATO Response Force on a rotational basis.

NATO is reportedly specifically looking at holding regular exercises in the Baltics and Central Europe. Philip Hammond, then Defence Secretary, told the Defence Committee in early July that NATO is preparing plans for a "more enduring pattern of exercises in the Baltic States and Poland, and in the Baltic itself." He added the UK took action in the short-term – deploying additional Typhoons to the Baltic Air Policing Mission – but added the UK "will be

¹⁵ Defence Committee, *Towards the next Defence and Security Review: Part two*, 9 July 2014, HC358, q276

¹⁶ [Doorstep statement by Anders Fogh Rasmussen](#), 16 April 2014

¹⁷ ["Standing up for Freedom and Security: Keynote speech by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen at GLOBSEC 2014"](#), NATO, 15 May 2014

looking across NATO to make that a more regular and continuing activity to provide ongoing reassurance.”¹⁸

This would enable NATO to establish a permanent presence but without deploying permanent forces - units would rotate for training and exercises.

The Defence Committee similarly heard evidence from others, including the former Deputy Supreme Allied Commander Europe, General Sir Richard Shirreff, recommending a stronger NATO presence in the Baltics, which could take the form of regular training and exercises.¹⁹ He added that beefing up NATO’s presence in areas of threat would send a “strong signal to Russia that NATO means what it says by collective defence.”²⁰

In addition, General Philip Breedlove, the Supreme Allied Commander Europe, has suggested pre-positioning equipment and supplies in Central Europe, possibly Poland, to enable NATO to have a basing area ready for forces if required.²¹

Article 5

Article 5 of the Washington Treaty states "the parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all." It does not commit Allies to military action but states that each member will assist the Party or Parties attacked by taking “such action as it deems necessary”:

The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defence recognised by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.²²

2.3 Transatlantic relationship and defence spending

The debates over the level of members spending on defence has ebbed and flowed over NATO’s 65 year history. It has returned to the fore in recent years in the aftermath of the financial crisis and the resulting budget cuts imposed by governments.

This crystallised in the *Smart Defence* initiative at the 2012 Chicago Summit. This focused on equipment and capabilities and encouraging Allies to “maximise the efficiency of their defence spending by focusing on greater prioritisation, specialisation and multinational cooperation in their acquisition of modern equipment.”²³

¹⁸ Defence Committee, *Towards the next Defence and Security Review: Part two*, 9 July 2014, HC358, q347

¹⁹ Defence Committee, *Towards the next Defence and Security Review: Part two*, 9 July 2014, HC358, Q269

²⁰ Defence Committee, *Towards the next Defence and Security Review: Part two*, 9 July 2014, HC358, Q270

²¹ “NATO will look east for new HQ”, *The Times*, 24 July 2014; “Is Germany’s framework nations concept a ‘substantial NATO compromise?’”, *Jan Techau, director of Carnegie Europe, Atlantic Council*, 17 June 2014

²² A full copy of the Treaty can be accessed online at: <http://www.nato.int/docu/basic/txt/treaty.htm>

²³ [NATO Defence Ministers plan for NATO forces 2020](#)”, *NATO newsroom*, 18 April 2012

This year, the focus has shifted slightly, to the amount governments apportion to defence. NATO has a guideline that 2% of GDP should be spend on defence but only four countries (the UK, US, Estonia and Greece) spent that much in 2013.²⁴ There is a clear imbalance between the United States and European Allies and the United States has repeatedly called on the latter to contribute more – most famously by former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates in his Brussels speech in 2011.²⁵ The UK Government has likewise criticised other Allies. Defence Minister Andrew Murrison has said “if we are to enjoy the insurance policy, we must pay the premium.”²⁶

Members of Parliament discussed defence spending in the House on 19 June 2014. John Baron, who called the debate and spoke in favour of increasing the UK’s defence budget, observed “it is a sad fact that many of our NATO allies are not pulling their full weight.”²⁷ A number of Members have pressed the Government to legislate to commit to spending 2% of GDP on defence. In response, Defence Minister Mark Francois articulated the Government’s position on defence spending “On current plans, defence spending will continue to meet the 2% target this year and next year. Decisions on public spending after financial year 2015-16 will be taken in the next comprehensive spending review.”²⁸

Rasmussen presented his arguments for an increase in defence budgets in a speech in May 2014, pointedly mentioning Russia:

Russian defence spending has grown by more than 10 percent in real terms each year over the past five years. And according to some forecasts that rate of growth could increase in the coming years.

By contrast, several European NATO countries have cut their defence spending by more than 20 percent over the same period. Some Allies have even cut by more than 40 percent. And the cuts have been particularly deep here in Central and Eastern Europe.

This is unsustainable. Now is the time to stop the cuts and start reversing the trend. We have a NATO target of 2% of GDP to be spent on defence. We need to gradually increase our defence budgets to reach that level. We must spend more on what we need. Less on personnel. And more on equipment, skills and training. So that our forces are more flexible, deployable and ready.

Some Allies, like Estonia, are already setting a good example. Poland is very close to the 2 percent benchmark and modernising its forces. While Latvia, Lithuania and Romania have announced that they too will gradually invest more in defence.

We must also bridge the gaps in our military capabilities. This means we need to stimulate further involvement in our multinational "Smart Defence" projects. And also closer regional cooperation. The Visegrad countries continue to demonstrate that this is a pragmatic way to build greater security together. And in a way that makes both NATO and the European Union stronger.

Multinational cooperation can help in multiplying individual efforts. But ultimately, credible defence and deterrence requires credible investment. And if there was ever

²⁴ NATO published statistics on defence spending on 24 February 2014: [Financial and Economic data relating to NATO defence](#)

²⁵ “[Secretary of Defense speech](#)”, *Department of Defense*, 10 June 2011

²⁶ HC Deb 14 July 2014 c565

²⁷ HC Deb 19 June 2014 c1337

²⁸ HC Deb 19 June 2014 c1365

any doubt in our capitals that defence matters, the Ukraine crisis has surely removed it.²⁹

The level of spending on personnel, versus equipment, varies hugely among Allies. According to figures released by NATO, the UK spent 35% of its budget in 2013 on personnel and 23% on equipment, similar in proportion to the United States. Other countries devote far more of their budget to personnel expenditure – twelve countries devote over 60% to personnel expenditure and nine countries allocated less than 10% of their budget to equipment.³⁰

Percentage of GDP spent on defence, Nato members, 2009 - 2013

	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2009 - 2013 average
Albania	1.5	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.5
Belgium	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1
Bulgaria	1.9	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.6
Croatia	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.6
Czech Republic	1.6	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2
Denmark	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4
Estonia	1.8	1.7	1.7	2.0	2.0	1.8
France	2.1	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0
Germany	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.4
Greece	3.2	2.7	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.6
Hungary	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.9	1.1
Italy	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.3
Latvia	1.2	1.0	1.0	0.9	0.9	1.0
Lithuania	1.1	0.9	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.9
Luxembourg	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
Netherlands	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.4
Norway	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.5
Poland	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8
Portugal	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.5	1.5
Romania	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.4	1.3
Slovakia	1.5	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.2
Slovenia	1.6	1.6	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.4
Spain	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.1	0.9	1.1
Turkey	2.1	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9
UK	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.5
Canada	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.0	1.1
USA	5.3	5.3	4.8	4.5	4.4	4.9

Source: NATO

²⁹ “Standing up for Freedom and Security - Keynote speech by NATO Secretary General Anders Fogh Rasmussen at GLOBSEC 2014”, NATO, 15 May 2014

³⁰ “Financial and Economic data relating to NATO defence”, NATO, 24 February 2014, table 5a

2.4 Enlargement and Partnerships

This will not be an enlargement summit. Currently there are four countries that aspire to join NATO: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Montenegro.

NATO has reportedly ruled out formally inviting Georgia³¹ to join its Membership Action Plan. Rasmussen said that instead, there will be a “substantive package for Georgia” but would not be drawn on the package elements. He said the package “will bring Georgia closer to NATO.”³² Reuters reported that this dodges a possible confrontation with Moscow, which is strongly opposed to its neighbour, with whom it fought a war in 2008, joining the Alliance, noting:

Putting Georgia on a path to NATO membership would have angered Russia, which is deeply hostile to the Western military alliance advancing into former Soviet republics, and some allies feared it could provoke Russian retaliation.

Welcoming Georgia into the alliance would mean NATO could be obliged to go to its defence in the event of another war with Russia.³³

NATO’s Partnerships is a common theme of Summits and Anders Fogh Rasmussen said at the beginning of the year that stronger partnerships will be an important theme at Newport. Foreign office Minister David Lidington, in previewing the summit, said the summit will seek to strengthen NATO’s relations with partners in the world. Partners tend to be grouped together by geographic location and a list is available on the [NATO website](#).

³¹ House of Commons Library Note [Georgia moves closer to the EU](#), 15 July 2014 SN06938 looks at recent developments in Georgia in more depth

³² [Public Opening Remarks by Anders Fogh Rasmussen](#), NATO, 25 June 2014

³³ [“NATO will not offer Georgia membership step, avoiding Russian clash”](#), Reuters, 25 June 2014

About NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) was formed in 1949 with the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty in Washington. The Treaty created an alliance of ten European and two North American nations, dedicated to ensuring their collective security and preservation and intended to counter the perceived threat from the Soviet Union and later the countries of the Warsaw Pact.

When the Cold War ended in 1989 and the threat of the Soviet Union diminished, some began to question NATO's continued relevance. However, conflict in the Balkans and instability throughout the former Soviet bloc countries in the early 1990s led NATO to develop a new role. In addition to its original purpose of collective security, NATO became a catalyst for extending security and stability throughout Europe via its peacekeeping and peace-support operations.

The main tenet of the Alliance is Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, which sets out the principle of collective security as laid down by the UN Charter. It states unequivocally that an armed attack against one or more members shall be considered an attack against them all. Article 5 was invoked for the first time the day after the 11 September 2001 attacks in America. NATO took control of international forces in Afghanistan in 2003. NATO conducted a seven month military operation in Libya in 2011.

Beyond Afghanistan, NATO is involved in four other operations:

- Kosovo – KFOR (Kosovo Force) first entered Kosovo in June 1999. Currently approximately 5,500 troops operate in the Balkans as part of KFOR. In June 2008, the Alliance decided to take on responsibility for supervising the dissolution of the Kosovo Protection Corps and to help create a professional and multiethnic Kosovo Security Force.
- Monitoring the Mediterranean Sea - Operation Active Endeavour launched in October 2001 and is led by NATO naval forces to detect and deter terrorist activity. Since 2003 NATO forces have boarded suspect vessels.
- Counter-piracy off the Horn of Africa - Operation Ocean Shield focuses on at-sea counter-piracy operations. Approved in August 2009.
- Support the African Union – provides airlift support for African Union peacekeepers in the AU Mission in Somalia (AMISOM). Established in June 2007 at African Union's request.

NATO has embarked on several periods of expansion, particularly in 2004 when seven countries joined. There are currently 28 member countries: Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, The Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States.

Library note [NATO: The Chicago Summit](#), SN06325, 14 May 2012 provides a short background to NATO and looked ahead to the issues to be discussed at the summit. It does not include the outcomes of the Summit, which are:

- [Chicago Summit Declaration issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Chicago on 20 May 2012](#)

- [Chicago Summit Declaration on Afghanistan Issued by the Heads of State and Government of Afghanistan and Nations contributing to the NATO-led International Security Assistance Force \(ISAF\)](#)
- [Summit Declaration on Defence Capabilities: Toward NATO Forces 2020](#)
- [Deterrence and Defence Posture Review](#)
- [NATO's policy guidelines on counter-terrorism](#)

Resources

- [Official UK NATO Summit website](#)
- [Official NATO website](#)
- [NATO Strategic Concept](#), adopted at 2010 Lisbon summit
- [Key NATO texts](#)