CHAPTER 3

THE OPENING UP OF THE ALLIANCE

The Process of NATO Enlargement

Partnership for Peace

Cooperation between NATO and Russia

NATO's Partnership with Ukraine

The Alliance's Mediterranean Dialogue

NATO's South East Europe Initiative

The Opening Up of the Alliance

The Process of NATO Enlargement

"The Parties may, by unanimous agreement, invite any other European state in a position to further the principles of this Treaty and to contribute to the security of the North Atlantic area to accede to this Treaty. (...)"

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

Since the signature of the North Atlantic Treaty, seven countries have joined the initial 12 signatories, raising the total number of NATO Allies to 19. The Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland joined the Alliance in March 1999, following an invitation issued at the 1997 Madrid Summit Meeting. The three latest member countries participated in their first Summit meeting as members in Washington in April 1999. At that time, NATO leaders underlined the continuing openness of the Alliance to further new members and pledged that NATO would continue to welcome new members in a position to further the principles of the Treaty and contribute to peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area.

The Alliance expects to extend further invitations in coming years to nations willing and able to assume the responsibilities and obligations of membership, when it considers that the inclusion of these nations would serve the overall political and strategic interests of the Alliance and would enhance overall European security and stability.

NATO leaders also launched a Membership Action Plan, specifically designed to provide advice and feedback to countries aspiring to joint the Alliance.

The 1995 Study on NATO's Enlargement

In January 1994 at the Brussels Summit, Allied leaders reaffirmed that the Alliance was open to membership of other European states in a position to further the principles of the Washington Treaty and to contribute to security in the North Atlantic area.

Following a decision by Allied Foreign Ministers in December 1994, the "why and how" of future admissions into the Alliance were examined by the Allies during 1995. The resulting "Study on NATO Enlargement" was shared with interested Partner countries in September 1995 and made public. The principles outlined in the Study remain the basis for NATO's open approach to inviting new members to join. With regard to the "why" of NATO enlargement, the Study concluded that, with the end of the Cold War and the disappearance

of the Warsaw Treaty Organisation, there was both a need for and a unique opportunity to build improved security in the whole of the Euro-Atlantic area, without recreating dividing lines.

NATO enlargement is a further step towards the Alliance's basic goal of enhancing security and extending stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area, complementing broader trends towards integration, notably the enlargement of the European Union (EU) and the strengthening of the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) (See Chapter 15). It threatens no one. NATO will remain a defensive Alliance whose fundamental purpose is to preserve peace in the Euro-Atlantic area and to provide security to its members.

The Study further concluded that the enlargement of the Alliance will contribute to enhanced stability and security for all countries in the Euro-Atlantic area in numerous ways. It will encourage and support democratic reforms, including the establishment of civilian and democratic control over military forces. It will foster the patterns and habits of cooperation, consultation and consensus-building which characterise relations among the current Allies and will promote good-neighbourly relations in the whole Euro-Atlantic area. It will increase transparency in defence planning and military budgets, thereby reinforcing confidence among states, and will reinforce the tendency toward integration and cooperation in Europe. Furthermore, it will strengthen the Alliance's ability to contribute to European and international security and support peacekeeping under the United Nations or OSCE; and it will strengthen and broaden the transatlantic partnership.

With regard to the "how" of enlargement, the Study confirmed that, as in the past, any future extension of the Alliance's membership would be through accession of new member states to the North Atlantic Treaty in accordance with its Article 10. Once admitted, new members would enjoy all the rights and assume all obligations of membership under the Treaty. They would need to accept and conform with the principles, policies and procedures adopted by all members of the Alliance at the time that they join. The Study made clear that willingness and ability to meet such commitments, not only on paper but in practice, would be a critical factor in any decision taken by the Alliance to invite a country to join.

States which are involved in ethnic disputes or external territorial disputes, including irredentist claims, or internal jurisdictional disputes, must settle those disputes by peaceful means in accordance with OSCE principles, before they can become members.

The Study also noted that the ability of interested countries to contribute militarily to collective defence and to peacekeeping and other new missions of the Alliance would be a factor in deciding whether to invite them to join the

Alliance. Ultimately, the Study concluded, Allies would decide by consensus whether to invite each new member to join, basing their decision on their judgment - at the time such a decision has to be made - of whether the membership of a specific country would contribute to security and stability in the North Atlantic area or not. No country outside the Alliance has a veto or 'droit de regard' over the process of enlargement or decisions relating to it.

At the Madrid Summit in July 1997, at the end of a careful and comprehensive process of deliberation and of intensified, individual dialogue with interested partner countries, Allied Heads of State and Government invited the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to begin accession talks with NATO. Following this decision, negotiations took place with each of the invited countries in Autumn 1997 and Accession Protocols for each of the three were signed in December 1997. These Accession Protocols were ratified by all 16 Allies according to their respective national procedures and by the new members. The three countries formally acceded to the Treaty in March 1999.

NATO enlargement is an open, continuing process, not a single event.

The Process of Accession

The main stages leading up to the accession of the three new member countries were as follows:

- **10 January 1994**. At the NATO Summit in Brussels, the 16 Allied leaders said they expected and would welcome NATO enlargement that would reach to democratic states to the East. They reaffirmed that the Alliance, as provided for in Article 10 of the Washington Treaty, was open to membership of other European states in a position to further the principles of the Washington Treaty and to contribute to security in the North Atlantic area.

- **September 1995**. The Alliance adopted the Study on NATO Enlargement which described factors to be taken into account in the enlargement process. It also stipulated that the process should take into account political- and security-related developments throughout Europe. The Study remains the basis for NATO's approach to inviting new members to join.

- **During 1996**, an intensified individual dialogue was undertaken with 12 interested Partner countries. These sessions improved their understanding of how the Alliance works and gave the Alliance a better understanding of where these countries stood in terms of their internal development as well as the resolution of any disputes with neighbouring

countries. The Study identified this as an important precondition for membership.

- **10 December 1996**. The NATO Allies began drawing up recommendations on which country or countries should be invited to start accession talks, in preparation for a decision to be made at the Madrid Summit of July 1997.

- **Early 1997**. Intensified individual dialogue meetings took place with 11 Partner countries, at their request. In parallel, NATO military authorities undertook an analysis of relevant military factors concerning countries interested in NATO membership.

- **8 July 1997**. Allied leaders, meeting in Madrid, invited the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland to start accession talks with the Alliance. They also reaffirmed that NATO would remain open to new members.

- **September and November 1997**. Accession talks were held with each of the three invited countries. At the end of the process, the three countries sent letters of intent confirming commitments undertaken during the talks.

- **16 December 1997**. NATO Foreign Ministers signed Protocols to the North Atlantic Treaty on the accession of the three countries.

- **During 1998**, Allied countries ratified the Protocols of Accession according to their national procedures.

- **12 March 1999**. After completion of their own national legislative procedures, the Foreign Ministers of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland deposited instruments of accession to the North Atlantic Treaty in a ceremony in Independence, Missouri, in the United States. This marked their formal entry into the Alliance.

- **16 March 1999**. The national flags of the three new member states were raised at a ceremony at NATO headquarters, Brussels.

During this period, a number of measures were successfully completed by each of the perspective member countries in order to ensure the effectiveness of their future participation in the Alliance. These included measures in the security sphere (e.g. arrangements for receiving, storing and using classified information), as well as in areas such as air defence, infrastructure, force planning and communication and information systems.

The Membership Action Plan (MAP)

The Membership Action Plan (MAP) is designed to assist those countries which wish to join the Alliance in their preparations by providing advice, assistance and practical support on all aspects of NATO membership. Its main features are:

- the submission by aspiring members of individual annual national programmes on their preparations for possible future membership, covering political, economic, defence, resource, security and legal aspects;

- a focused and candid feedback mechanism on aspirant countries' progress on their programmes that includes both political and technical advice, as well as annual 19+1 meetings at Council level to assess progress;

- a clearing-house to help coordinate assistance by NATO and by member states to aspirant countries in the defence/military field;

- a defence planning approach for aspirants which includes elaboration and review of agreed planning targets.

NATO Foreign Ministers will keep the enlargement process, including the implementation of the Membership Action Plan, under continual review. NATO leaders will review the process at their next Summit meeting which will be held no later than 2002.

The launching of the Membership Action Plan (MAP) in April 1999 has helped the countries aspiring to NATO membership to increasingly focus their preparations on meeting the goals and priorities set out in the Plan. Moreover, its implementation has ceased to be a matter concerning only ministries of foreign affairs and defence. With the establishment of inter-ministerial meetings at the national level, fulfilling the objectives of the Plan is increasingly engaging other government departments in a coordinated and systematic effort.

The nine countries that have declared an interest in joining NATO and are participating in the MAP are Albania, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1].

The MAP gives substance to NATO's commitment to keep its door open. However, participation in the MAP does not guarantee future membership, nor does the Plan consist simply of a checklist for aspiring countries to fulfil. Decisions to invite aspirants to start accession talks will be taken within NATO by consensus and on a case-by-case basis.

---

1   Turkey recognises the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name.

The MAP provides for concrete feedback and advice from NATO to aspiring countries on their own preparations directed at achieving future membership. It provides for a range of activities designed to strengthen each aspirant country's candidacy. The MAP does not replace the Partnership for Peace (PfP) programme. The aspirants' participation in PfP and its Planning and Review Process (PARP) has been tailored to their needs. Full participation in PfP/PARP is essential because it allows aspirant countries to develop interoperability with NATO forces and to prepare their force structures and capabilities for possible future membership.

Like PfP, the MAP is guided by the principle of self-differentiation: aspirant countries are free to choose the elements of the MAP best suited to their own national priorities and circumstances. All aspirants have submitted an Annual National Programme on preparations for possible membership, covering political and economic, defence/military, resource, security and legal issues. They set their own objectives, targets and work schedules. These programmes are expected to be updated each year by aspirant countries but can be amended at any time.

NATO is following the progress made by each aspirant and providing political and technical advice. Meetings of the North Atlantic Council with each of the aspirants are taking place to discuss progress. Throughout the year, meetings and workshops with NATO civilian and military experts in various fields allow for discussion of the entire spectrum of issues relevant to membership. An annual consolidated progress report on activities under the MAP will be presented to NATO foreign and defence ministers at their regular spring meetings each year.

Aspirant countries are expected to achieve certain goals in the political and economic fields. These include settling any international, ethnic or external territorial disputes by peaceful means; demonstrating a commitment to the rule of law and human rights; establishing democratic control of their armed forces; and promoting stability and well-being through economic liberty, social justice and environmental responsibility.

Defence and military issues focus on the ability of the country to contribute to collective defence and to the Alliance's new missions. Full participation in PfP is an essential component. Through their individual PfP programmes, aspirants can focus on essential membership related issues. Partnership Goals for aspirants include planning targets which are covering those areas which are most directly relevant for nations aspiring NATO membership.

Resource issues focus on the need for any aspirant country to commit sufficient resources to defence to allow them to meet the commitments that future membership would bring in terms of collective NATO undertakings.

Security issues centre on the need for aspirant countries to make sure that procedures are in place to ensure the security of sensitive information.

Legal aspects address the need for aspirants to ensure that legal arrangements and agreements which govern cooperation within NATO are compatible with domestic legislation.

PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE

Aim and scope

Partnership for Peace (PfP) is a major initiative introduced by NATO at the January 1994 Brussels Summit Meeting of the North Atlantic Council. The aim of the Partnership is to enhance stability and security throughout Europe. The Partnership for Peace Invitation was addressed to all states participating in the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC)[2] and other states participating in the Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE)[3] able and willing to contribute to the programme. The invitation has since been accepted by a total of 30 countries. The accession to the Alliance of the three former PfP countries Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland brings the current number of PfP participants to 27. The activities which each Partner undertakes are based on jointly elaborated Individual Partnership Programmes.

The PfP programme focuses on defence-related cooperation but goes beyond dialogue and cooperation to forge a real partnership between each Partner country and NATO. It has become an important and permanent feature of the European security architecture and is helping to expand and intensify political and military cooperation throughout Europe. The programme is helping to increase stability, to diminish threats to peace and to build strengthened security relationships based on the practical cooperation and commitment to democratic principles which underpin the Alliance. In accordance with the PfP Framework Document which was issued by Heads of State and Government at the same time as the PfP Invitation Document, NATO undertakes to consult with any active Partner if that Partner perceives a direct threat to its territorial integrity, political independence, or security.

---

2   The NACC was replaced by the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) in May 1997. The EAPC has 46 member Countries.

3   The Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) became an Organisation (OSCE) at the beginning of 1995. It has 55 member states, comprising all European states together with the United States and Canada.

All members of PfP are also members of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) which provides the overall framework for cooperation between NATO and its Partner countries. However, the Partnership for Peace retains its own separate identity within the framework provided by the EAPC and maintains its own basic elements and procedures. It is founded on the basis of a bilateral relationship between NATO and each one of the PfP countries.

Objectives

The Framework Document includes specific undertakings to be made by each participant to cooperate with NATO in fulfilling the objectives of the programme as a whole. They are as follows:

- to facilitate transparency in national defence planning and budgeting processes;

- to ensure democratic control of defence forces;

- to maintain the capability and readiness to contribute to operations under the authority of the United Nations and/or the responsibility of the OSCE;

- to develop cooperative military relations with NATO, for the purpose of joint planning, training and exercises, in order to strengthen the ability of PfP participants to undertake missions in the field of peacekeeping, search and rescue, humanitarian operations, and others as may subsequently be agreed;

- to develop, over the longer term, forces that are better able to operate with those of the members of the North Atlantic Alliance.

The Framework Document also states that active participation in the Partnership for Peace will play an important role in the evolutionary process of including new members in NATO.

Procedures and Structures

Any country wishing to join the Partnership for Peace is first invited to sign the Framework Document. In addition to describing the objectives of the Partnership, this describes the basic principles on which PfP is founded. By virtue of their signature, countries reiterate their political commitment to the preservation of democratic societies and to the maintenance of the principles of international law. They reaffirm their commitment to fulfil in good faith the obligations of the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights; to refrain from the threat or use of

force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state; to respect existing borders; and to settle disputes by peaceful means. They also reaffirm their commitment to the Helsinki Final Act and all subsequent CSCE/OSCE documents and to the fulfillment of the commitments and obligations they have undertaken in the field of disarmament and arms control.

After signing the Framework Document, the next step in the procedure is for each Partner to submit a Presentation Document to NATO. This document indicates the steps which will be taken to achieve the political goals of the Partnership, the military and other assets the Partner intends to make available for Partnership purposes, and the specific areas of cooperation which the Partner wishes to pursue jointly with NATO.

Based on the statements made in the Presentation Document, and on additional proposals made by NATO and each Partner country, an Individual Partnership Programme (IPP) is jointly developed and agreed. This covers a two-year period. The IPP contains statements of the political aims of the Partner in PfP, the military and other assets to be made available for PfP purposes, the broad objectives of cooperation between the Partner and the Alliance in various areas of cooperation, and specific activities to be implemented in each one of the cooperation areas in the IPP.

The selection of activities is made by each Partner separately, on the basis of its individual requirements and priorities, from a list of activities contained in a Partnership Work Programme (PWP). This principle of self-differentiation is an important aspect of PfP which recognises that the needs and situations of each Partner country vary and that it is for each one of them to identify the forms of activity and cooperation most suited to their needs. The Work Programme contains a broad description of the various possible areas of cooperation and a list of available activities for each area. The PWP, like each IPP, also covers a two year period and is reviewed every year. It is prepared with the full involvement of Partners.

Areas of Cooperation

Enhanced PfP cooperation covers a wide spectrum of possibilities, both in the military field and in the broader defence-related but not strictly military area. The areas of cooperation listed in the current Partnership Work Programme 2001-2002 are as follows:

1. air defence related matters;

2. airspace management/control;

3. consultation, command and control, including communications and information systems, navigation and identification systems, interoperability aspects, procedures and terminology;

4. civil emergency planning;

5. crisis management;

6. democratic control of forces and defence structures;

7. defence planning, budgeting and resource management;

8. planning, organisation and management of national defence procurement programmes and international cooperation in the armaments field;

9. defence policy and strategy;

10. planning, organisation and management of national defence research and technology;

11. military geography;

12. global humanitarian mine action;

13. language training;

14. consumer logistics;

15. medical services;

16. meteorological support for NATO/Partner forces;

17. military infrastructure;

18. NBC defence and protection;

19. conceptual, planning and operational aspects of peacekeeping;

20. small arms and light weapons;

21. operational, material and administrative aspects of standardisation;

22. military exercises and related training activities;

23. military education, training and doctrine.

Political-Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace (PMSC/PfP)

The Political-Military Steering Committee on Partnership for Peace is the basic working body with responsibility for PfP matters. It meets in various configurations, either with Allies only or with Allies and Partners.

The main responsibilities of the PMSC include advising the North Atlantic Council with respect to PfP questions; being responsible for the overall coordination of the Partnership Work Programme; developing political-military guidelines for use by the NATO Military Authorities for the preparation of their input to the Partnership Work Programme with respect to military exercises and activities; providing guidance for the preparation of the Individual Partnership Programmes, and for submitting them to the Council for approval; and developing and coordinating work in relation to the Partnership Planning and Review Process (PARP) (see below).

The military aspects of cooperation in PfP are developed by the NATO Military Authorities on the basis of guidance proposed by the PMSC and agreed by the Council. The PfP working forum on the military side is the Military Committee Working Group on Cooperation (MCWG(COOP)), which acts as a consultative body for the Military Committee. The MCWG(COOP) meets either with Allies only or with Allies and Partner countries. The Military Committee also meets with Partners to discuss military aspects of cooperation in PfP.

Partnership Coordination Cell (PCC)

The Partnership Coordination Cell is a unique PfP structure, based at Mons (Belgium) where the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) is also located. It was established under the authority of the North Atlantic Council and executes its tasks under the direct authority of both NATO Strategic Commanders.

The task of the PCC is to coordinate joint military activities within PfP and to carry out the military planning necessary to implement the military aspects of the Partnership Work Programme, notably with respect to exercises and related activities in such fields such as peacekeeping, humanitarian operations and search and rescue. The PCC also participates in the evaluation of such military activities. Detailed operational planning for military exercises is the responsibility of the military commands conducting the exercise.

The Cell is headed by a Director. Its staff, which has international status, consists of NATO personnel and, since the beginning of 1998, also includes

personnel from Partner countries. Staff officers from Partner Missions are also attached to the PCC for liaison purposes.

At NATO Headquarters, Partner countries have established full Diplomatic Missions formally accredited to NATO, as well as senior military representation to the Military Committee.

Examples of enhancements of PfP

Building on the decisions taken in 1997 to enhance PfP, one of the important steps implemented early on was the establishment of PfP Staff Elements (PSEs) in various NATO military headquarters at the strategic and regional levels. A second phase of this process, involving the creation of PSEs at the sub-regional level, is under consideration. Each PSE consists of a nucleus of Allied and Partner officers with international status working together on planning for exercises and conducting other cooperative functions. Some 56 Partner personnel and a similar number of NATO personnel are involved in the eight PSEs that have been established. This includes seven Partner officers serving at the Partnership Coordination Cell (PCC) at Mons, alongside their colleagues from NATO countries.

Partner countries are represented at meetings of the NATO Military Committee in EAPC/PfP format by senior officers serving within the missions of Partner countries established at NATO and designated as their country's military representative.

The Partnership for Peace Planning and Review Process (PARP)

The PfP Framework Document commits NATO to developing with the Partner countries a planning and review process, designed to provide a basis for identifying and evaluating forces and capabilities which might be made available for multinational training, exercises and operations in conjunction with Alliance forces. Initially PfP operations were limited to peacekeeping, search and rescue and humanitarian operations. However, as part of the enhancements of PfP introduced since 1997, PfP operations and corresponding planning and evaluation requirements have been expanded to encompass the full range of the Alliance's new missions, including peace support operations.

The Planning and Review Process is offered to Partners on an optional basis and draws on NATO's extensive experience in defence planning. It is in essence a biennial process involving both bilateral and multilateral elements. For each two-year planning cycle, Partners wishing to participate in the

process undertake to provide information on a wide range of subjects including their defence policies, developments with regard to the democratic control of the armed forces, national policy relating to PfP cooperation, and relevant financial and economic plans. The information is provided in response to a "Survey of Overall PfP Interoperability" issued by NATO in the Autumn every second year. Participating countries also provide an extensive overview of their armed forces and detailed information of the forces which they are prepared to make available for PfP cooperation.

On the basis of each Partner's response, a Planning and Review Assessment is developed. A set of Partnership Goals is also prepared, in order to set out the measures each Partner needs to introduce in order to make its armed forces better able to operate in conjunction with the armed forces of Alliance countries. After bilateral and multilateral consultations, the Planning and Review Assessment and the Interoperability Objectives are jointly approved by the Alliance and the Partner country concerned. A Consolidated Report, which summarises each of the agreed assessments and the forces being made available by each Partner, is agreed by the representatives of the Allies and of all Partners participating in the process. The report is brought to the attention of EAPC Ministers.

The first PARP cycle was launched in December 1994 with 15 Partners participating. A Consolidated Report on its achievements was presented to Alliance and Partner Ministers in spring 1995. Building on the success of this first cycle, a number of measures were adopted to broaden and deepen the process for the next cycle which was launched in October 1996. The second cycle, for which 18 Partners signed up, provided a further demonstration of the inherent strength of the process. There was a significant increase in the breadth and quality of information exchanged, resulting in a much clearer picture of the forces being made available by Partners. The number and substance of Interoperability Objectives were also substantially increased, further adding to the measures available for enhancing the Partner countries' capabilities and their ability to operate with Alliance forces.

The process of developing and preparing the individual assessments and the Consolidated Report in spring 1997 led the way for the development of recommendations for further enhancement of the process. This coincided with measures being taken to enhance the PfP programme as a whole and contributed to the work of the Senior Level Group on PfP Enhancement. The effect of the recommendations, which were approved by Ministers at their meetings in spring 1997, is to increase the parallels between the PARP process and the defence planning process which takes place within NATO itself. For example, political guidance is to be developed for each cycle, agreed by the Defence Ministers of the countries participating in PARP in conjunction with the

Consolidated Report. This political guidance will play a very similar role to the Ministerial Guidance which has long formed a key part of Alliance defence planning procedure. In addition, the Interoperability Objectives have been renamed Partnership Goals, reflecting the fact that their future scope will extend beyond the development of interoperability, into other defence planning fields.

PARP has contributed significantly to the close cooperation of Partner countries in the NATO-led peace operations in former Yugoslavia. In addition, PARP is helping to strengthen the political consultation element in PfP and to provide for greater Partner involvement in PfP decision-making and planning. PARP is also a crucial element in preparing prospective members of NATO for accession.

An enhanced and more operational Partnership

Partnership emerged as a central underlying theme at the 1999 Washington Summit. Plans were approved by Heads of State and Government for an enhanced and more operational Partnership which will provide additional tools to support the Alliance's role in Euro-Atlantic security. The Summit decisions brought to fruition a number of important enhancements to Partnership for Peace launched at the Madrid Summit in 1997. These aimed to make PfP more operational and to give Partners a greater role in PfP planning and decision-making. In addition, the updated Strategic Concept adopted in Washington established crisis management and Partnership as part of the fundamental security tasks of the Alliance. The strengthened Partnership will also contribute to the effectiveness of two other Summit initiatives, the Defence Capabilities Initiative and the Membership Action Plan. In addition, PfP can be expected to play a key role in fostering security and stability in the Balkan region in the wake of the Kosovo crisis.

Taken together, the Washington decisions further cement the Partnership's role as a permanent fixture of Euro-Atlantic security for the next century.

Cornerstones of the Partnership

The Political Military Framework (PMF) for NATO-led PfP operations provides for Partner involvement in political consultation and decision-making, in operational planning, and in command arrangements for NATO-led PfP operations. The document addresses four phases: (1) a non-crisis phase, (2) a consultation phase prior to initiation of military planning, (3) a planning and consultation phase between initiation of military planning and execution of the operation, and (4) an execution phase.

In terms of Partner involvement, a distinction is made between "potential contributing nations", "recognised potential contributing nations", and "contributing nations". Since summer 1999, the principles and guidelines of the PMF are being implemented, for example in the context of Partner country participation in the Kosovo Force (KFOR) established in June 1999.

The PMF will complement and support the Alliance's Combined Joint Task Force (CJTF) concept (see Chapter 12).

The expanded and adapted PfP Planning and Review Process (PARP) (see above) will closely resemble the Alliance's force planning process. PARP will introduce Partnership Goals to define forces and capabilities declared by Partners for PfP activities. Ministerial Guidance procedures will help shape these forces and capabilities.

PfP will continue to develop on the basis of enhanced defence-related and military cooperation, which allows for significantly expanding the involvement of Partner countries in the PfP work of NATO committees, increasing the presence of officers from Partner countries in NATO military structures, and increasing the scope and complexity of NATO/PfP exercises.

Reinforcing operational capabilities

The experience in Bosnia and Herzegovina had shown the importance of the contribution made by cooperation in PfP to effective multinational peace support operations. The increased operational dimension of PfP emphasised at the Washington Summit could therefore take into account the lessons learned and practical experience gained in the IFOR/SFOR operations in Bosnia and address the specific challenges to military effectiveness and interoperability that such multinational operations present.

A new Operational Capabilities Concept (OCC) has been developed within PfP to improve the ability of Alliance and Partner forces to operate together in future NATO-led PfP operations. It will also provide increased flexibility in putting together tailored force packages to mount and sustain future NATO-led PfP operations. The OCC will focus on the forces and capabilities potentially available for such operations. The enhanced peacetime working relationships developing progressively between Partner and Alliance headquarters and staffs, and between Allied and Partner formations, will facilitate the integration of these forces into NATO-led forces. Other central features will be a database and assessment and feedback mechanisms on the operational capabilities of forces declared by Partners.

The OCC represents a new and more integrated approach to military cooperation and links together the different elements of Partnership for Peace.

Closer and more focused forms of military cooperation generated by the OCC will improve cooperation in peacetime and result in Partner country forces which are more effective militarily and better prepared to operate with those of the Alliance. This will help Partner countries to prepare follow-on forces for the Stabilisation Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina (SFOR) and for the Kosovo Force (KFOR) and for other NATO-led operations which may be undertaken in the future.

The OCC also establishes a link between normal cooperation in the context of the Partnership for Peace and the NATO force generation process which is activated in a crisis. Over time, it will help to generate forces and capabilities adapted to the requirements for Alliance-led crisis management operations and to improve the effectiveness of cooperation in the field. The improvement of capabilities will have significant impact on the cost/benefit ratio of participation in Partnership for Peace and will give added value to the Partnership as a whole.

The Operational Capabilities Concept will also have benefits for other Alliance initiatives, for example improving the contribution made by the Partnership for Peace to the CJTF concept (see Chapter 12) and to the implementation of the Membership Action Plan. Together with Planning and Review Process (PARP) described earlier, it also establishes a mechanism which will enable decisions taken in the context of the Defence Capabilities Initiative (DCI) (see Chapter 2) to be reflected in the future development of PfP.

The Operational Capabilities Concept and the steps for its implementation were endorsed at the autumn 1999 Ministerial meetings. Its main elements are being implemented step by step, focusing on the establishment of a database on the pool of forces and capabilities declared by Partner countries as being available for PfP exercises and operations and on related assessment and feedback mechanisms.

Better coordination of efforts for training and education

The more operational Partnership also includes measures to improve training and education efforts, through a PfP Training and Education Enhancement Programme (TEEP), designed to meet the current and future demands of the Partnership. Even though training and education typically remains a national responsibility, the programme is helping to improve interoperability and promote greater cooperation and dialogue among the wider defence and security communities in NATO and Partner nations, thus ensuring the best use of human and other resources.

TEEP encompasses six main elements, namely:

• linkages and collaboration amongst NATO and PfP training and education institutions;

• feedback and assessment related to PfP activities;

• interoperability tools for Partners;

• exercise planning tools and methods offered to Partners;

• advice by NATO in the field of national training and education strategies;

• advanced distributed learning and simulation.

Most elements of the Programme have been put in place and are in their first year of implementation. Two areas are still being developed, namely:

Linkages and Collaboration. To date, NATO has recognised and accorded the status of PfP Training Centre to seven institutions, in Austria, Greece, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey and Ukraine. A periodic Conference of PfP Training Centres and other PfP training and education institutions provides a forum where all participants can explore ways to exchange information, experience and expertise, investigate where coordination is possible to avoid duplication, and examine how to make the best use of resources.

Advanced Distributed Learning and Simulation. The aim in this sphere is to use distant learning technologies (similar, for example, to internet courses) and to develop a NATO framework for distant learning and simulation management for use in the education and training of military personnel for NATO-led PfP operations and PfP related tasks. The objective is to build a combined resource of multipurpose training and education tools, with a clear focus on operational requirements. In the first phase of the project, work has begun on the development of a prototype as well as an interim overall policy for the future organisation and management of the resource.

The Partnership's potential for crisis management

The decisions taken at Washington mark a further stage in the development of the Partnership and of the EAPC in view of the latter's potential for crisis management. It has already proved its worth as a forum for political consultations on topics ranging from Bosnia and Herzegovina and Kosovo to humanitarian demining and continues to develop. Combined with the improvements in PfP, it is helping to provide NATO and its Partner countries with the tools needed to improve security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area as a whole.

Since its introduction, the Partnership has played a valuable role in supporting NATO's overall effort towards conflict prevention and crisis management. Practical PfP cooperation has been instrumental in preparing NATO and Partner forces for joint operations. The interoperability achieved through PfP contributed to the successful integration of Partner forces in IFOR/SFOR and subsequently in KFOR.

However, PfP's role is not restricted to its contributions to military operations. Quite apart from its focus on transparency, reform, collaboration and interoperability, the Partnership has made concrete contributions to NATO's conflict prevention and crisis management efforts in general. Well before the air campaign in Kosovo and the subsequent deployment of KFOR, PfP mechanisms were being used in Albania and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[4] to signal NATO's commitment to the region and to deal with spill-over effects of the crisis.

Programmes specifically tailored to the situation in these countries have been integral elements of the Alliance's overall approach to the crisis in Kosovo. NATO assisted the efforts of the government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[4] to improve its crisis management, civil emergency planning, logistic and other capabilities to deal with the effects of the Kosovo crisis. Assistance programmes for Albania, put in place first after the internal crisis of 1997, helped rebuild the Albanian armed forces and deal with other consequences of that crisis, notably problems caused by the destruction and looting of explosive ordnance storage sites. The NATO/PfP Cell in Tirana is a visible demonstration of the Alliance's interest and commitment in the region.

Both the EAPC and PfP will continue to evolve to meet the challenges of the changing security environment in the Euro-Atlantic area. Neither of them has reached its full potential in preventing, managing and defusing crises. Indeed, achieving that potential is one of the Partnership's major future challenges.

PfP experience in promoting stability through conflict prevention and crisis management has been put to use in the development of NATO's South East Europe Initiative (SEEI). PfP is making a substantial contribution to SEEI by applying its practical approach to the stimulation and development of regional cooperation in South East Europe. Regional actors take the lead in a great variety of activities which are modeled on PfP but further enhanced by a region-wide, rather than country-specific, focus. NATO complements these efforts by activities that it conducts itself. The customised application of PfP tools to South East Europe is helping to create a model for regional security coopera-

---

4   Turkey recognises the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name.

tion which has relevance and utility beyond this region. In this context, a South East Europe Common Assessment Paper on Regional Security Challenges and Opportunities (SEECAP) has been negotiated among countries of the region to set out their common perceptions of security risks, with a view to promoting an agenda for cooperative actions to deal with regional challenges. A South East Europe Security Cooperation Steering Group (SEEGROUP) has also been established to strengthen practical cooperation. This forms another component of the Partnership's increasing role in conflict prevention and crisis management in the Euro-Atlantic area that is destined to develop further in the future.

Cooperation in Peacekeeping

The Political-Military Steering Committee/Ad Hoc Group on Cooperation in Peacekeeping (PMSC/AHG), which operates in the framework of the EAPC, serves as the main forum for consultations on political and conceptual issues related to peacekeeping, and for the exchange of experience and the discussion of practical measures for cooperation. The PMSC/AHG reports periodically to meetings of Foreign and Defence Ministers on these matters. All meetings of the PMSC/AHG include Partners. A representative of the OSCE Chairman-in-Office regularly attends the meetings of the Group and, occasionally, a representative of the United Nations also participates.

In the course of its work, the Group has produced two detailed reports on cooperation in peacekeeping. The first report from 1993 - known as the "Athens Report" - dealt with conceptual approaches to peacekeeping. A second report, the "Follow-On to the Athens Report" of 1995, revisited these issues in the light of experiences gained since 1993.

In 1995, drawing on the extensive peacekeeping experience available, including the experience of the conflict in the former Yugoslavia, the members of the Ad Hoc Group completed a compendium of "Lessons Learned in Peacekeeping Operations". The paper reflects national experiences gained by Allied and Partner countries in areas such as the preparation, implementation and operational aspects of such operations. By exchanging national experiences, Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council members aim to develop further practical approaches to peacekeeping.

In 1999, the PMSC/AHG produced a "Compendium of Views and Experiences on the Humanitarian Aspects of Peacekeeping", reflecting the high level of common understanding developed among the participating nations and other international organisations and non-governmental organisations active in the field of humanitarian assistance.

The Group has continued to exchange views on "Principles, Methods and Experiences on Early Warning and Conflict Prevention" and is further expanding contacts and discussions with the UN, OSCE and other relevant organisations on this topic.

COOPERATION BETWEEN NATO AND RUSSIA

Overview of NATO-Russia Relations

Since the end of the Cold War, NATO has attached particular importance to the development of constructive and cooperative relations with Russia. Over the past ten years, NATO and Russia have succeeded in achieving substantial progress in developing a genuine partnership and overcoming the vestiges of earlier confrontation and competition in order to strengthen mutual trust and cooperation.

Since 1991, the Alliance and Russia have been working together on a variety of defence and security-related issues. In 1994, Russia joined the Partnership for Peace Programme, further enhancing the emerging broad NATO-Russia dialogue. Russia's participation in the implementation of the Peace Agreement for Bosnia and Herzegovina was a particularly significant step towards a new cooperative relationship. For the first time, Allied and Russian contingents worked side by side in a multinational military operation.

By signing the NATO-Russia Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security in May 1997, NATO and Russia institutionalised and substantially enhanced their partnership. They committed themselves to further developing their relations on the basis of common interests and created a new forum to achieve this goal: the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC). Since July 1997 the PJC has been the principal venue for consultation between NATO and Russia. Its central objective is to build increasing levels of trust by providing a mechanism for regular and frank consultations. Since the conclusion of the Founding Act, considerable and encouraging progress has been made in intensifying consultation and cooperation. The PJC has developed into an important venue in which to consult, to promote transparency and confidence-building and to foster cooperation.

Initial constructive work in the PJC was, however, increasingly overshadowed by the emerging crisis in Kosovo. This development culminated in Russia's suspension of cooperation within the PJC on 24 March 1999, as a result of NATO's air campaign to end the Kosovo conflict. After the end of the Kosovo campaign, Russia returned to the PJC, but for some months limited its agenda to topics related to Kosovo. Russia also agreed to contribute a signifi-

cant number of troops to the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR), as provided for in UN Security Council Resolution 1244.

Following the setbacks encountered in 1999, a visit to Moscow by NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson in February 2000 helped to restore a broader relationship, going beyond the Kosovo agenda. As a result of that visit, NATO and Russia once again are actively engaged in implementing the objectives of the Founding Act. Building on the positive momentum achieved during the Secretary General's visit, monthly PJC meetings and regular Ministerial meetings of the PJC have provided a further positive impetus to NATO-Russia cooperation across the board. This has included the opening of a NATO Information Office in Moscow by the NATO Secretary General in February 2001 and the beginning of consultations on the establishment of a NATO Military Liaison Mission in Moscow.

The Evolution of NATO-Russia Relations

Building upon early cooperation in the framework of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC) from 1991 onwards, Russia joined the Partnership for Peace (PfP) in 1994 and agreed to pursue "Broad, Enhanced Dialogue and Cooperation" with NATO beyond PfP.

Meetings between NATO member countries and Russia at Ministerial, Ambassadors' and experts' levels led to the exchange of information and consultations on wide-ranging issues of common interest, such as peacekeeping, ecological security and science. In the public information field, new initiatives included arrangements for improving access to information about NATO in Russia. As an initial step, a NATO information officer was posted to the NATO Contact Point Embassy in Moscow in the summer of 1995, later to be joined by a second officer.

Close cooperation between Russia and NATO on the implementation of the military aspects of the 1995 Peace Agreement on Bosnia and Herzegovina added a major new dimension to the evolving security partnership. The unprecedented participation of Russian troops, along with contingents from Allied and other Partner countries, in the NATO-led Implementation Force (IFOR) and subsequently in the Stabilisation Force (SFOR) which succeeded it, reflected shared goals and joint political responsibility for the implementation of the Peace Agreement. Today, Russia contributes about 1 200 troops to SFOR, which numbers approximately 20 000 in all. Russia's participation also provides a concrete demonstration of the fact that NATO and Russia can collaborate effectively in the construction of cooperative security in Europe. Joint efforts in SFOR and cooperation within the framework of the Partnership for

Peace have assisted both sides in overcoming misperceptions about each other.

Significant initiatives have also been taken in other fields. In March 1996, a Memorandum of Understanding on Civil Emergency Planning and Disaster Preparedness was signed between NATO and the Ministry of the Russian Federation for Civil Defence, Emergencies and the Elimination of Consequences of Natural Disasters (EMERCOM). This has subsequently borne fruit, in particular through the establishment of a Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre and a Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Unit in May 1998, proposals for which had been initiated by Russia.

The NATO-Russia Founding Act

At their meeting on 10 December 1996, Foreign Ministers of NATO requested the Secretary General to explore with Russia the scope for an agreement to deepen and widen NATO-Russia relations and to provide a framework for their future development. Four months of intensive negotiations between Secretary General Solana and Russian Foreign Minister Primakov led to agreement on a ground-breaking document. The "Founding Act on Mutual Relations, Cooperation and Security between NATO and the Russia Federation" was signed in Paris on 27 May 1997 by the Heads of States and Governments of the North Atlantic Alliance, the Secretary General of NATO and the President of the Russian Federation.

The Founding Act is the expression of an enduring commitment, under-taken at the highest political level, to work together to build a lasting and inclusive peace in the Euro-Atlantic area. It creates the framework for a new security partnership and for building a stable, peaceful and undivided Europe. It commits the Alliance and Russia to forging a closer relationship, not only in their own interest, but also in the wider interest of all other states in the Euro-Atlantic region.

The preamble of the document sets out the historical and political context of NATO-Russia relations, recalling the fundamental transformation both NATO and Russia have undergone since the days of the Cold War. The four sections of the document outline the principles and mechanisms governing the partner-ship between NATO and Russia.

Section I spells out the guiding principles on which the NATO-Russia partnership is based. Section II creates a new forum for implementing consultation and cooperation under the Founding Act: the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC). Section III outlines areas for consultation and cooperation. Section IV covers political-military issues, including the reiteration of the politi-

cal commitment by NATO member states that they have "no intention, no plan and no reason" to deploy nuclear weapons on the territory of new members of the Alliance.

In sum, the Founding Act represents a reciprocal commitment to help build together a stable, peaceful and undivided continent on the basis of partnership and mutual interest.

The NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council

The NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC) met for the first time on 18 July 1997 and quickly became the hub of efforts to build confidence, overcome misperceptions, and develop a pattern of regular consultations and cooperation.

The PJC meets on a monthly basis at the level of Ambassadors and military representatives and twice a year at the level of Ministers of Foreign Affairs and Defence, as well as at the level of Chiefs of Staff or Chiefs of Defence. It may also meet at the level of Heads of State and Government.

On 18 March 1998, the Russian Federation formally established its Mission to NATO and appointed a Senior Military Representative as an integral part of its Mission, to facilitate military and defence-related cooperation.

In the first three years of its existence, the PJC addressed a wide range of topics of direct interest to both sides. Among them were:

- the situation in the former Yugoslavia;

- meetings of Military Representatives under the auspices of the PJC;

- measures to promote cooperation, transparency and confidence between NATO and Russia;

- the contribution by NATO and Russia and the role of the PJC to the security architecture of the Euro-Atlantic region;

- political and defence efforts against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction;

- nuclear weapons issues;

- strategies and doctrines of NATO and Russia;

- peacekeeping;

- disarmament and arms control;

- search and rescue at sea;

- retraining of military officers;

- combating international terrorism;

- defence-related scientific cooperation;

- defence-related environmental issues;

- civil emergency planning and disaster relief.

Under the political umbrella of the PJC, a close network of working groups, experts' meetings, joint projects and staff level contacts emerged, to follow-up and implement consultations of the PJC itself.

The Kosovo Conflict

As the situation in Kosovo deteriorated in 1998, NATO and Russia made full use of the PJC mechanism to consult on the crisis. In June 1998, the PJC met at the level of Defence Ministers and condemned Belgrade's massive and disproportionate use of force as well as violent attacks by Kosovar extremists. Ministers reaffirmed their determination to contribute to international efforts to resolve the crisis.

In the autumn of 1998, NATO and Russia both expressed support for diplomatic efforts to secure a political solution and to avert a humanitarian catastrophe, and stressed the need for immediate, full and irreversible compliance with relevant UN Security Council Resolutions. As the situation worsened in early 1999, NATO informed Russia about its decision to issue an Activation Order for a limited air response and phased air operation to help put an end to the intolerable humanitarian situation in Kosovo and to support efforts aimed at a political solution. On 30 January 1999, the North Atlantic Council issued a warning to the Belgrade government that failure to meet the demands of the international community would lead NATO to take whatever measures were necessary to avert a humanitarian catastrophe.

Russia did not share the Allies' view on the possible use of military force to end the conflict and to enforce the international community's demands reflected in relevant UN Security Council Resolutions. Nevertheless, in February 1999, both NATO and Russia emphasised their full support for the peace talks taking place in Rambouillet. On 23 March, when the talks failed and all diplomatic avenues to end the conflict had been exhausted, NATO decided that there was no alternative to the use of force.

When NATO airstrikes over Kosovo began, Russia temporarily suspended consultation and cooperation in the framework of the PJC. Without formally withdrawing from the Founding Act, Russia also ceased to participate in meet-

ings in the framework of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council and expelled the two NATO information officers from Moscow. However, military cooperation in Bosnia and Herzegovina continued.

In the wake of the Military Technical Agreement signed by NATO and Yugoslav military commanders on 9 June 1999 and UN Security Council Resolution 1244 of 12 June, the basis for an international security presence in Kosovo (KFOR) was established. Russia's participation in KFOR was made possible by the signing of a separate agreement in Helsinki. The integrated force became operational as Serb forces withdrew from the province and the work of restoring peace and stability began. Today, Russia contributes about 3 250 troops to the 43 000-strong Kosovo force.

Resumption and Broadening of NATO-Russia Cooperation

Monthly meetings of the PJC resumed in July 1999, but Russia limited the agenda to topics relating to Kosovo. Committed, on its part, to the full range of cooperation foreseen in the NATO-Russia Founding Act, NATO urged Russia to resume cooperation across the board, as agreed in the 1999 PJC Work Programme.

This was to be a gradual process. When NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson visited Moscow on 16 February 2000, following a Russian invitation, a joint statement was issued in which NATO and Russia agreed to a gradual return to broad cooperation on the basis of the Founding Act. The PJC meetings that followed this visit again had a broader agenda. In particular, frank and open exchanges on respective military strategies and doctrines have demonstrated the role the PJC can play in dispelling misperceptions and enhancing transparency and confidence.

In Florence in May 2000, Foreign Ministers of NATO and Russia agreed to further intensify their dialogue in the PJC and to seek improved cooperation on a broad range of issues. They approved a PJC Work Programme for the remainder of 2000 and confirmed agreement on the establishment of a NATO Information Office in Moscow as foreseen in the Founding Act. In Florence, Russia also resumed its participation in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. At a meeting at the level of Defence Ministers in June 2000, Russian Defence Minister Sergeyev, echoing the view of NATO countries, stated that there was no alternative to NATO-Russia cooperation. The statement issued at the end of the meeting also recognised the important role of the partnership for stability and security in the Euro-Atlantic area. It recorded agreement to intensify dialogue and cooperation in the defence and military field on the basis of common interest, reciprocity and transparency, as laid down in the Founding Act.

The situation in Kosovo, and the shared determination of NATO and Russia to ensure the full implementation of UN Security Council Resolution 1244, remained high on the agenda of the Permanent Joint Council. It issued firm warnings against acts of provocation or other attempts to undermine the peace process in the region and took note of ever more converging views on the situation in the Balkans.

At the PJC Ministerial meeting in December 2000, NATO and Russia reaffirmed their commitment to build, within the framework of the PJC, a strong, stable and equal partnership in the interest of security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area. Ministers exchanged letters on the establishment of a NATO Information Office in Moscow. They also approved an ambitious Work Programme for 2001, which included promising new items, such as cooperation in the field of search and rescue at sea and defence reform. Defence Ministers also agreed to begin consultations on the opening of a NATO Military Liaison Mission in Moscow.

Against the background of enhanced dialogue and improved cooperation, NATO Secretary General Lord Robertson again visited Moscow on 19-21 February 2001. The Secretary General of NATO and the Russian leadership took positive stock of what had been achieved over the previous year and discussed how the potential of the Founding Act could be tapped more effectively. During this visit, the NATO Secretary General officially inaugurated the NATO Information Office in Moscow, which is expected to contribute significantly to public understanding of NATO and of the evolving relations between NATO and Russia.

Future prospects

Cooperation in SFOR and KFOR are striking examples of how NATO and Russia can indeed interact successfully to achieve common goals. They have indicated that they will continue to work together closely on the ground, both in Bosnia and Herzegovina and in Kosovo.

They also face numerous common security challenges in other areas. Working together to address these challenges is in the interest of both sides and contributes to the further strengthening of the basis of mutual trust which is essential for peace and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area[5].

---

5   In December 2000, PJC Foreign Ministers adopted an ambitious Work Programme for 2001, including cooperation in the field of search and rescue at sea, considered by both sides as one of the most promising area of future practical interaction between NATO and Russia.

NATO's Partnership with Ukraine

A visit to Ukraine by the North Atlantic Council in March 2000 injected new momentum into the Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine established in Madrid in July 1997.

The meeting in Kyiv of the NATO-Ukraine Commission - the first time this body, which directs the Partnership, had met in Ukraine - was an occasion for the 19 NATO allies and Ukraine to review the full range of their cooperation. It was hailed as a significant step for bringing Ukraine closer to the Euro-Atlantic community of nations.

The signing of the Charter on a Distinctive Partnership in Madrid in 1997 shifted cooperation between NATO and Ukraine on to a new plane and gave formal recognition to the importance of an independent, stable and democratic Ukraine to Europe as a whole.

The Charter is in line with Ukraine's declared strategy of increasing its integration in European and transatlantic structures. It is the basis on which NATO and Ukraine agree to consult in the context of Euro-Atlantic security and stability and in areas such as conflict prevention, crisis management, peace support and humanitarian operations.

Seminars, joint working group meetings and other cooperative programmes have focused on areas such as defence reform and the reshaping of the defence establishment, civil-military relations, budgeting and resource planning. Seminars on retraining retiring Ukrainian military personnel and on military downsizing and conversion have also been held.

Joint work in civil emergency planning and disaster preparedness is also a major area of cooperation with direct practical benefits for Ukraine. A Memorandum of Understanding on civil emergency planning was concluded in December 1997, providing for cooperation in this field. A disaster relief exercise was subsequently scheduled for September 2000, in the Transcarpathia region of Ukraine, to test humanitarian assistance procedures in the event of further flooding.[6]

---

6   Transcarpathia 2000 took place in the framework of the Partnership for Peace programme from 20-28 September 2000. It involved disaster response teams from Belarus, Croatia, Hungary, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland and Ukraine as well as the participation of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. Disaster response scenarios exercised included search and rescue, life support and medical care, water purification and cleaning of contamination in rivers, and railway accident situations involving toxic spills. In the early spring of 2001, this mechanism was put to the test when renewed flooding in Transcarpathia created the need for a coordinated response.

Other strong areas of cooperation are the scientific field, in which NATO has supported the Ukrainian scientific community through grants; economic aspects of security; and training. In this latter context NATO has launched a programme of foreign language teaching for up to 100 Ukrainian military officers.

The NATO Information and Documentation Centre opened by the NATO Secretary General in May 1997 has become a focal point for information activities to explain the benefits of the Distinctive Partnership with NATO to the Ukrainian public. The Centre is the first such centre to be opened in any NATO Partner country. It has since played an important role in explaining Alliance policies and overcoming misperceptions.

In December 1998 a Memorandum of Understanding was signed, enabling two NATO Liaison Officers to be stationed in Kyiv to facilitate Ukraine's full participation in the Partnership for Peace. The NATO Liaison Office was established in 1999, facilitating contacts between NATO and civil and military agencies involved in Ukrainian participation in the Partnership for Peace and in the implementation of the NUC Work Plan.

Other positive developments include the ratification on 1 March 2000 by the Ukrainian Parliament of the Partnership for Peace Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) and its additional protocol. This development should facilitate increased Ukrainian participation in the Partnership for Peace. The Parliament also gave its approval to Ukraine's adherence to the Open Skies Treaty, making an important contribution to transparency in arms control.

The Evolution of NATO's Relationship with Ukraine

NATO's relations with Ukraine began to develop soon after the country achieved independence in 1991. Ukraine immediately joined the North Atlantic Cooperation Council (NACC), and became an active participant. It joined the Partnership for Peace programme in 1994, and was among the founding members of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council which replaced the NACC in May 1997.

When President Kuchma visited NATO on 1 June 1995, he signalled his country's wish to upgrade NATO-Ukraine relations to a new level. Three months later, on 14 September 1995, Foreign Minister Udovenko visited NATO to accept formally the Ukrainian PfP Individual Partnership Programme and to hold discussions with the North Atlantic Council on issues related to European security. A Joint Press Statement was issued, outlining the general principles of NATO-Ukraine relations in the context of the Partnership for Peace and in other areas.

Further meetings were held at different levels in 1996 and 1997. A Ukrainian Mission to NATO, including a military representative, was also established as well as Ukrainian representation in the Partnership Coordination Cell (PCC) adjacent to the headquarters of SHAPE at Mons, Belgium. In accordance with the decision taken by the NATO-Ukraine Commission at its meeting in Luxembourg in May 1998, a NATO Liaison Officer was subsequently assigned to Kyiv, to facilitate Ukraine's full participation in the Partnership for Peace and to enhance cooperation between NATO and the Ukrainian military authorities in general. Ukraine remains an active participant in PfP and has hosted a number of PfP exercises on its own territory. The ratification of a Partnership for Peace Status of Forces Agreement (SOFA) by the Ukrainian parliament has made it possible for this potential, including the use of the Yavoriv Training Centre in Western Ukraine, to be further exploited.

Ukraine has made significant contributions to international peacekeeping activities. It contributed an infantry battalion of 550 men to the NATO-led Implementation Force in Bosnia (IFOR), following the conclusion of the Dayton Peace Agreement. Similarly, it participated in the Stabilisation Force (SFOR) which replaced IFOR, contributing a mechanised infantry battalion and helicopter squadron involving some 400 men. Although no longer contributing to SFOR, Ukraine is a contributor to the NATO-led Kosovo Force (KFOR) and has also participated in the International Police Task Force and in the UN force in Eastern Slavonia.

The Charter for a Distinctive Partnership

At the time of the July 1997 Summit Meeting of NATO Heads of State and Government in Madrid, NATO leaders and Ukrainian President Kuchma signed a "Charter for a Distinctive Partnership between NATO and Ukraine", which had been initialled a few weeks earlier, in Sintra, Portugal. In signing the Charter, the member countries of NATO reaffirmed their support for Ukrainian sovereignty and independence, as well as its territorial integrity, democratic development, economic prosperity and status as a non-nuclear weapons state, and for the principle of inviolability of frontiers. These are regarded by the Alliance as key factors of stability and security in Central and Eastern Europe and on the continent as a whole.

Ukraine's decision to support the indefinite extension of the Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and its contribution to the withdrawal and dismantling of nuclear weapons based on its territory were warmly welcomed by NATO. The assurances given to Ukraine, as a non-nuclear weapon state party to the NPT, by all five nuclear-weapon states which are parties to the Treaty were also regarded as significant factors.

In addition to the Memorandum of Understanding on Civil Emergency Planning and Disaster Preparedness, signed between NATO and Ukraine on 16 December 1997, which established civil emergency planning as a major area of cooperation, other cooperative programmes cover a broad range of topics. Consultation and cooperation take place, through joint seminars and meetings of joint working groups, in many different fields, including civil-military relations; democratic control of the armed forces, and Ukrainian defence reform; defence planning, budgeting, policy, strategy and national security concepts; defence conversion; NATO-Ukraine military cooperation and interoperability; military training and exercises; economic aspects of security; science and technology issues; environmental security issues including nuclear safety; aerospace research and development; and civil-military coordination of air traffic management and control. A NATO-Ukraine Joint Working Group (JWG) on Defence Reform has been established to pursue further efforts in this area.

The NATO-Ukraine Commission

The North Atlantic Council meets periodically with Ukrainian representatives, as a rule not less than twice a year, in the forum established by the Charter called the NATO-Ukraine Commission. The role of the Commission is to assess implementation of the Charter and to discuss ways to improve or further develop cooperation.

A NATO-Ukraine Summit Meeting was held in Washington in April 1999 and, in March 2000, the NATO-Ukraine Commission met for the first time in Kyiv. The Political Committee of NATO visited Ukraine three times between 1997 and 2000 and held a variety of consultations and information exchanges in Kyiv and other Ukrainian cities.

Future Prospects

The positive developments described above have helped to establish a firm basis for future cooperation and are indicative of the fields in which progress has already been made. Robust participation in PfP, which involves programmes of practical defence-related activities in which many NATO countries and Partner countries participate, enables Ukraine to measure its defence establishment against those of its European neighbours and to establish more effectively its role in European security. Ukraine's participation in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) also contributes to this process.

THE ALLIANCE'S MEDITERRANEAN DIALOGUE

The Mediterranean Dialogue is an integral part of the Alliance's cooperative approach to security and is based on the recognition that security in the whole of Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean region.

The Dialogue was launched in 1994. Six countries joined the Dialogue initially, namely Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia. Algeria became a participant in February 2000. The Dialogue is aimed at creating good relations and better mutual understanding throughout the Mediterranean, as well as promoting regional security and stability. It provides for political discussions with the participating countries. Its work is organised through an annual Work Programme focusing on practical cooperation in security and defence-related areas, information, civil emergency planning and science.

The Dialogue complements other related but distinct international initiatives under the auspices of the European Union (EU) and the Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

Activities take various forms, including invitations to participants from Dialogue countries to take part in courses at the NATO School in Oberammergau, Germany and the NATO Defense College in Rome. Such courses cover peacekeeping issues; arms control; environmental protection; civil-military cooperation for civil emergency planning; and European security cooperation. A number of international fellowships have also been made available to researchers from Dialogue countries.

In principle, activities within the Dialogue take place on a self-funding basis. However, Allies may decide - on a case-by-case basis - to consider requests for financial assistance in support of Mediterranean partners' participation in the Dialogue. The level of participation varies from country to country.

At the Washington Summit in April 1999, Alliance leaders decided to enhance both the political and practical dimensions of the Dialogue. Among other things this would create further opportunities for discussion and for strengthening cooperation in areas where NATO can bring added value. This applies particularly in the military field, and in other areas where Dialogue countries have expressed interest.

Evolution of the Mediterranean Dialogue

The Mediterranean Dialogue has its origins in the Brussels Summit Declaration of January 1994. NATO Heads of State and Government referred to positive developments in the Middle East Peace Process as *"opening the*

way to consider measures to promote dialogue, understanding and confidence-building between the countries in the region" and encouraged *"all efforts conducive to strengthening regional stability".* At their meeting in December 1994 NATO Foreign Ministers declared their readiness *"to establish contacts, on a case-by-case basis, between the Alliance and Mediterranean non-member countries with a view to contributing to the strengthening of regional stability".* To this end, they directed the Council in Permanent Session *"to continue to review the situation, to develop the details of the proposed dialogue and to initiate appropriate preliminary contacts".* This resulted, in February 1995, in invitations to Egypt, Israel, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia to participate in a Dialogue with NATO. An invitation was extended to Jordan in November 1995, and to Algeria in February 2000.

The aim of the Dialogue is to contribute to security and stability in the Mediterranean, to achieve a better mutual understanding, and to correct misperceptions about NATO among Mediterranean Dialogue countries. It is based on the recognition that security in Europe is closely linked with security and stability in the Mediterranean and that the Mediterranean dimension is one of the security components of the European security architecture.

The Dialogue is progressive, and in principle is based on bilateral relations between each participating country and NATO. However it allows for multilateral meetings on a case-by-case basis. It offers all Mediterranean partners the same basis for discussion and for joint activities and aims to reinforce other international efforts involving Mediterranean Dialogue countries, such as those undertaken by the Barcelona process[7], the Middle East peace process and the OSCE, without either duplicating such efforts or intending to create a division of labour.

The Mediterranean Dialogue consists of a political dialogue combined with participation in specific activities.

The political dialogue consists of regular bilateral political discussions. These provide an opportunity for extensive briefings on NATO's activities, including its outreach and partnership programmes, its internal adaptation and its general approach to building cooperative security structures. In turn,

---

7   In November 1995, 15 EU member states and 12 non-member Mediterranean countries (Algeria, Cyprus, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Malta, Morocco, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey and the Palestinian Authority) signed the Barcelona Declaration which spelt out the framework of the Euro-Mediterranean Partnership (also known as the Barcelona Process). The Declaration outlines three major goals: 1. a political and security partnership aimed at creating a common area of peace and stability; 2. an economic and financial partnership designed to establish a common area of prosperity; and 3. a social, cultural and human partnership to increase exchanges between the civil societies of the countries involved. The Barcelona Process envisages the establishment of a complete free trade area by the year 2010.

Mediterranean Dialogue countries are invited to share their views with NATO on stability and security in the Mediterranean region.

Mediterranean Dialogue countries have been invited to participate in specific activities such as science, information and civil emergency planning, and to take part in courses at NATO schools in fields such as peacekeeping; arms control and verification; the responsibilities of military forces with regard to environmental protection; civil emergency planning; and NATO European security cooperation. Participation in these courses is on a self-funding basis. In order to increase transparency, certain activities in the military field have been added.

NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue has evolved at a steady pace since it was launched in 1994. The 1997 Madrid Summit added a new and more dynamic direction to it by establishing a Mediterranean Cooperation Group. This created a forum involving Allied member states directly in the political discussions with Dialogue countries, in which views could be exchanged on a range of issues relevant to the security situation in the Mediterranean, as well as on the future development of the Dialogue.

NATO's South East Europe Initiative

NATO's South East Europe Initiative (SEEI) was launched at the Washington Summit in order to promote regional cooperation and long term security and stability in the region.

The initiative was based on 4 pillars: a Consultative Forum on Security Issues on South East Europe; an open-ended Ad Hoc Working Group (AHWG) on Regional Cooperation in South East Europe under the auspices of the EAPC in Political Committee Session; Partnership for Peace working tools; and targeted security cooperation programmes for countries in the region.

The Consultative Forum includes NATO countries; six Partner countries in the South East Europe neighbourhood (Albania, Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[8], Slovenia); and Bosnia and Herzegovina. It met initially at Summit level on the margins of the NATO Summit in Washington in April 1999 and has subsequently met at Ambassadorial level at NATO headquarters in Brussels.

---

8   Turkey recognises the Republic of Macedonia with its constitutional name.

The EAPC-AHWG identified ideas for further development to promote regional cooperation which have been incorporated into a set of activities modelled on activities carried out under NATO's Partnership for Peace programme.

The methodology of the Partnership for Peace initiative has been used to address a number of issues which are important to South East Europe, including transparency in defence planning, crisis management and defence management. Activities such as workshops on these topics have thus been designed to have a region-wide focus. Some of these are led by the participating countries in the region, facilitated by NATO, and others by NATO itself. Designed to complement each other, they are helping to promote stability through regional cooperation and integration. A South East Europe Security Coordination Group has been established to coordinate regional projects.

A complementary programme of targeted security cooperation with Croatia, building on PfP mechanisms, was introduced in spring 2000. Croatia joined the Partnership for Peace in May 2000. NATO also has a special security cooperation programme with Bosnia and Herzegovina outside PfP, which likewise complements other South East Europe Initiative activities.

NATO is also providing advice and expertise on the retraining of military officers made redundant by force structure reforms in Bulgaria and Romania. This is a NATO project being carried out in the framework of the Stability Pact for South Eastern Europe[9], in cooperation with the World Bank, with funding arranged between the World Bank and the countries involved. It is therefore a project which reflects the mutually reinforcing character of the international and institutional actions being taken in this field.

---

9   The Stability Pact was initiated by the European Union in May 1999. It was subsequently adopted at an international conference held in Cologne on 10 June 1999 and placed under the auspices of the OSCE. It is designed to contribute to lasting peace, prosperity and stability in South Eastern Europe through coherent and coordinated action, by bringing together the countries of the region, other interested countries and organisations with capabilities to contribute. It establishes specific mechanisms to coordinate their joint efforts.