

## **CHAPTER 12**

---

# **THE MILITARY COMMAND STRUCTURE**

---

**The Role of Integrated Military Forces**

**Evolution of the New Military Structure**

**Implications of the Development of the European Security and  
Defence Identity**

**The Combined Joint Task Force Concept (CJTF)**

**Internal Adaptation of Alliance Forces**

**New Command and Control Concepts**

**The Military Structure**

**NATO Enlargement and the Accession of New NATO Members**

**Partnership for Peace Activities and Initiatives**

**Wider Consultation and Cooperation**



# THE MILITARY COMMAND STRUCTURE

## THE ROLE OF INTEGRATED MILITARY FORCES

All nations opting to be members of the military part of NATO contribute forces which together constitute the integrated military structure of the Alliance. In accordance with the fundamental principles which govern the relationship between political and military institutions within democratic states, the integrated military structure remains under political control and guidance at the highest level at all times.

The role of the integrated military structure is to provide the organisational framework for defending the territory of member countries against threats to their security and stability, in accordance with Article 5<sup>1</sup> of the North Atlantic Treaty. Within this integrated military structure, the Alliance maintains the necessary military capabilities to accomplish the full range of NATO's missions. With respect to collective defence under Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, the combined military forces of the Alliance must be capable of deterring any potential aggression against it, of stopping an aggressor's advance as far forward as possible should an attack nevertheless occur, and of ensuring the political independence and territorial integrity of its member states. They must also be prepared to contribute to conflict prevention and to conduct non-Article 5 crisis response operations. The Alliance's forces have essential roles in fostering cooperation and understanding with NATO's Partners and other states, particularly in helping Partners to prepare for potential participation in NATO-led Partnership for Peace operations. Thus they contribute to the preservation of peace, to the safeguarding of common security interests of Alliance members, and to the maintenance of the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area. The first significant example of this new extended role was the unprecedented deployment of NATO military forces alongside those of other countries in Bosnia and Herzegovina, where NATO was given responsibility by the United Nations, at the end of 1995, for implementing the military aspects of the Dayton Peace Agreement.

At the end of 1996, the Implementation Force (IFOR), created to undertake this task was replaced by a NATO-led multinational Stabilisation Force (SFOR), also consisting of forces drawn from NATO countries working alongside those of other countries participating in the effort to create the conditions for peace in the former Yugoslavia. At the end of 1997, member governments announced that from mid 1998, subject to a new mandate from the UN Security

---

1 See footnote 2 on page 158.

Council, NATO would organise and lead a further multinational force to consolidate the achievements to date, retaining the name SFOR.

In 1999, following the end of the Alliance's air campaign to end the repression and ethnic cleansing directed against the Kosovar Albanians by the Serb leadership, a Kosovo Force (KFOR) was created in accordance with the decision of the UN Security Council, with NATO at its core, to implement the Military Technical Agreement concluded on 10 June by the KFOR Commander and Yugoslav representatives. The first elements entered Kosovo on 12 June. As agreed in the Military Technical Agreement, the deployment of the security force was synchronised with the departure of Serb security forces from the province. By 20 June, the Serb withdrawal was complete and KFOR was well established in Kosovo.

At its full strength KFOR comprised some 50 000 personnel. It is a multinational force under unified command and control with substantial NATO participation, and arrangements for participation by the Russian Federation. More than 12 other non-NATO nations participated in the initial troop contributions to KFOR.

These decisions and the political process leading up to them are described in other chapters, as well as other aspects of the new roles and responsibilities of the Alliance including the implementation of the Partnership for Peace programme and the development of the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance (ESDI). Together, they have made extensive demands on NATO's existing military command structure and have exercised a major influence on its further adaptation and on the continuing implementation of the new command structure, whose activation began on 1 September 1999.

The reorganisation of its forces has changed the Alliance's overall defence posture. Adjustments relating to the availability and readiness of NATO forces continue to reflect the strictly defensive nature of the Alliance. However, the former concept of forward defence no longer applies in continental Europe, although regional differences remain with regard to the challenges which the forces may be required to face and their respective needs for forward deployment. United States forces in Europe have been cut by about two-thirds, and the majority of Allied forces previously stationed in Germany have left. These manifestations of the transformation of the defence posture are described more fully in Chapter 2.

Other aspects have also played an important part in the transformation. For example, the flexibility and mobility of the current overall defence posture includes provisions to ensure that NATO has the means to address challenges and risks posed by weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, biological and

chemical weapons) and their means of delivery. Increased attention is devoted to ensuring that these challenges are reflected in Alliance defence capabilities.

Increased «multinationality» has also been an important factor in the development of the new defence posture. It has provided enhanced opportunities for multinational task sharing among Allies, allowing military capabilities available to NATO to be maintained or enhanced and ensuring that the most effective use can be made of resources allocated for defence purposes. The principle of “multinationality” is applied throughout Alliance structures and is of key importance for NATO’s solidarity and cohesion, for the conduct of Alliance missions, and as a disincentive for the renationalisation of defence policy.

The principle of collective effort in Alliance defence is embodied in practical arrangements that enable the Allies to enjoy the crucial political, military and resource advantages of collective defence, and prevent the renationalisation of defence policies, without depriving the Allies of their sovereignty. These arrangements also enable NATO’s forces to carry out non-Article 5 crisis response operations and constitute a prerequisite for a coherent Alliance response to all possible contingencies. They are based on procedures for consultation, an integrated military structure, and on cooperation agreements. Key features include collective force planning; common funding; common operational planning; multinational formations, headquarters and command arrangements; an integrated air defence system; a balance of roles and responsibilities among the Allies; the stationing and deployment of forces outside home territory when required; arrangements, including planning, for crisis management and reinforcement; common standards and procedures for equipment, training and logistics; joint and combined doctrines and exercises when appropriate; and infrastructure, armaments and logistics cooperation. The inclusion of NATO’s Partners in such arrangements or the development of similar arrangements for them, in appropriate areas, is also instrumental in enhancing cooperation and common efforts in Euro-Atlantic security matters.

## **EVOLUTION OF THE NEW MILITARY STRUCTURE**

The evolution towards NATO’s new military command structure has been influenced by many factors, of which the most significant are the development of the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance; the implementation of the Combined Joint Task Force concept; the reductions and restructuring of Allied military forces as a whole, rendered possible by the transformation of the security environment following the end of the Cold War; and the assumption by the Alliance of new tasks and responsibilities, in particular in the sphere of peace support operations and crisis management. The

influence of each of these factors on the military structure of the Alliance is described below.

## **IMPLICATIONS OF THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EUROPEAN SECURITY AND DEFENCE IDENTITY**

The rationale for the decision made by NATO governments to strengthen the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) within the Alliance is described in Chapter 4, together with the implications of that decision and the resulting interaction between NATO and the Western European Union (WEU) and the European Union (EU).

The emergence of a more clearly identifiable and strengthened European role within NATO has both political and military significance and has played a significant role in defining the parameters of the Alliance's transformation. The process is a continuing one which has been influenced at different stages over the past decade by decisions taken by the European Union, those taken by the Western European Union, and those taken by the Alliance itself. While these decisions have been interlinked and form part of the adaptation of European and Euro-Atlantic institutions to the changed security environment brought about by the end of the Cold War, other factors have also played a key role. Three factors should be mentioned in particular.

The first of these has been the intensification of cooperation in the security field between the European and North American democracies represented in NATO and the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union and of Central and Eastern Europe, as well as European countries which adopted a neutral or non-aligned political position during the Cold War period. With the end of the division of Europe, the former opposition between East and West ceased to be relevant and allowed a broader, inclusive concept of security to be developed, in the interests of the Euro-Atlantic area as a whole. The second essential factor in this context has been the growing importance of crisis management, peacekeeping and peace support operations, thrown into sharp relief above all by the conflicts in the former Yugoslavia.

The third fundamental series of developments after the end of the Cold War began with the wish expressed by a significant number of Central and Eastern European countries to become members of the Alliance, followed by the decision by NATO countries to open the Alliance to new members in accordance with Article 10 of the North Atlantic Treaty, and finally the historic decision taken in July 1997 to invite three countries to begin accession negotiations. The military impact of this development is described later in this Chapter.

These developments taken together have provided the context in which the discussion of the European Security and Defence Identity within the Alliance has taken place.

In the political sphere, the development of the ESDI is aimed at strengthening the European pillar of the Alliance while reinforcing the transatlantic link. It is designed to enable European allies to assume greater responsibility for their common security and defence and to enable a more coherent contribution to be made by the European Allies to the security of the Alliance as a whole.

In the military sphere, the development of the ESDI calls for assets of the Alliance together with the forces of non-NATO countries, in agreed circumstances, to be placed under the authority of the Western European Union for operations in which the Alliance itself may not be directly involved.

One of the central requirements of ESDI is accordingly for arrangements which enable the necessary elements of the NATO command structure to be used to assist in the conduct of operations led by the Western European Union<sup>2</sup>. These elements have therefore been described as “separable, but not separate”, since they could be placed under the authority of the Western European Union while remaining integral parts of the Alliance’s own military structure.

A further central aspect in the development of the European Security and Defence Identity is the concept known as “Combined Joint Task Forces” or “CJTFs”. This concept and its significance for the adaptation of NATO’s military structure are described below.

## **THE COMBINED JOINT TASK FORCE (CJTF) CONCEPT**

A CJTF is a multinational (combined) and multi-service (joint) task force, task-organised and formed for the full range of the Alliance’s military missions requiring multinational and multi-service command and control by a CJTF Headquarters. It may include elements from non-NATO Troop Contributing Nations.

---

<sup>2</sup> The role of the Western European Union (WEU) with respect to the development of the European Security and Defence Identity has been progressively assumed by the European Union (EU), in accordance with decisions taken by the Council of the European Union in Helsinki in December 1999 and in Feira, Portugal, in June 2000. In November 2000, in Marseilles, corresponding decisions were taken by the WEU Council of Ministers: the operational role of the WEU was formally transferred to the EU and arrangements were put in place for the WEU’s residual functions and structures. See also Chapter 4 and Chapter 15.

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

The need which the concept was created to fulfil arose from the changing security situation in Europe and the emergence of smaller but diverse and unpredictable risks to peace and stability. In particular, it was agreed that future security arrangements would call for easily deployable, multinational, multi-service military formations tailored to specific kinds of military tasks. These included humanitarian relief, peacekeeping and peace enforcement, as well as collective defence. The forces required would vary according to the circumstances and would need to be generated rapidly and at short notice.

At the core of the CJTF concept which was evolved to meet these needs are the command and control arrangements essential to allow such forces to operate effectively. The wide variety of circumstances under which CJTFs might operate places considerable demands on the command and control arrangements for such operations. The role of CJTF headquarters is therefore crucial. A CJTF headquarters will be formed around core elements (the "nuclei") from selected "parent" headquarters of the command structure. It will be augmented from other NATO headquarters and by nations and contributing Partner countries as necessary, using a modular approach, in order to meet the requirements of the specific mission.

A number of trials of the CJTF concept have been completed, for example, in the context of the Exercise Allied Effort in November 1997, in which a number of Partner countries participated as observers; and in the context of the Exercise Strong Resolve in March 1998, in which Partner countries participated and were integrated throughout the structure of the CJTF. The aim of the trials was to validate the evolving CJTF Headquarters concept.

Based on these trials and other relevant staff analyses, the Alliance began the full implementation of the CJTF concept in 1999. This process, which includes the acquisition of necessary headquarters support and command, control and communications equipment is scheduled for completion in late 2004. The implementation process is taking fully into account lessons learned from NATO-led operations in former Yugoslavia. Work also continues in the training and equipping of the headquarters contributing to CJTF. The final

phase of implementation of the Concept will provide the Alliance with an important tool for crisis management in the 21st century.

## INTERNAL ADAPTATION OF ALLIANCE FORCES

The internal adaptation of the Alliance's military forces is a further development of the reductions and restructuring undertaken in recent years to enable the Alliance to confront more effectively the circumstances of the changed security environment.

This process can be traced back to the London Declaration of July 1990, when Heads of State and Government of NATO nations called for a process of adaptation commensurate with the changes that were reshaping Europe. The London Summit was a decisive turning point in the history of the Alliance and led to the adoption, in November 1991, of a new Strategic Concept, reflecting a much broader approach to security than had been envisaged hitherto. This was reflected in the evolution in the European security situation in 1992 and 1993 and, in January 1994, NATO Heads of State and Government called for a further examination of how the Alliance's political and military structures and procedures might be developed and adapted to conduct the Alliance's missions, including peacekeeping, more efficiently and flexibly.

In September 1994, the Military Committee launched the NATO Long Term Study (LTS) to examine the Alliance's Integrated Military Structure and to put forward "*proposals for change to the Alliance's Force Structures, Command Structures and Common Infrastructure*". As work continued on the Study, Foreign Ministers provided further crucial guidance at their meeting in Berlin in June 1996, defining the scope of missions for NATO for which the new command structure would need to be equipped.

At their meeting in Berlin in June 1996, NATO Foreign Ministers affirmed that an essential part of the Alliance's adaptation is to build a European Security and Defence Identity within NATO, to enable all European allies to make a more coherent and effective contribution to the missions and activities of the Alliance as an expression of shared responsibilities; to act themselves as required; and to reinforce the transatlantic partnership. They also called for the further development of the Alliance's ability to carry out new roles and missions relating to conflict prevention and crisis management and efforts against the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, while maintaining the capability for collective defence. This was to be complemented by enhancing the Alliance's contribution to security and stability throughout the Euro-Atlantic area by broadening and deepening cooperation with NATO Partner countries.

This essential impetus for the Military Committee's work on internal adaptation resulted from decisions taken collectively by all 16 member countries. In December 1997, Spain announced its intention to join the new military structure. France, which participates in the Military Committee's work on internal adaptation, has indicated that it is not in a position to participate fully in NATO's integrated structures, but has expressed its continued positive attitude towards the continuing process of internal adaptation and selective participation in NATO-led operations.

The Alliance's efforts to improve its capability to fulfil all its roles and missions called for three fundamental objectives to be achieved. The Alliance's military effectiveness had to be ensured; the transatlantic link preserved; and the European Security and Defence Identity (ESDI) developed within the Alliance.

The overriding imperative in developing any new structure was that it must be "mission oriented". It needed to provide NATO with the capability to cope with the full range of Alliance roles and missions, ranging from its traditional task of undertaking collective defence, to fulfilling new roles in changing circumstances, including "non-Article 5" missions such as peace support operations. Furthermore, factors such as flexibility, force effectiveness, Alliance cohesion, the principle of multinationality, affordability and incorporation of ESDI and CJTF requirements all had to be taken into account.

The new structure also had to have growth potential and the flexibility to accommodate new member nations without the need for major restructuring. In this context, it was determined that the accession of the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland would not require any additional NATO command structure headquarters. Finally, the structure had to afford adequate opportunity for the participation of Partner countries.

## **NEW COMMAND AND CONTROL CONCEPTS**

In its internal adaptation work, NATO has developed new concepts of command interrelationships designed to ensure effective coordination between the different levels of command established under the new military structure. These new concepts reflect a more flexible approach to the conduct of Alliance missions and the fulfilment of mission requirements. They are based on a streamlined, multi-functional approach to the whole command structure. They include the following characteristics:

- A "supported/supporting" command relationship. This is one of the mainstays of the interrelationship concept which has shaped the development of the new structure. It is designed to give the North Atlantic

Council, the Military Committee, and military commanders at all levels greater flexibility in transferring the weight of emphasis to where it may be most required.

- Greater emphasis on the conduct of Alliance activities and operations at the regional level. This also takes into account the increased inter-dependency among regions. Work on the new command structure has accentuated the need for regionally-based headquarters able both to receive forces and to support inter- and intra-regional reinforcement.
- A flexible approach with respect to command and control (C2) measures, such as boundaries, coordination lines and phasing which will greatly facilitate the conduct of exercises and operations. For example, in Allied Command Europe, only those command and control measures necessary for the conduct of strategic and regional level daily peacetime operations need to be permanently employed or established. The requirement for permanently established boundaries below regional level in Allied Command Europe is thus eliminated and under the new structure there are no permanently activated Joint Sub-Regional Command (JSRC) Joint Operations Areas.
- Increased focus on the principle of “multinationality” with regard to the manning of the new military headquarters. This allows scope for representation of all member nations at the Strategic Command level. It also facilitates representation across the command structure of nations whose territory is adjacent to other Regional Commands, enhancing initial reinforcement capabilities; and resulting in wider participation at the JSRC-level, allowing nations whose territory is adjacent to a country in which a JSRC is located to be equitably represented.

This adaptation was carried forward under the Terms of Reference of the Long Term Study launched in 1994. The type, number and location of the headquarters which would constitute the command structure was agreed by Defence Ministers in 1997. With this decision as a basis, the North Atlantic Council approved activation requests for the headquarters in March 1999, paving the way for the full implementation of the new NATO Military Command Structure which began in September 1999.

## **THE MILITARY STRUCTURE**

The integrated military structure includes forces made available to NATO by the member nations participating in the structure, in accordance with prescribed conditions. These forces are currently organised in three main cate-

gories, namely **Immediate and Rapid Reaction Forces**, **Main Defence Forces**, and **Augmentation Forces**.

**Reaction Forces** are versatile, highly mobile ground, air and maritime forces maintained at high levels of readiness and available at short notice for an early military response to a crisis. **Immediate Reaction Forces** consist of land, maritime and air components such as the Alliance's Standing Naval Forces in the Atlantic and Mediterranean and the Allied Command Europe (ACE) Mobile Force (Land) (AMF(L)) Headquarters. **Rapid Reaction Forces** are composed of other land, air and maritime components such as the ACE Rapid Reaction Corps Headquarters and the Multinational Division (Central) Headquarters (MND(C)).

**Main Defence Forces** include active and mobilisable ground, air and maritime forces able to deter and defend against coercion or aggression. These forces comprise multinational and national formations at varying levels of readiness which include four multinational main defence corps: one Danish-German, one Dutch-German and two German-United States. Some of these forces could also be employed for sustaining "non-Article 5 operations".

In addition to these forces, an agreement is in place setting out arrangements under which the European Corps (Eurocorps), consisting of units from Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg and Spain, can be made available to NATO in times of crisis for employment under the framework of both Main Defence Forces and Reaction Forces. In April 2000, similar arrangements resulted in the transfer of the operational command of the Kosovo Force (KFOR) to the Eurocorps as part of the command rotation, under the overall command of NATO.

**Augmentation Forces** consist of other forces at varying degrees of readiness and availability which can be used to reinforce any NATO region or maritime area for deterrence, crisis management or defence.

These forces are further delineated between those which come under the **operational command** or **operational control** of a Strategic Commander when required, in accordance with specified procedures or at prescribed times; and those which member states have agreed to assign to the operational command of a Strategic Commander at a future date, if required.

Some of the above terms have precise military definitions. The terms "command" and "control", for example, relate to the nature of the authority exercised by military commanders over the forces assigned to them. When used internationally, these terms do not necessarily have the same implications as they do when used in a purely national context. In assigning forces to NATO, member nations assign operational command or operational control as distinct from full command over all aspects of the operations and administration of

those forces. These latter aspects continue to be a national responsibility and remain under national control.

In general, most NATO forces remain under full national command until they are assigned to the Alliance for a specific operation decided upon at the political level. Exceptions to this rule are the integrated staffs in the various NATO military headquarters; parts of the integrated air defence structure, including the Airborne Early Warning and Control Force (AWACS); some communications units; and the Standing Naval Forces as well as other elements of the Alliance's Reaction Forces.

## **The Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR)**

The primary task of SACEUR is to contribute to preserving the peace, security and territorial integrity of Alliance member states. Should aggression occur, or be considered imminent, SACEUR, as Supreme Commander, is responsible for executing all military measures within his capability and authority, to demonstrate Alliance solidarity and preparedness to maintain the integrity of Alliance territory, safeguard freedom of the seas and economic lifelines, and to preserve or restore the security of his Area of Responsibility (AOR).

SACEUR conducts military planning, including the identification and requesting of forces required for the full range of Alliance missions, which include the promotion of stability, contribution to crisis management and provision for effective defence. He makes recommendations to NATO's political and military authorities on any military matter which might affect his ability to carry out his responsibilities. SACEUR has direct access to national Chiefs of Staff and may communicate with appropriate national authorities, as necessary, to facilitate the accomplishment of his missions.

Like the Chairman of the Military Committee, the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe, also has an important public profile and is the senior military spokesman for the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE). Through his own activities and those of his public information staff he maintains regular contacts with the press and media and undertakes official visits within NATO countries and in the countries with which NATO is developing dialogue, cooperation and partnership. He is also responsible for developing military contacts with NATO's PfP Partners.

## **Allied Command Europe (ACE)**

SACEUR is the senior military commander for NATO's Strategic Command (SC) Europe. He is a United States (US) Flag or General officer. His

command is exercised from the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) at Casteau, Mons, Belgium.

The task of Allied Command Europe is to safeguard the area extending from the northern tip of Norway to Southern Europe, including the whole of the Mediterranean, and from the Atlantic coastline to the eastern border of Turkey, and includes an area around the Canary Islands and its associated airspace. This equates to nearly two million square kilometres of land, more than three million square kilometres of sea, and a population of about 320 million people. In the event of crisis, the Supreme Allied Commander Europe becomes responsible for implementing military measures to defend, preserve the security, or restore the integrity, of Allied Command Europe's Area of Responsibility within the framework of the authority given to him by the Alliance's political authorities.

Within Allied Command Europe, there are two Regional Commands responsible to the Supreme Allied Commander Europe:

Allied Forces North Europe (AFNORTH): Brunssum, the Netherlands.

Allied Forces South Europe (AFSOUTH): Naples, Italy.

## **Allied Forces North Europe (AFNORTH)**

### **Brunssum, the Netherlands**

The AFNORTH area includes Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Germany, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland and the United Kingdom. It also includes the North Sea, Irish Sea, English Channel, Skagerrak, the Kattegat, the Sound and Belts and the Baltic Sea. The Commander is a German or United Kingdom four-star Flag or General officer. His subordinate commands are composed of:

- Two Component Commands:
  - Allied Air Forces North in Ramstein, Germany;
  - Allied Naval Forces North in Northwood, United Kingdom.
- Three Joint Sub-Regional Commands:
  - Joint Command Centre in Heidelberg, Germany;
  - Joint Command Northeast in Karup, Denmark;
  - Joint Command North in Stavanger, Norway.

## **Allied Forces South Europe (AFSOUTH)**

### **Naples, Italy**

AFSOUTH covers an area of some four million square kilometres including Greece, Hungary, Italy, Spain and Turkey. It also includes the Black Sea, the Sea of Azov, the whole of the Mediterranean and the Atlantic Approaches to the Strait of Gibraltar east of longitude 7° 23' 48" W, and an area around the Canary Islands and its associated airspace. The region is physically separated from the AFNORTH region by non-NATO countries (Switzerland and Austria). The Commander of AFSOUTH is a United States four-star Flag or General Officer. His subordinate commands are composed of:

- Two Component Commands:
  - Allied Air Forces South in Naples, Italy;
  - Allied Naval Forces South in Naples, Italy.
- Four Joint Sub-Regional Commands:
  - Joint Command South in Verona, Italy;
  - Joint Command Southcentre in Larissa, Greece;
  - Joint Command Southeast in Izmir, Turkey;
  - Joint Command Southwest in Madrid, Spain.

## **Other Staffs and Commands Responsible to SACEUR**

The staffs or commands responsible to the Supreme Allied Commander Europe and dealing principally with Reaction Forces consist of :

- Reaction Forces Air Staff (RF(A)S): Kalkar, Germany;
- NATO Airborne Early Warning Force (NAEWF) : Geilenkirchen, Germany;
- ACE Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC): Rheindahlen, Germany;
- Multinational Division (Central)(MND(C)): Rheindahlen, Germany;
- Multinational Division (South) (MND(S)) (yet to be activated; location to be determined);
- Standing Naval Force Mediterranean (STANAVFORMED);
- ACE Mobile Forces, Land (AMF(L)): Heidelberg, Germany;
- Mine Counter Measures Force North (MCMFORNORTH);
- Mine Counter Measures Force Mediterranean (MCMFORMED).

### *The Reaction Forces (Air) Staff (RF(A)S)*

The RF(A)S was created to facilitate detailed planning for Reaction Forces Air. The staff of approximately 80 personnel is located at Kalkar, Germany and is headed by a three-star German Air Force general as Director.

### *NATO Airborne Early Warning Force (NAEWF)*

The NATO Airborne Early Warning Force was established following a NATO Defence Planning Committee decision in December 1978 to acquire a NATO-owned Airborne Early Warning air defence capability to provide air surveillance and command and control for all NATO commands. The NATO AEW Force (NAEWF) is the largest commonly funded acquisition programme undertaken by the Alliance.

The NAEWF is a fully operational, multinational force consisting of two components: the E-3A component, which comprises 18 NATO E-3A aircraft and operates from a Main Operating Base (MOB) at Geilenkirchen in Germany and the E-3D component which consists of seven UK-owned and operated E-3D aircraft based at RAF Waddington in the United Kingdom. The NAEWF provides an air surveillance and early warning capability which greatly enhances effective command and control of NATO forces by enabling data to be transmitted directly from Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) aircraft to command and control centres on land, sea or in the air. Each aircraft is equipped with sophisticated radar systems capable of detecting aircraft at great distances over large expanses of territory.

### *The ACE Rapid Reaction Corps (ARRC)*

The ARRC is the land component of the ACE Rapid Reaction Forces. Its role is to be prepared for employment throughout Allied Command Europe (ACE) in order to augment or reinforce local forces whenever necessary. Its peacetime planning structure includes 10 assigned divisions plus corps troops from 14 NATO nations, allowing a rapid response to a wide range of eventualities. Its broad spectrum of capabilities enables forces to be tailored appropriately to multi-faceted and unpredictable risks.

The operational organisation, composition and size of the ARRC would depend on the type of crisis, area of crisis, its political significance, and the capabilities and availability of regional and local forces. The transportability of components, the availability of lift assets, the distances to be covered and the infrastructure capabilities of the receiving member nation also play a signifi-

cant, determining role. The ARRC Headquarters could deploy up to four divisions and corps troops. The major units available to the ARRC consist of:

- national divisions from Germany, Greece, Turkey, and the United States, as well as the Spanish Rapid Reaction Division made available under special coordination agreements;
- framework divisions under the lead of one nation: one British with an Italian component; one British with a Danish component; and one Italian with a Portuguese component;
- the Multinational Division Central (MND(C)) including Belgian, Dutch, German and British units;
- the Multinational Division South (MND(S)) (yet to be activated; location to be determined);
- corps troop units - predominantly British but with significant contributions from other participating Allies.

The Headquarters of the ARRC is multinational. It is located in Rheindahlen, Germany. The Headquarters of the ARRC is under the command and control of the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) in peacetime, with the Headquarters of MND(C) under operational command of Commander, ARRC. The remaining divisions and units come under SACEUR's operational control only after being deployed. The commander of the ARRC is a British three-star general.

The Headquarters of the ARRC assumed, for the first time, command of the land component of the NATO-led Peace Implementation Forces (IFOR) in Bosnia and Herzegovina on 20 December 1995.

### *Immediate Reaction Forces (Maritime)*

There are three Maritime Immediate Reaction Forces operating in ACE. The Standing Naval Force Mediterranean (STANAVFORMED) consists of destroyer or frigate ships and provides the core of SACEUR's multinational maritime force in periods of tension or crisis. Two Standing Naval Forces for mine countermeasures, MCMFORNORTH and MCMFORMED, provide a continuous NATO Mine Countermeasures (MCM) capability, primarily for regional use in the AFNORTH and AFSOUTH Areas of Responsibility. They are under the operational command of SACEUR and can be deployed NATO-wide, when required.

These forces provide NATO with a continuous naval presence and are a constant and visible reminder of the solidarity and cohesiveness of the

Alliance. They are an immediately available deterrent force and make an important contribution to the Alliance's operational capabilities.

The Standing Naval Force Mediterranean (STANAVFORMED) was established in April 1992, replacing the former Naval On-Call Force for the Mediterranean (NAVOCFORMED) created in 1969. It is composed of destroyers and frigates contributed by those nations operating naval forces in Allied Command Europe (ACE). Ships of other NATO nations participate from time to time.

The MCMFORNORTH replaced the Standing Naval Force Channel (STANAVFORCHAN) in 1998 and is composed of units primarily from countries in the Northern Region. The naval forces of other nations also join the force from time to time.

### *The ACE Mobile Force (AMF)*

The AMF was created in 1960 as a small multinational force which could be sent at short notice to any threatened part of Allied Command Europe. The Headquarters of the AMF is at Heidelberg, Germany. Its role is to demonstrate the solidarity of the Alliance and its ability and determination to resist all forms of aggression against any member of the Alliance. The AMF was deployed for the first time in a crisis role in January 1991, when part of its air component was sent to south-east Turkey during the Gulf War, as a visible demonstration of NATO's collective solidarity in the face of a potential threat to Allied territory. The land component of the force, consisting of a brigade-sized formation of about 5 000 men, is composed of units assigned to it by 14 NATO nations.

The composition of the AMF has been adapted to meet the requirements of its new role as part of NATO's Immediate Reaction Forces (IRF). It consists of air and land elements (IRF(A) and IRF(L)) to which most NATO Allies contribute.

## **The Supreme Allied Commander Atlantic (SACLANT)**

The primary mission of SACLANT, under the overall political authority of the North Atlantic Council and/or the Defence Planning Committee, is to contribute to the military capability required to preserve the peace, security and territorial integrity of Alliance member states. Should aggression occur, or be considered imminent, SACLANT, as Supreme Commander, is responsible for executing all military measures within his capability and authority, to demonstrate Alliance solidarity and preparedness to maintain the integrity of Allied ter-

ritory; safeguard freedom of the seas and economic lifelines; and preserve or restore the security of his Area of Responsibility. As the NATO strategic commander located in North America, SACLANT also plays an important role in maintaining the transatlantic link between Europe and North America. Like SACEUR, he advises NATO's political and military authorities on military matters and has direct access to the Chiefs of Defence, Defence Ministers and Heads of Government of NATO member countries when circumstances require.

The Headquarters of the Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic (HQ SACLANT) is located in Norfolk, Virginia, USA.

## **Allied Command Atlantic (ACLANT)**

The ACLANT Area of Responsibility (AOR) extends from the North Pole to the Tropic of Cancer and from the East Coast of North America to the West Coast of Africa and Europe (including Portugal, but not the English Channel, the British Isles or the Canary Islands).

NATO is an Atlantic Alliance, dependent on vital sea lines for economic well-being in peacetime and survival in war. The primary task of ACLANT is therefore to contribute to security in the Atlantic area by safeguarding the Allies' sea lines of communication, supporting land and amphibious operations, and protecting the deployment of the Alliance's sea-based nuclear deterrent.

The Alliance's Strategic Concept, approved by Heads of State and Government at the Washington Summit in April 1999, reflects a broad approach to security which places increased emphasis on conflict prevention and crisis management. In keeping with this approach, NATO's maritime force structures have been adapted to meet the needs of today's security environment in order to provide the range of options needed to respond to peacetime, crisis or conflict situations.

NATO's new military command structure eliminates the need for permanently established boundaries between commands below the strategic level. There are five major subordinate commands, including three Regional Headquarters, which report directly to SACLANT. Each of the Regional Headquarters is responsible to SACLANT for planning and executing Alliance military activities and arrangements, in peace, crisis or conflict, including undertaking tasks which may be delegated to them within the ACLANT Area of Responsibility or beyond it if required.

The five major subordinate commands are as follows:

## **Regional Headquarters, Eastern Atlantic (RHQ EASTLANT)**

### **Northwood, United Kingdom**

The primary mission of RHQ EASTLANT is to contribute to preserving the peace, security and territorial integrity of Alliance member states throughout the ACLANT Area of Responsibility. The Commander-in-Chief Eastern Atlantic (CINCEASTLANT) is a British four-star admiral.

CINCEASTLANT is "dual-hatted", serving both as a regional commander within the Allied Command Europe (ACE) structure in his capacity as CINCEASTLANT, and as a component commander under CINCNORTH in his capacity as Commander, Allied Naval Forces North (COMNAVNORTH). Operating within the chain of command of both NATO Strategic Commanders enables the headquarters to be a focus for military movements and seamless maritime operations involving both Strategic Commands.

CINCEASTLANT is also responsible for the administration and operation of the Standing Naval Force Atlantic (STANAVFORLANT), on behalf of the Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic.

## **Standing Naval Force Atlantic (STANAVFORLANT)**

The Standing Naval Force Atlantic (STANAVFORLANT) is a permanent peacetime multinational naval squadron composed of destroyers, cruisers and frigates from the navies of various NATO nations. The Force operates, trains and exercises as a group, providing day-to-day verification of current NATO maritime procedures, tactics and effectiveness.

Created in 1967, the Force has since involved a total of over 500 ships and more than 150 000 serving men and women. It participates annually in a series of scheduled NATO and national exercises designed to maintain readiness and foster interoperability. It provides a visible, practical example of Allied solidarity and transatlantic cooperation. Recent exercises have also demonstrated the capacity of the Force to undertake peace support and humanitarian operations outside the traditional area of responsibility of the Alliance, in line with NATO's policy of extending security throughout the Euro-Atlantic area.

## **Regional Headquarters, Western Atlantic (RHQ WESTLANT)**

### **Norfolk, Virginia**

The primary mission of RHQ WESTLANT is to contribute to preserving the peace, security and territorial integrity of Alliance member states throughout the ACLANT Area of Responsibility. The Commander-in-Chief Western Atlantic (CINCWESTLANT) is an American four-star admiral.

WESTLANT's most significant role in crisis or war is to ensure the safe transit of critical reinforcement and resupply from North America to Europe, in support of the full spectrum of NATO forces operating anywhere in or beyond NATO's area of responsibility.

In peacetime, CINCWESTLANT sponsors joint multinational exercises and Partnership for Peace (PfP) activities, as well as maintaining operational control and providing support for the NATO forces assigned to the headquarters.

## **Regional Headquarters, Southern Atlantic (RHQ SOUTHLANT)**

### **Lisbon, Portugal**

The primary mission of RHQ SOUTHLANT is to contribute to preserving the peace, security and territorial integrity of Alliance member states throughout the ACLANT Area of Responsibility. The Commander-in-Chief Southern Atlantic (CINC SOUTHLANT) is a Portuguese three-star admiral.

As the ACLANT commander bordering the southern portion of Allied Command Europe, CINC SOUTHLANT is the focus for military movements and seamless maritime operations across much of the southeast boundary between the European and Atlantic Regional Commands.

## **Striking Fleet Atlantic (STRIKFLTANT)**

### **Norfolk, Virginia**

The Commander, Striking Fleet Atlantic (COMSTRIKFLTANT) is the Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic's major subordinate commander at sea. As such, his primary mission is to deter aggression by establishing and maintaining maritime superiority in the Atlantic and ensuring the integrity of NATO's sea lines of communication. COMSTRIKFLTANT is an American three-star admiral.

The composition of the Force can be tailored to manage crisis situations as they evolve, providing support to aviation forces as well as amphibious and

marine forces, and directly supporting Allied Command Europe land and air operations. Forces from Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Federal Republic of Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom and United States contribute to the Force. STRIKFLTANT has a potential wartime complement of three to four carrier battle groups, one or two anti-submarine task forces, an amphibious task force and approximately 22 000 Dutch, British and American marines.

NATO exercises are conducted periodically to ensure the interoperability of the forces assigned to the fleet under realistic environmental conditions and to strengthen command and control procedures.

## **Submarine Allied Command Atlantic (SUBACLANT)**

### **Norfolk, Virginia**

The Commander Submarine Allied Command Atlantic (COMSUBACLANT) is the principal adviser to the Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic on submarine matters and undersea warfare. COMSUBACLANT is an American three-star admiral.

SUBACLANT provides a coordination capability for Allied Command Atlantic as well as direct liaison with Allied Command Europe for the management of Alliance submarine policy and doctrine. It is essentially a coordinating authority and is the principal source of submarine operational and tactical doctrine to both strategic commands.

## **Saclant undersea research centre (SACLANTCEN)**

### **La Spezia, Italy**

The role and structure of the SACLANT Undersea Research Centre, which forms an integral part of the major subordinate command structure of ACLANT, is described in Chapter 14 (Research and Technology).

## **Canada - United States Regional Planning Group (CUSRPG)**

The Canada-United States Regional Planning Group (CUSRPG) is composed of military representatives of Canada and the United States. Its function is to coordinate the defence efforts of NATO in the Canada-United States (CANUS) region. There is no overall NATO commander for the region. Command arrangements therefore depend on the existing structures of the

Canadian and United States armed forces and the North American Aerospace Defence Command (NORAD), unless the respective military and national authorities determine that the formation of other combined headquarters is required to exercise such command.

The mission of the CUSRPG is to undertake the military planning required to preserve the peace, security and territorial integrity of the CANUS region. This includes arrangements for the basing and protection of strategic nuclear forces in this area; early warning and air defence; protection of industrial mobilisation and military potential; and defence against military actions which pose a threat to the security of the region.

The CUSRPG is composed of a Chiefs of Staff Committee (COSC), a Regional Planning Committee (RPC), a Regional Planning Committee Working Team (RPC WT), and a Secretariat located in Washington. Observers from the NATO International Military Staff (IMS) and the NATO Strategic Commanders (SCs) may be invited to attend RPC meetings.

The Chief of the Defence Staff of Canada and the United States Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff are responsible to the NATO Military Committee (MC) for the coordination of NATO matters in the CANUS region. This includes the preparation and approval of plans for the defence of the CANUS region which are forwarded to the Chairman of the NATO Military Committee; maintaining liaison with the Chairman of the Military Committee, the NATO Strategic Commanders and other NATO agencies as required; and overseeing NATO and Partnership for Peace (PfP) training and exercise activities in the CANUS region.

## **NATO ENLARGEMENT AND THE ACCESSION OF NEW NATO MEMBERS**

The underlying objective of opening up the Alliance to new members is to enhance stability in Europe as a whole, not to expand NATO's military influence or capabilities or to alter the nature of its basic defence posture. NATO's collective security guarantees and its dependence on multinational force structures offer the best means of achieving the above objective, on the basis of shared risks, shared responsibilities and shared costs. The opening up of the Alliance and the accession of three new members in 1999, combined with the influence of partnership and cooperation in the framework of the Partnership for Peace programme, allows the military focus to be directed towards current and future needs. This implies more mobile and flexible capabilities, designed to facilitate rapid response, reinforcement and other requirements in the crisis management field. New member countries participate in the full range of NATO

missions and tasks. They are actively involved, along with the other countries participating in the integrated military command structure, in the planning, development and manning of NATO's force structures.

At the Madrid Summit in July 1997, the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland were invited to begin accession negotiations with the Alliance. These were completed and Protocols of Accession were signed by the end of 1997. The three new member countries acceded to the Alliance in March 1999. In the intervening period, in parallel with the political process, intensive work was undertaken both in the countries themselves and within NATO to enable Czech, Hungarian and Polish forces to adapt their future role so that the process of joining the military structures of the Alliance could be managed efficiently. Pre-accession briefings and discussions took place to prepare each country for the obligations which they would assume on becoming members of the Alliance and to familiarise them with the procedures and practices which apply. These preparations helped to define each new member country's participation in NATO structures, to establish the methods by which their integration would be achieved, and to facilitate their involvement in Alliance activities during the accession period.

## **PARTNERSHIP FOR PEACE ACTIVITIES AND INITIATIVES**

Within the general framework of the Partnership for Peace initiative, and particularly in the context of the Partnership Planning and Review Process (PARP), a wide range of military activities and initiatives have been introduced to further strengthen links between NATO and its Partner countries. These are not limited to participation in military exercises but also include, for example, opportunities to attend courses at the NATO Defense College in Rome and at the NATO (SHAPE) School in Oberammergau. PfP nations have also been invited to put forward candidates for posts under the arrangements mentioned earlier for Partnership for Peace Staff Elements located at different NATO military headquarters, participating fully in the planning and conduct of PfP activities.

Officers from Partnership countries have also assumed international functions within NATO's International Military Staff at the Partnership Coordination Cell (PCC) (see Chapter 3). The scope for involvement of personnel from Partner countries in CJTF exercise planning, concept and doctrine development and operations, as well as in CJTF headquarters, is also being examined.

Progress in implementing many of these measures has been rapid. Some 20 Partnership countries participated in the NATO-Crisis Management Exercise held from 12-18 February 1998. This command post exercise

(i.e. not involving actual troop deployments) was designed to test and practice actions to be taken by NATO, in association with its Partners, in implementing a UN-mandated peace support operation in a hypothetical crisis situation. Another part of the exercise focused on NATO and Partner country involvement in responding to material disasters.

Throughout these activities as well as through cooperation in relation to other topics and activities identified as PfP Areas of Cooperation, emphasis is being placed on increasing transparency in relation to military activities and enhancing consultation and cooperation.

In conducting NATO/PfP exercises, for example in the context of search and rescue missions and humanitarian or peace support operations, emphasis is placed on contributing to the capabilities and readiness of participating countries to undertake such operations. Simultaneously, mutual understanding of different military systems and procedures is being enhanced and strengthened.

There is also a strong focus on multinationality within the military headquarters as well as in the forces taking part in exercises. This has facilitated the transition to more complex forms of NATO/PfP exercises involving higher levels of military units. The process has proven to be mutually beneficial to NATO and Partner countries, allowing valuable lessons to be learned from the experience of working together in combined exercises.

## **WIDER CONSULTATION AND COOPERATION**

Following the Madrid Summit in July 1997, as part of the process of enhancing consultation and cooperation and introducing measures to increase transparency, a number of new institutions were created in both the political and military spheres.

In addition to the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC), NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC), and NATO-Ukraine Commission (NUC), which operate in the civilian, political dimension and are described in earlier chapters, meetings take place in various formats to manage the military side of these multilateral and bilateral cooperative institutions. A Euro-Atlantic Partnership Military Committee (EAPMC) now meets to discuss and exchange views among all EAPC countries on military issues. In the same way, to facilitate closer links in support of the special relationship between NATO and Russia, meetings of Military Representatives and Chiefs of Staff have been established under the auspices of the PJC (PJC-MR/CS). Similar meetings are held with Ukraine at the Military Representatives' level (MC/PS with Ukraine) and at the Chiefs of Staff level (MC/CS with Ukraine).

Meetings of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Military Committee (EAPMC) are held either in Plenary Session, with all Partner countries, or in Limited Session, in order to focus on functional or regional matters such as joint participation in Peace Support Operations. Alternatively, they may be held in Individual Session with a single Partner country. These meetings take place either at the level of Chiefs of Defence (CHODs), normally held twice a year to coincide with the other CHODs meetings taking place in Brussels, or every month at the level of Permanent Military Representative. These arrangements limit the frequency and costs of the journeys to Brussels which each Chief of Defence needs to make. All meetings are chaired by the Chairman of the NATO Military Committee.

The NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council (PJC) in Chiefs of Staff/Chiefs of Defence Session (PJC-CS) normally meets at least twice a year, to coincide with the meeting of the Military Committees in Chiefs of Staff Session in the spring and autumn of each year.

Each meeting is attended by NATO Chiefs of Defence, the NATO Strategic Commanders and military representatives of Russia. Meetings of the PJC-MR in Permanent Session, attended by military representatives based in Brussels, may take place more frequently.

Both meetings in Chiefs of Defence Session and meetings in Permanent Session are chaired jointly by three representatives, namely the Chairman of the Military Committee, a NATO Chief of Defence or a NATO Military Representative based at NATO headquarters in Brussels, and the Russian Military Representative. The NATO representation at the above meetings rotates among NATO countries for periods of three months.

During meetings at both the Chiefs of Defence and Permanent Representative levels, the three joint chairmen also share the lead for each agenda item. The agenda for each meeting is prepared on the basis of agreement established bilaterally between the NATO International Military Staff and the Russian representation, and is subsequently approved by each of the three chairmen.

The Military Committee with Ukraine meets in Chiefs of Defence session at least twice a year, and is also scheduled to coincide with other meetings taking place at the same level. The meeting includes NATO Chiefs of Defence, the NATO Strategic Commanders and the Ukrainian Representative, and is chaired by the Chairman of the Military Committee. Meetings of the Military Committee with Ukraine at Military Representative level are also convened twice a year.