



Asociace  
pro mezinárodní  
otázky  
Association  
for International  
Affairs

# Policy Paper 3/2014

NATO after the Wales Summit: Readyng the Alliance for the Future

—

October 2014

## **NATO after the Wales Summit: Readyng the Alliance for the Future**

—

**Jakub Kufčák**

*October 2014*



### Summary and Recommendations

- In order to sufficiently respond to the threat posed by non-linear hybrid warfare, NATO needs to build on steps made in Wales and adapt from the concept of defense in depth of territory to strategy of deterrence by denial.
- NATO must, together with the EU, develop contingency plans how to deploy allied special forces, police and intelligence specialists on the NATO territory possibly invaded by the “little green men” in order to assist the local forces even before Article 5 is triggered.
- These plans should apply to NATO’s cyber defense posture threshold and prepositioning of allied special forces and police specialists ready to assist in the initial stages of non-linear aggression in the Baltics. This approach would lead to depoliticizing the issue and minimizing the risk of successful jab-and-pause tactics and ameliorate the possible extended deterrence dilemma in cyber domain.
- While the defense spending pledge achieved in Wales is not insignificant, Alliance should focus on reforming the NATO Defense Planning Process. This should in the long-term entail a break with the time-honored procedure of apportioning target requirements on a purely national basis. The Framework Nation Concept should provide the needed regional or functional clusters.
- The transition from Afghanistan and the management of many NATO partnerships while creating the category for upper-tier partners who contributed the most is one of the bright sides of the Summit. Further challenge lays in engaging emerging powers like Brazil and India.
- Some concerns were left in the area of non-military exploitation of members’ internal vulnerabilities by foreign actors and with regard to the security vacuum between NATO and Russia. The latter being less of a problem than the former because NATO is not the sole answer to the threat posed by exploitation of internal civil-military vulnerabilities - the cooperation between NATO and EU is.



### Introduction: NATO before the Wales Summit

The NATO's Wales summit was, even before the Ukrainian crisis started, coined as one of the most important summits after the end of the Cold War. A summit that would allow the Alliance to make a closure after the 13 years long ISAF mission in Afghanistan that had transformed NATO, provided a catalyst for military transformation and framework for relations with partners around the globe. In the words of the Secretary General Rasmussen from February 2013, NATO had to shift from “operational engagement to operational readiness. From campaign to contingency. From deployed NATO to prepared NATO.”<sup>1</sup>

The main aim was to preserve at times of economic austerity and political wariness since a “mere survival may be construed as a success for the Alliance.”<sup>2</sup> This political wariness on the both sides of the Atlantic touches on the political tension within NATO that stems from a deeper problem – the gap in transatlantic burden sharing between USA and Europe. The Ukrainian crisis has not changed this situation but has shifted the focus from readiness to readiness *and* reassurances.

This created a situation where NATO is, for numerous reasons, unlikely to conduct another state-building enterprise at “strategic distance” like the Afghan deployment (a Libyan-type scenario is the upper limit to any NATO Europe intervention capability)<sup>3</sup> and where the collective defense mission is reinvigorated in order to reassure the allies on the Eastern flank that Article 5 of the Washington treaty is still *the* security guarantee.

But the Russian strategy in Crimea and Eastern Ukraine has shown that it specifically aims not to trigger NATO's collective defense response. The nature of the Alliance's *reassurances* has to incorporate both conventional measures and unconventional measures in order to counter the non-linear forms of aggression (so-called “green men”) and cyber attacks. NATO has to keep refocusing its traditional defense and deterrence capabilities while developing approaches to deter “grey zone” acts of coercion and aggression.

This paper will assess the NATO's Wales Summit through three big themes that were somewhat outshined by the recent developments to the East and to the South of the European territory (Russian and ISIL threat). Firstly, the challenges to Article 5 and the nature of NATO's reassurances. Secondly, the problem of NATO's burden sharing and multinational projects, and thirdly the need to rebalance the focus on territorial defense with continuation

---

<sup>1</sup> Secretary General Andres Fogh Rasmussen. NATO after ISAF: staying successful together. Speech to the Munich Security Conference, 02.02.2014.

<sup>2</sup> Andrew Dorman. NATO's 2012 Chicago Summit: A Chance to Ignore the Issues Once Again? In: *International Affairs* 88: 2 (2012), p. 302.

<sup>3</sup> Jacob Stokes, Julianne Smith, Nora Bensahel, David Barno. Charting the Course: Directions for the New NATO Secretary General. *Center for a New American Security*, Policy Brief, September 2014, p. 6.



of NATO's partnerships as one of the most important tools in the Alliance's cooperative security and backbone of its global relevance.

### **Collective Defense and NATO's Adaptation to the Post-Crimea Environment**

The NATO's reaction to the changed security environment can be understood within two categories: reassurances and readiness. The immediate reaction to the worsening security environment on the Eastern borders of the Alliance was the reassurance that the Allies are prepared to make concrete steps to strengthen the defense of the most exposed members. And concrete steps were made even before the NATO gathering in Wales.

All three major Western European powers (plus Canada, Poland, Denmark and the Czech Republic) offered to bolster the NATO Baltic Air Policing Mission and the number of aircrafts involved in the mission has from May 2014 tripled. The United States also launched the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI) that finances the rotating U. S. presence in the Eastern members of the NATO in June and deployed to Europe two more B2 strategic stealth bombers capable to deliver nuclear weapons in order to demonstrate the American commitment to European security.

In Wales the Alliance formally adopted the NATO Readiness Action Plan (RAP) confirming on a more practical level further steps to fill the perceived gaps in its Eastern flank – most importantly the continuous presence of NATO troops in Eastern Europe alas on rotational basis, the establishment of the 4,000-strong Very High Readiness Joint Task Force (VJTF) operational by the end of 2014 within the NATO Response Force ready for deployment within few days notice and prepositioning of facilities, equipment, supplies and logistics specialists on the territories of the Eastern member states in order to enable rapid reinforcement and deployment of allied forces in this area should the need arise. On the other hand, the calls for permanent stationing of the NATO forces were not answered since some members of the Alliance argued that NATO-Russia Founding Act of 1997 pledging NATO not to permanently station forces on the territories of new NATO members should not be violated.<sup>4</sup>

These steps should be labeled as *reassurances* and not part of the *readiness* category since they at their core do not ready the Alliance to counter the new Russian tactics of non-linear

---

<sup>4</sup> However the "NATO's pledge to Russia was conditional, not unconditional. It was that, as long as there was no security threat to Eastern Europe, there would be no permanent NATO troops stationed there." Ira Louis Straus. The Myth that NATO Committed to Having No Permanent Troops in Eastern Europe. *Atlantic Community*, 04. 09. 2014. [Online] <http://www.atlantic-community.org/-/the-myth-that-nato-committed-to-having-no-permanent-troops-in-eastern-europe>.



aggression like the Crimean operation originally was. They merely reassure the Allies by conventional means and do not act as an Article 5 tripwires for possible Crimea style operation in the Baltics. At best they mildly raise the possible costs the aggressor would have to bear. As long as NATO relies on defense in depth, the only effective defense against “jab and pause” style of war are the local forces actually patrolling the borders.<sup>5</sup> Since the decision what constitutes an armed attack that would trigger Article 5 is met by NATO members, there is a chance, however small, that initial stages of such operation carried out by ‘armed civilians and militants’ would not be covered by NATO’s collective defense.<sup>6</sup> *Reassurances* on the other hand contribute to Alliance’s cohesion and build mutual trust – one of the four principles of function that are necessary to keep the NATO working in a viable way.<sup>7</sup>

The remarks by gen. Breedlove in August certainly did not alleviate this fear because he basically confirmed that as long as this non-linear aggression is not *attributable* to an aggressor nation, Article 5 would not apply.<sup>8</sup> The reluctance of some NATO members to commit to permanently stationing troops at the expense of relations with Russia combined with historical experiences of the region seem to justify that the Baltic states are still somewhat worried.

NATO could make the RAP more of a deterrent, going beyond its usefulness in the short and medium term, simply by deciding that it would be first step towards a permanent bases unless Russia withdraws from Ukraine.<sup>9</sup> Further, should NATO make the VJFT truly effective, the deployment of the unit should be handed to the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) not requiring the consent of all 28 member-states, effectively depoliticizing the issue,<sup>10</sup> just as Prime Minister Cameron indicated in a statement to the House of Commons.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Jakub Grygiel, Wess A. Mitchell. Limited War is Back. *The National Interest*, 28. 08. 2014. [Online] <http://nationalinterest.org/feature/limited-war-back-11128>.

<sup>6</sup> David Axe, Robert Beckhusen. NATO could have trouble combating Putin’s military strategy. *Reuters*, 15. 09. 2014. [Online] <http://blogs.reuters.com/great-debate/2014/09/15/how-nato-could-defend-against-a-russian-invasion>.

<sup>7</sup> The other three being: American leadership, burden-sharing and Alliance credibility. Mark Webber, Ellen Hallams and Martin A. Smith. Repairing NATO’s motors. In: *International Affairs*, 90: 4 (2014), p 773-793.

<sup>8</sup> "If we see these actions taking place in a NATO nation and we are able to attribute them to an aggressor nation, that is Article 5." <http://www.reuters.com/article/2014/08/17/us-ukraine-crisis-breedlove-idUSKBN0GH0JF20140817>.

<sup>9</sup> Comments from Francois Heinsbourg and Ulrich Speck. Jan Techau. Three Questions on NATO. *Carnegie Europe*, 05. 09. 2014. [Online] <http://carnegieeurope.eu/strategieurope/?fa=56543>.

<sup>10</sup> Wojciech Lorenz. NATO Narrows Military Gap on its Eastern Flank. *PISM*, Strategic File, No. 20 (55), September 2014.

<sup>11</sup> Ian Davis, Nigel Chamberlain. An Evaluation of the Wales Summit: NATO builds coalitions for conflict on multiple fronts. *NATO Watch*, 10. 09. 2014, p. 8.



# Policy Paper 3/2014

NATO after the Wales Summit: Readyng the Alliance for the Future

October 2014

The summit, however, inaugurated also certain steps in the right direction in order to reinforce the capabilities directly relating to non-linear threats – the real steps to NATO *readiness*. The development of NATO's hybrid warfare exercise scenarios, deployable allied Special Operations Component Command headquarters as one of the deliverables from the Connective Forces Initiative Package, and a pledge to much needed enhanced cooperation with the EU on hybrid threats. Importantly, the work on hybrid warfare is to be reviewed alongside the implementation of the Readiness Action Plan.<sup>12</sup>

NATO further needs to, together with EU, develop contingency plans how to deploy allied special forces, police and intelligence specialists on the NATO territory possibly invaded by the 'little green men' in order to assist the local forces in case of urgency and in effect formulate the strategy of deterrence by denial.<sup>13</sup> NATO and the EU should look for ways how to assist and serve as an force-enabler for a special coordinating group set up on the background of the Wales summit by the Baltic states that aims to coordinate and model the reaction of respective institution in case of threat to public security in any of the three countries.<sup>14</sup>

In the area of cyber defense, another theme concerning the "grey zone", was significant progress achieved through the NATO Cyber Defence Policy that was originally approved by NATO defense ministers in June and endorsed by the Wales summit. Cyber attacks can now be treated as harmful as conventional attacks and cyber defense is now considered a part of NATO's core task – collective defense. The ambiguity however remains as to what degree of intensity under what kind of circumstances would warrant the Article 5 response since the decision ultimately rests with the North Atlantic Council that decides on a case-by-case basis.<sup>15</sup>

This cyber posture is a double-edged sword given the fact that as long as the actual threshold invoking Article 5 stays undefined, member states cannot be fully confident that collective defense would be invoked should they need it. On the other hand, to reveal the threshold is not a good idea either since the possible opponent will intentionally act just below the threshold to avoid a collective response. There is also vast discrepancy between NATO members' cyber capabilities and it is unclear to what extent are the more advanced willing to reveal and use their cyber capabilities on other member states behalf giving rise to a situation somewhat analogous to nuclear extended deterrence dilemma.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Wales Summit Declaration, 05. 09. 2014, paras. 13, 69, 104.

<sup>13</sup> Felix Seidler. How NATO Can Defend Estonia Against Russia. 18. 05. 2014, [Online] <http://www.seidlers-sicherheitspolitik.net/2014/05/how-nato-can-defend-estonia-against.html>.

<sup>14</sup> Baltic states set up special group to counter terror groups, 05. 09. 2014, [Online] <http://www.baltictimes.com/news/articles/35519>.

<sup>15</sup> Wales Summit Declaration, 05. 09. 2014, par. 72.

<sup>16</sup> Jarno Linnéll. NATO's September Summit Must Confront Cyber Threats. *Breaking Defense*,



Currently only 14 NATO nations dispose of some type of cyber defense capability within their armed forces but national cyber capability targets are to be elaborated within the NATO's Defence Planning Process (NDPP) by 2016 giving rise to calls for future establishment of a joint cyber command under the SACEUR and development of NATO cyber warfare doctrine.<sup>17</sup>

### NATO's Burden-sharing Gap and Future Capabilities

NATO currently faces an unsustainable gap in defense costs for security that the American and European sides bear that endangers the NATO cohesion and in long-term weakens the Alliance's place in American strategy diminishing the American leadership that is "*sine qua non* for NATO" [italics in original].<sup>18</sup> This is critical issue also because "the interest in NATO in Washington (and some other capitals) is at its lowest level since 1949 and the founding of the Alliance."<sup>19</sup>

The Wales summit declaration addressed this issue but with limited success. The Allies agreed that all NATO members whose current defense expenditure is below 2% commitment will *aim* to increase their defense expenditures in real terms as their GDP grows and *move towards* the 2% guideline within a decade. Likewise Allies who spend annually less than 20% of their defense budgets on major new equipment including R&D, will *aim* to increase their annual investments to 20% within a decade.<sup>20</sup> While it is true that this is pledge on defense investment issued for the first time by NATO leaders in order to reach NATO's spending recommended guidelines within a concrete timeline as NATO Secretary General Rasmussen asserted,<sup>21</sup> it is also a non-binding political pledge.

Moreover, the endeavor of some Allies to use stronger wording, i. e. commitment, was acceptable only for 10-12 nations and failed. Obviously, if raise in defense spending is not a realistic option for all NATO members then "more bang for the buck" certainly is. The pledge to invest 20% of the defense spending on major new equipment certainly is a positive step forward since the Alliance needs to start to concentrate on improved outcomes rather

---

11. 08. 2014. [Online] <http://breakingdefense.com/2014/08/natos-september-summit-must-confront-cyber-threats>.

Piret Pernik. Increasing NATO's Role in Cyber Defence. *International Centre for Defence Studies*, 28. 08. 2014. [Online] <http://blog.icds.ee/article/increasing-natos-role-in-cyber-defence>.

<sup>18</sup> Mark Webber, Ellen Hallams and Martin A. Smith. Repairing NATO's motors. In: *International Affairs*, 90: 4 (2014), p 778.

<sup>19</sup> Julian Lindley-French. NATO's post 2014 strategic narrative. *Wilton Park*, Conference report, June 2014, p. 3.

<sup>20</sup> Wales Summit Declaration, 05. 09. 2014, paras. 13-14.

<sup>21</sup> Louisa Brooke-Holland, Claire Mills. NATO Wales Summit 2014: outcomes. *House of Commons*, Research Briefing, 12. 09. 2014, p. 9.



# Policy Paper 3/2014

NATO after the Wales Summit: Readyng the Alliance for the Future

October 2014

than simple expenditure. However, NATO seem to be one step behind in this respect because no contributions to NATO be it additional troops or capabilities offered will not count towards the spending pledge.<sup>22</sup>

The summit also endorsed several multinational cooperative projects that aim to do just that – the JISR and AGS being the products of the Chicago Summit in 2012. The “work is on track” on the Joint Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (JISR) initiative to deliver an initial operational capability to support NATO operations and NRF by 2016 rectifying the shortfalls identified during the Afghan and Libyan operations. This common NATO capability should be further augmented by the Alliance Ground Surveillance (AGS) capability that is to become operationally deployable in 2017.<sup>23</sup>

More importantly, during the October 2013 NATO Defense Ministers Meeting, Germany presented the new 'Framework Nation Concept' (FNC), which aims to combine capabilities among Alliance members to a much greater extent. This concept was meant to provide a new impetus for multinational cooperation in the NATO Defense Planning Process. Three initiatives were founded from this concept at the NATO summit. Firstly, a group of ten Allies led by Germany signed a joint letter committing them to work together in the long term in order to create a number of multinational projects to address Alliances priority areas across a broad spectrum of capabilities, initially in the areas of logistics support, CBRN protection, firepower delivery from land, air and sea and deployable headquarters. Secondly, the UK leads another grouping of the Allies establishing the Joint Expeditionary Force (JEF) that should facilitate the efficient deployment of existing and emerging military capabilities and units. Thirdly, Italy as a lead nation will focus together with 6 Allies on improving the stabilization and reconstruction, provision of enablers and command and control capabilities.<sup>24</sup>

This endeavor could in the future potentially lead to reform if not radical break with the time-honored procedure of apportioning target requirements on a purely national basis forming regional clusters of nations sharing capabilities. Given the dire situation in defense spending a very rational course of action enhancing not only capabilities and NATO's cohesion but possibly creating new dependencies.

One further note should be made about NATO-EU coordination with regard to multinational projects in the defense area. While rhetorically both sides pledge to work more closely together since the inception of EU's CSDP in 1999 and mild success has been achieved through the Berlin Plus Agreement, well known constraints between Turkey and Cyprus preclude further cooperation since the accession of Cyprus into the EU in 2004. As Sven

<sup>22</sup> Tigner Brooks. Analysis: NATO's budget increase 'aim'. *IHS Jane's Defence Weekly*, 11. 09. 2014. [Online] <http://www.janes.com/article/43029/analysis-nato-s-budget-increase-aim>.

<sup>23</sup> Wales Summit Declaration, 05. 09. 2014, par. 65.

<sup>24</sup> Wales Summit Declaration, 05. 09. 2014, par. 67.





Biscop recently argued, the price for more meaningful coordination between the EU and NATO could well be the creation of specific arrangements that would allow Turkey access to the European Defence Agency (EDA).<sup>25</sup> The Wales summit, however, lacked ambition in this area.

### **Balancing the Alliance's Core Tasks: Between the Defense of the Territory and Global NATO**

The 2010 Strategic Concept laid down the three core tasks on which the security of Euro-Atlantic depends. Recent developments seem to push the Alliance to spend more energy on the collective defense but the health of the organization rests ultimately on moderate American leadership and NATO's place in the American grand strategy that sees NATO as the force multiplier for American "hub-and-spoke" system connecting with partners around the globe.<sup>26</sup>

So far the main device to this end that also facilitated interoperability was the ISAF mission that is close to its end. The Allies recognized this and at the Wales summit created two new initiatives to ensure that these bonds are not lost. Firstly the Interoperability Platform engaging 24 partner nations in order to maintain the interoperability, including 5 (Australia, Finland, Georgia, Jordan, Sweden) Enhanced Partners, which are granted early access to operational planning and streamlined participation in exercises thanks to their significant contributions to NATO operations.<sup>27</sup> Noteworthy in this respect is that Allies resisted the urge to grant this enhanced partnership solely to countries endangered by Russia, as the Poles allegedly pleaded for.<sup>28</sup> Georgia, Jordan and Moldova were further provided with new Defense and Related Security Capability Building Initiative aimed to project stability through capability building.<sup>29</sup>

These steps significantly bolster NATO's ability and created new avenues for cooperation with non-NATO countries. Pundits, however, point out that NATO will need to also engage with emerging powers like Brazil, India. Even more contrasting with this is the lack of

---

<sup>25</sup> Sven Biscop. The summit of our ambition? European defence between Brussels and Wales. *Egmond, Royal Institute for International Relations*, Security Policy Brief no. 55, March 2014.

<sup>26</sup> Mark Webber, Ellen Hallams and Martin A. Smith. Repairing NATO's motors. In: *International Affairs*, 90: 4 (2014), p. 776.

<sup>27</sup> Office of the Press Secretary. FACT SHEET: NATO and U.S. Efforts in Support of NATO Partners, Including Ukraine, Moldova, and Georgia. 05. 09. 2014.

<sup>28</sup> Greg Sheridan. Australia to be NATO partner, 200 troops may return to Afghanistan. *The Australian*, 02. 09. 2014. [Online] <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/national-affairs/defence/australia-to-be-nato-partner-200-troops-may-return-to-afghanistan/story-e6frg8yo-1227044445639?nk=b0dda0022612728a38501237b0272f24>.

<sup>29</sup> Wales Summit Declaration, 05. 09. 2014, par. 89.



tangible measures to match the NATO rhetoric for Ukraine – the Summit made clear that the Alliance can do very little to roll back the territorial gains already gained by Russia and its proxies.<sup>30</sup> It could be therefore argued that NATO failed to avoid reinforcing the perception of a vulnerable “gray zone” between the Alliance and Russia.<sup>31</sup>

Another country in this gray zone, Georgia, hoped that it would finally get the Membership Action Plan (MAP) in 2014. NATO refuses to grant the MAP since 2008 Bucharest summit (and again couple months before the Wales Summit) and Russia-Georgia war. With the Ukrainian crisis straining the NATO’s relation with Russia and the possibility that Ukraine could again seek NATO membership Allies chose to once again postpone the issue of Georgian membership. But it will resurface again and this will be the moment of truth of NATO’s enlargement because of the gap between NATO open door rhetoric and politics.

In Wales, however, NATO somewhat watered down the long-standing premise that the MAP is the last step before the membership noting that “Georgia’s relationship with the Alliance contains the tools necessary to continue moving Georgia forward towards eventual membership”.<sup>32</sup> The fact that Georgian president attending the Wales Summit met on the sideline of the summit with Czech, Polish, Bulgarian, Latvian and French delegations speaks volumes about how divided NATO still potentially is about the Georgian membership – the Eastern European members and the USA possibly exercised restraint to avoid costly debate focusing on pressing matters more relevant to their security interests.

## Conclusions

Has the Wales Summit put NATO on the right path in order to meet the evolving challenges? As always only the time will tell because the Summit declaration is, as always, a glass half empty or half full. Obvious is that many of the steps made prior to the Summit and at the Summit were aimed at averting the most unlikely scenario, i.e. a Russian conventional attack on NATO member. This sober assessment would, however, miss the symbolic message that these steps convey. That is the reassurances for NATO allies that feel immediately threatened.

---

<sup>30</sup> Ian Davis, Nigel Chamberlain. An Evaluation of the Wales Summit: NATO builds coalitions for conflict on multiple fronts. *NATO Watch*, 10. 09. 2014, p. 7, 13.

<sup>31</sup> Damon Wilson quoted in Atlantic Council Members’ Conference Call Series. Live from the NATO Summit: Assessing the Future of the Alliance. 05. 09. 2014. [Online] <http://www.atlanticcouncil.org/images/transcripts/transcript-burns-kempe-wilson-nato-2014.pdf>. Richard Weitz. Russia vs. the new NATO. *Russia Direct*, 12. 09. 2014. [Online] <http://www.russia-direct.org/opinion/russia-vs-new-nato>.

<sup>32</sup> Wales Summit Declaration, 05. 09. 2014, par. 93.



# Policy Paper 3/2014

NATO after the Wales Summit: Readyng the Alliance for the Future

October 2014

Some steps to counter the threat that constitutes the likely scenario, i.e. hybrid, non-linear warfare just under the Article 5 were also made, although these could be further bolstered by e.g. pre-agreed political consensus applied to certain scenarios of collective response in order to avoid delayed collective response to minimum. These should apply to NATO's cyber defense posture threshold and prepositioning of allied special forces and police specialists ready to assist in the initial stages of non-linear aggression in the Baltics. This approach would lead to depoliticizing the issue and minimizing the risk of successful jab-and-pause tactics and ameliorate the possible extended deterrence dilemma in cyber domain.

The Summit declaration displays strong endeavor not to create capabilities solely for the sake of it but meaningfully crafts new initiatives in order to strike the balance between territorial defense and external operations (VJFT could serve as the example). That is wise course of action given that the European neighborhood is currently very volatile.

Addressing the defense spending problems in NATO Europe was anticipated to be a hard task for the Summit, these expectations proved true as Allies pledged just to aim for 2% of GDP defense spending and 20% investments in new major equipment within the next 10 years – hard to tell if it is a signal of lacking urgency or realistic plan. Based on previous track record the former. Since NATO-wide commitment for increased defense spending is not doable, the new Secretary General should consider proposing a concrete roadmap for implementation of this now official goal of the Alliance but perhaps more fruitful in the long-term would be to push for national laws requiring the governments to commit certain % of GDP to defense.

In the meantime the reform of the NATO Defence Planning Process should be the priority. The Framework Nation Concept provided, it seems, much needed impetus for creation of more regional or functional clusters, which could, in the distant future, replace or supplement national basis for the planning process.

The transition from Afghanistan and the management of many NATO partnerships while creating the category for upper-tier partners who contributed the most is one of the bright sides of the Summit. Further challenge lays in engaging emerging powers like Brazil and India.

Some concerns were left in the area of non-military exploitation of members' internal vulnerabilities by foreign actors and with regard to the security vacuum between NATO and Russia. The latter being less of a problem than the former because NATO is not the sole answer to the threat posed by exploitation of internal civil-military vulnerabilities – the cooperation between NATO and EU is.



Asociace  
pro mezinárodní  
otázký  
Association  
for International  
Affairs

# Policy Paper 3/2014

NATO after the Wales Summit: Readyng the Alliance for the Future

–  
October 2014

## ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS – AMO

The Association for International Affairs – AMO is a preeminent independent think-tank in the Czech Republic in the field of foreign policy. Since 1997, the mission of AMO has been to contribute to a deeper understanding of international affairs through a broad range of educational and research activities. Today, AMO represents a unique and transparent platform in which academics, business people, policy makers, diplomats, the media and NGOs can interact in an open and impartial environment.

### In order to achieve its goals AMO strives to:

- formulate and publish briefings, research and policy papers;
- arrange international conferences, expert seminars, roundtables, public debates;
- organize educational projects;
- present critical assessment and comments on current events for local and international press;
- create vital conditions for growth of a new expert generation;
- support the interest in international relations among broad public;
- cooperate with like-minded local and international institutions.

## RESEARCH CENTER

Founded in October 2003, the AMO's Research Center has been dedicated to pursuing research and raising public awareness of international affairs, security and foreign policy. The Research Center strives to identify and analyze issues crucial to Czech foreign policy and the country's position in the world. To this end, the Research Center produces independent analyses; encourages expert and public debate on international affairs; and suggests solutions to tackle problems in today's world. The Center's activities can be divided into two main areas: first, it undertakes [research and analysis](#) of foreign policy issues and comments on [AMO blog](#); and second, it fosters dialogue with the policy-makers, expert community, and broad public.

[www.amo.cz](http://www.amo.cz)

