

## NATO'S FUTURE: A TALE OF THREE SUMMITS<sup>1</sup>

HANS BINNENDIJK, SENIOR FELLOW, CENTER FOR TRANSATLANTIC  
RELATIONS, JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY SAIS  
NOVEMBER 2016

### SUMMARY

NATO tends to make progress on key policy issues and capability from summit to summit. Major shifts in the orientation of the Alliance can be traced to significant summits like London (1990), Washington (1999), Prague (2002), and Lisbon (2010). During the past two years, NATO has held a summit in Wales (4-5 September 2014) and one in Warsaw (8-9 July 2016). A third mini-summit is planned for Brussels in 2017.

These first two summits taken together again significantly shifted the focus of the Alliance in the face of a series of new and dangerous challenges in the East and South. They shifted NATO's posture in the East from benign neglect to allied reassurance to some degree of deterrence. The proposed force posture is inadequate to defeat a determined Russian short warning attack. Considerable increases in forward deployed forces (perhaps seven brigades) plus strengthened reinforcements would be necessary for NATO to hold its ground. But the Warsaw formula does provide what might be called "deterrence by assured response." In the South, Allies recognized the complexity of the threats to Europe and sought to define NATO's role in dealing with them.

The third summit next year in Brussels could set the stage for further progress on both fronts. Much more still needs to be done. But with these fairly dramatic changes, NATO is in the process of once again restructuring itself so that it will not be "obsolete" in the effort to provide security for the transatlantic allies.

This paper briefly analyzes 20 key issues now facing the Alliance and highlights the progress made in Wales and Warsaw. It also suggests some directions for the Brussels summit and beyond. Table I serves as a guide to this discussion. The vertical columns represent the major issues addressed at each summit and the horizontal rows trace progress on that issue from Wales to Warsaw and suggest initiatives for the Brussels summit.

---

<sup>1</sup> For additional background, see "[Alliance Revitalized: NATO for a New Era](#)" produced by the five think tank "Washington NATO Project" and published by the Center for Transatlantic Relations at SAIS.

**TABLE I. NATO FROM WALES TO BRUSSELS**

| <b>2014 Wales Summit Implementation<sup>2</sup></b> | <b>Key 2016 Warsaw Summit Decisions<sup>3</sup></b> | <b>2017 Brussels Summit Priorities<sup>4</sup></b> |
|---|---|--|
| Condemn Russian Behavior <sup>5</sup>               | Unity/ 360 degree deterrent                         | New Strategic Concept (?)                          |
| Readiness Action                                    | Plan Enhanced Forward Presence                      | *Follow on Forces/Manage A2AD                      |
| Defense Investment Pledge                           | Enhanced Situational Awareness                      | *Readiness/Sustainability Goals                    |
| Maritime Strategy                                   | Southern Operations/C-ISIL etc                      | *Southern Strategy                                 |
| Ballistic Missile Defense                           | Nuclear Warning                                     | Airpower Initiatives                               |
| Partnership Interoperability Platform               | NATO-EU Cooperation/Open Door                       | Further Enlargement (?)                            |
| Defense Capacity Building                           | Project Stability                                   | *Organize for Capacity Building                    |
| Cyber as Collective Defense                         | Cyber Pledge/New Domain                             | *Strengthen Command Structure                      |
| Counter-Hybrid Strategy                             | Resilience Requirements/Guidelines                  | *Resilience Support Operations                     |
| Framework Nation/Smart Defense                      | Regional Cooperation                                | Enhance Framework nation                           |
| Operation Resolute Support                          | Continue RS/fund through 2020                       | Retain scalable S&R capability                     |

The greatest progress made at the Wales summit and the subsequent two years of implementation are: 1) articulation of a strong public unified position on Russia despite differing threat perceptions within the Alliance, 2) implementation of the Readiness Action Plan, and 3)

<sup>2</sup> This first column highlights the major decisions made at Wales. The narrative summarizes those decisions and how they have been implemented.

<sup>3</sup> This second column highlights the major decisions made at Warsaw. The narrative summarizes those decisions.

<sup>4</sup> No time has been set for the 2017 Brussels Summit. Much will depend on the schedule of the new American President. The summit may be a half day “get to know you” event, but some new initiatives will be expected. The narrative summarizes potential initiatives for Brussels and beyond. The six marked with an asterisk might be good priorities for Brussels.

<sup>5</sup> Where possible, the rows across the columns have some relationship with one another. So Table I can be read both horizontally and vertically.

implementation of NATO's Ballistic Missile Defense plans. Good progress was made in four other areas but implementation may need to be accelerated; those areas are: 1) cyber security, 2) maritime strategy and capability, 3) the framework nation concept, and 4) counter-hybrid warfare. Considerable progress still needs to be made in three other areas: 1) the Defense Investment Pledge, 2) the Partnership Interoperability Platform, and 3) Defense Capacity Building.

The Warsaw summit made significant progress in many key areas as noted below. Five accomplishments stand out:

- 1) agreeing to forward deploy NATO multinational battalions to the Baltic States and Poland;
- 2) improving NATO's situational awareness and decision making in crisis;
- 3) putting the concept of national resilience at the center of defense efforts;
- 4) cementing the NATO-EU partnership; and
- 5) continuing Operation Resolute Support in Afghanistan.

---

## *Top Priority for Brussels: Enhance the Readiness and Sustainability of Follow-on-Forces*

---

Table I suggests a series of candidate initiatives for the Brussels summit. Given that this is likely to be a "get to know you" mini-summit, the focus might be on a few key issues that are either top priority or low hanging fruit. Six are marked by an asterisk in the chart. The top priority should be enhancing the readiness and sustainability of NATO's Follow-on-Forces and strengthening the command structure needed to manage them. A second priority should be to begin development of a southern strategy and new tools to implement it. Two areas highlighted at the Warsaw summit -- to improve the resilience of NATO members and to provide defense capacity building for key partners -- need implementation

plans that could be in place by the Brussels summit.

The narrative below expands upon this summary assessment.

**I. Nature of the Threat:** The Wales summit clearly condemned Russian behavior in Ukraine. The Warsaw summit reinforced and amplified that assessment of Russia, including “risks and challenges” posed by Russia in Syria. But the Warsaw summit also sought to maintain Alliance unity by stressing threats from the South and calling for a 360 degree response in both deterrence and defense. The Warsaw summit called for “no business as usual” with Russia but also sought to maintain a dialogue where useful.

The Brussels summit may need to further consolidate Alliance unity on threat perception. It also remains important not to neglect opportunities for progress with Russia, perhaps in areas like military transparency and the Vienna Documents, military rules of the road and conflict avoidance, and possible missile defenses.

**2. New Strategic Concept:** An issue for the Brussels summit is whether a new or modified Strategic Concept is needed to update the 2010 version. Historically, a new NATO Strategic Concept is issued about once per decade. The new U.S. Administration will have a large vote here. The general feeling at NATO HQ and at SHAPE appears to be that it is premature to initiate at Brussels a process to draft a new Strategic Concept. Most feel that implementing Wales and Warsaw is key and that a new strategic concept drafting process would divert attention from that task and could be divisive. Besides, they argue that subsequent political guidance and summit communiqué language has updated the 2010 Concept and that the three core tasks in the 2010 Concept (collective defense, crisis management and cooperative security) remain central and are primarily what NATO needs from the Concept. Of these three tasks, collective defense has become primary, crisis management is approached with reluctance, and cooperative security remains underdeveloped. The NATO Military Committee is beginning work on a redraft of MC400 in lieu of a new Strategic Concept.

Nonetheless, two fundamental reasons might still lead to a decision at Brussels to draft a new concept or to formally amend the old one for a 2018 summit. First, the strategic environment has changed fundamentally since 2010 so at least a major update would be useful. And second, a new U.S. Administration will need to buy into NATO policies and NATO may need to realign itself somewhat with a new Administration.

**3. Southern Strategy:** NATO is increasingly engaged in a wide array of military operations in the South. Yet NATO nations are very reluctant to make new commitments in the South, while Middle Eastern nations are reluctant to embrace the NATO Alliance. The ISAF operation in Afghanistan is of course over,

---

*Priority Number 2:  
Develop a  
Southern Strategy*

---

but Operation Resolute Support is continuing and the scope of NATO activity in the broader region in general is increasing. NATO is often not the lead institution but it is the supporting institution, an unusual position for the Alliance. Examples of NATO operations in the South include: 1) continuing Resolute Support, 2) training Iraqi forces in Iraq, not just in Jordan, 3) developing new regional Defense Capability Building initiatives, 4) supporting the counter-ISIL coalition with NATO AWACS (but NATO is still not a member of the coalition), 5) strengthening capabilities the Black Sea area, 6) continuing KFOR in Kosovo, 7) developing the potential role for the RAP in the South, 8) undertaking naval operations in the Aegean and central Mediterranean, 9) considering operations in support of Libya, and 10) reinvigorating the Med Dialogue, the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative, and beginning a new partnership arrangement with the Gulf Cooperation Council.

The concept of “projecting stability” highlighted at Warsaw holds these diverse efforts together for now, but a sound NATO Southern Strategy remains elusive. NATO’s efforts in the South are eclectic and require a unifying concept. A former Italian official has suggested the following elements for a NATO southern strategy: 1) stressing political will to act as an alliance in the South, 2) a division of labor with the EU, 3) close political consultation with southern partners including the African Union and the Gulf Cooperation Council, 4) designated roles for NATO in the following areas: countering WMD, maritime patrols, migration control, counter-terrorism, and building partner capacity.

## ASSURING DETERRENCE

**4. Readiness Action Plan (RAP):** The most important accomplishment of the Wales summit was to reassure eastern Allies that the Alliance would be able to reinforce front line nations should they be attacked by an adversary. The Warsaw summit listed ten developments on the implementation of the RAP: 1) 45,000 person NATO Response Force (NRF) enhanced, 2) 15,000 person NATO spearhead force (VJTF) of the NRF on 2-3 day readiness with rotational assignments set through 2022, 3) 8 small NATO Force Integration Units (NFIU) deployed in front line states, 4) legal and logistical constraints reduced to insure rapid deployment across borders, 5) HQ Multinational Command North East fully operational and new NATO Multinational Division HQ established in Romania, 6) NATO Standing Naval Forces enhanced and aligned with the NRF, 7) about 300 NATO exercises completed including the largest, Trident Juncture, 8) enhanced planning and enabled decision making, 9) counter-hybrid warfare strategy in place, and 10) a new framework for adaptation in the South. The U.S. European Reassurance Initiative (ERI), which complements and enables the RAP, also quadrupled in size to \$3.4 billion annually. Two U.S. Brigade Combat teams are permanently deployed in Europe (in Germany and Italy). A third heavy U.S. Brigade Combat Team (BCT) is being forward deployed to NATO's east on a heel-to -toe rotational basis. EUCOM has been forward deploying one Army company on a

rotational basis in each of the Baltic states and in Poland. Equipment for a fourth U.S. BCT is also being forward deployed to Europe to facilitate reinforcement. Military exercises are near continual. The Ukrainian and Georgian militaries are receiving additional U.S. training. The summit lists other national efforts as well.

**5. Enhanced Forward Presence:** Many analysts argued after Wales that while enhanced reinforcement capabilities might reassure some eastern NATO allies, they might not be adequate to deter Russia. War games were played that demonstrate that the RAP and ERI alone might not properly deter Russia since Russia could strike well before reinforcements were in place and the Alliance might balk rather than retaliate and regain lost territory. In short, the tripwire created at Wales was inadequate. The Warsaw summit sought to shift NATO's posture from reassurance to deterrence by supplementing the U.S. forward deployed forces mentioned above. It approved plans to deploy on a persistent rotating basis one battalion sized NATO Battle Group each to Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland (with the UK, Canada, Germany and the U.S. respectively as framework nations). They will operate "in concert with national forces." NATO is currently designing the rules of engagement for these Battle Groups. The Estonian Chief of Defense Staff has said that this should be sufficient to deter Russia, citing the Berlin example during the Cold War. This is deterrence by the probable imposition of unacceptably high costs rather than deterrence by defense. Poland contributed a division level headquarters which may command the multinational battalions. In NATO's southeast, Romania will lead a multinational brigade and provide a multinational division headquarters. Once these multinational NATO forces are in place, Moscow should have little doubt that NATO would retaliate with full military force against an overt attack which engages these NATO forces. This enhanced forward presence agreed at Warsaw was carefully crafted to be consistent with even the tightest legitimate interpretation of the NATO-Russia Founding Act. But it is still not adequate to defeat a full scale Russian surprise attack against the Baltic states, since Russia would have time and geography as their advantage. NATO would need to regain occupied territory, which could take considerable time.

**6. Follow On Forces and A2/AD:** The top issue for the Brussels Summit should be the size, readiness, deployability and sustainability of national Follow on Forces, especially ground forces, to deal with contingencies in the East. These forces would be needed to augment the VJTF, NRF, national forces and forward deployed NATO Battle Groups should a Major Joint Operation Plus (MJO+) be required. To successfully win a MJO+ NATO might require three or more Army Corps. New and clearer pledges are needed at the political level for NATO's readiness, deployability and sustainability goals for national forces. These goals exist but they are low visibility and do not drive expenditures for national forces. They need to be revised upward. These Follow on Forces would probably be deployed to an Anti-access Area-denial (A2/AD) environment in which Russian combat aircraft, air defenses, submarines, anti-ship cruise missiles, special forces, space and cyber assets would make it difficult for NATO's reinforcing units to arrive and operate. Defeating Russia's geographic and A2/AD advantages in NATO's northeast is an attainable goal if planning efforts are made in advance. Having capabilities and plans in place

should further enhance deterrence and avoid a showdown. But attacks against Russian territory might be required to deal with the A2/AD environment, raising nuclear issues and caution among several NATO members.

**7. Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) and Nuclear Warning:** The Warsaw summit catalogued progress in NATO's BMD program and reiterated that it was a counter-proliferation effort designed to defeat missiles launched from the Middle East, and not aimed at missile launches from Russia. The BMD program is clearly on track despite the concerns of some that the Iran nuclear deal might undercut the justification for it. The program's Initial Operating Capability was declared at Warsaw along with the transfer to NATO of BMD Command and Control (C2) operations. C2 is the only NATO (non-national) element of the program and developing it is the next core element for the Alliance program. The Warsaw summit noted Aegis Ashore deployment in Romania and early warning radar deployment in Turkey. It looked forward to Aegis Ashore deployment in Poland in 2018. Some analysts are now calling for the NATO BMD mission to be expanded to include defense against shorter-range Russia missiles, a move which would probably break the NATO consensus on BMD and be seen as highly provocative by Russia. Much may depend on the future viability of the INF Treaty.

With regard to Russian nuclear strategy, in one key sentence, the Warsaw communiqué warned Russia with regard to its nuclear "escalate to de-escalate" doctrine, stating that "any employment of nuclear weapons against NATO would fundamentally alter the nature of conflict." Continued work will be needed to maintain the safety, security and effectiveness of NATO's nuclear deterrent, including modernizing dual capable aircraft as needed. Future NATO exercises may need to pay greater attention to nuclear issues to prepare for potentially tough decisions. Efforts might also be made to bring France more closely into NATO's nuclear planning.

## IMPROVING ALLIANCE CAPABILITIES

**8. Defense Investment Pledge:** The Warsaw Communiqué argues that the Allies have turned a corner and that there is a halt to most defense spend reductions in Europe. Five nations meet the 2% of GDP defense spending goal and ten meet the 20% of defense spending investment goal set at Wales. The Warsaw Communiqué stresses output and pushes for budget increases to be spent on NATO's capability priorities. Defense Ministers will continue to review progress of the Defense Investment Pledge (DIP). In light of the new emphasis on burden sharing in the U.S., however, much more is needed at the Brussels summit to strengthen the DIP. For example, a detailed spending roadmap that gets all nations to the 2% and 20% goals would be productive. The Baltic states in particular need to improve their defenses by acquiring more anti-armor and air defense systems and by developing at least one operational army brigade each. For the front line states, 2% should be a floor and not a ceiling.

**9. Framework Nation Concept:** The Warsaw summit listed a series of at least eight examples where multinational approaches and smart defense have increased the efficiency of available forces and resources. While Smart Defense has proved to be useful, it operates at the project level and so its scope is limited. More important is the Framework Nation Concept originally suggested by Germany and adopted at Wales. Three key framework nation groupings are led by Germany (16 nations), Italy (6 nations) and the United Kingdom (7 nations). Other than to urge further cooperation,

the Warsaw Summit did not advance efforts in this area. The Framework Nation Concept, if broadened and made more operational, has the capability of significantly reducing redundancy and maximizing the efficiency of European forces. It is a sound alternative to building a European Army. At Brussels, a means needs to be found to accelerate and expand the Framework Nation approach.

---

*For front line states,  
2% should be a  
floor and not a  
ceiling.*

---

**10. Maritime Developments:** A new direction for NATO Maritime strategy was set in Wales, shifting away from low level operations such as counter-piracy and emphasizing high end combat. Since then several steps have been taken to strengthen NATO's maritime capabilities. For example: 1) Standing Naval Forces are being enhanced and brought into alignment with NRF operations, 2) the strategy is being operationalized with greater focus on high end combat, 3) Operation Ocean Shield will be terminated, 4) Operation Active Endeavor will shift to Operation Sea Guardian with a corresponding shift away from counter-terrorism operations, 5) NATO naval operations are underway in the Aegean in support of FRONTEX, 6) a new NATO role in central Mediterranean is under development, 7) NATO has indicated possible support for the Libyan coast guard and navy. NATO's maritime strategy now needs to consider more deeply the A2/AD problem and ways to strengthen NATO and partner maritime assets in the Baltic and Black Seas. National contributions to Standing Naval Forces need to be further augmented.

**11. Airpower Review:** While ground forces and maritime forces have received considerable high level attention in the past two years, NATO needs to place a greater focus on its airpower. The Wales summit did commission a NATO airpower study, which remains a fairly low level exercise. Air missions are frequently the cutting edge of NATO responses and operations in the East and South. Unmanned vehicles are increasingly being used; NATO's AGS Global Hawk will need to find its place in the airpower strategy. European fighter aircraft are numerous but aging and munitions have proven to be in short supply. Decisions need to be made about the use of airfields in time of conflict. NATO's Joint Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (JISR) requirements are heavily dependent on the US. (NATO has its own AWACS and ground

surveillance system in limited quantities). JISR will be critical in seeking to deal with Russian A2AD capabilities. European strategic lift and refueling capabilities are very limited. Combat aviation units need to be integrated into the air picture. A new NATO air power strategy is needed to complement the maritime strategy and to decide where European air forces should place their emphasis and how independent of U.S. enablers they should become over time. Hopefully the airpower study commissioned at Wales will inform a new strategy.

---

## *Cyber attacks could constitute an Article 5 attack.*

---

**12. Cyber Defenses:** Each summit during the past decade has expanded the cyber defense role of the Alliance. At Wales, cyber defenses were categorized as collective defense and it was noted that certain cyber attacks could constitute an Article 5 attack. At Warsaw: 1) cyber was classified as a separate “domain” which could have significant long term consequences for NATO’s command structure; 2) nations made a “cyber pledge” to better defend their own networks (which has been the most vulnerable element of NATO’s network); NATO is primarily responsible for defending its own network and this pledge should expand cyber protection provided by individual nations), and 3) NATO’s cyber range will be expanded to give nations practice in defending against cyber threats. For the future, NATO will need to more clearly define how it is prepared to use the offensive cyber capabilities of member states to enhance cyber deterrence. A Cyber Coordination Center and eventually a NATO Operational Cyber Forces HQ will be needed.

**13. Enhanced Resilience against Hybrid War:** After Russian intervention in Ukraine, NATO has conducted detailed studies on hybrid warfare and has developed new strategies to deal with it. At Warsaw, NATO noted that under certain conditions hybrid attacks could constitute Article 5 attacks. It also noted that while responding to hybrid attacks is in the first instance a national issue, NATO is prepared to assist Allies under such attack. A spotlight was placed on enhanced resilience as one means to defeat hybrid war. NATO has established Baseline National Resilience Requirements and guidelines that nations should meet. They focus primarily and perhaps too narrowly on continuity of government, securing critical infrastructure, maintaining essential services, and providing for civilian support for the military. More might be done on societal cohesion and countering corruption. The Warsaw communiqué offered that NATO could support and enhance national resilience preparedness if asked. Small Assistance Support Teams are reportedly being developed to assist members with resilience problems, but their formation is at a preliminary stage. The next step, perhaps for Brussels, is to define more precisely how NATO can deliver on its promise to enhance national resilience and how to use these Assistance Support Teams.

**14. Enhanced Situational Awareness:** Slow decision-making based on incomplete or differing intelligence assessments is beginning to be addressed by the Alliance. This is true at the operational and strategic levels. Improved Joint Information Surveillance and Reconnaissance (JISR) capabilities decided at Warsaw will focus in the first instance on the most ready forces, such as the NRF. Strategically, NATO will have a new Assistant Secretary General for Intelligence and Security who will run a new Division in the International Staff. But problems related to situational awareness and rapid decision making are deep. Significant intelligence assets

need to be focused on Russian capabilities and behavior. Former SACEUR Phillip Breedlove has called for improved “indications and warning” which could best be developed using all source intelligence, including: imagery, signals, measurement and signature, human intelligence, open source intelligence, social science information, and cultural awareness. Special efforts will be needed to use unclassified or moderately classified information that can be widely shared with NATO nations and publics. In addition, the new Intelligence and security division will need to develop stronger assessment capabilities to evaluate intelligence. Scenario-based discussions should be used much more often to prepare the way for potentially difficult decisions. The next step for the Brussels summit might be to create a NATO Intelligence Committee somewhat similar to the Military Committee, consisting of national intelligence officers from each mission.

**15. NATO’s Command Structure:** In 2011, NATO’s command structure reform reduced the NATO military command from 13,000 to about 8,800 posts. The reform created a more agile and deployable structure. But the reforms were also driven by budget cuts and were based on the assumption that NATO’s eastern front would be peaceful. Today the NATO command structure needs to deal with multiple issues unforeseen in 2011 and it is overtasked. This austere structure may need to be expanded to deal with the multiple threats now facing the Alliance.

---

## *Next Step for Brussels: Create a NATO Intelligence Committee*

---

### PARTNERSHIPS

**16. Partnership Interoperability Platform (PIP):** At Wales, NATO sought to simplify its alphabet soup of partnerships by creating a 24 nation Partnership Interoperability Platform and by highlighting a five-nation Enhanced Opportunity Partnership (EOP) Group (Sweden, Finland, Georgia, Jordan, and Australia). Japan sought EOP membership but was unwisely twice rebuffed. Wales therefore added two additional partnership mechanisms to the confusion. At Warsaw, the merits of each class of partnerships was praised but nothing was done to sort out the confusion.

---

## *The NATO-EU partnership appears to be developing into serious cooperation.*

---

Efforts are needed to group together those advanced democratic partners who are capable and willing to contribute significantly to NATO operations (EOP on steroids) and those vulnerable nations who need special NATO Defense Capability Building efforts.

**17. NATO-EU Partnership:** The NATO-EU partnership for the first time appears to be developing into serious cooperation, despite the fact that the Cyprus issue has not yet been settled. This cooperation has become vital. A Joint NATO-EU Declaration at Warsaw noted the many areas of

increased cooperation including: on hybrid warfare, on resilience, on cyber defenses, on Ukraine sanctions, on migration, on maritime cooperation, on defense capability building, on enhanced consultations. Aggressive implementation of this opportunity is needed in each of these areas. NATO will need to establish strong mechanisms to coordinate this cooperation. The EU might be invited to participate in the Brussels summit.

**18. Open Door/ Sweden and Finland/ Balkans:** Warsaw confirmed the membership invitation to Montenegro and the Alliance's Open Door Policy. Three aspirants remain in the queue. Georgia received encouraging words but membership still seems out of reach for the near term. Macedonia remains unable to overcome the name issue with Greece, and outside facilitation should be considered. Bosnia and Herzegovina will need to make progress on military installations and other issues.

The important next step in the Open Door Policy will be Sweden and Finland. While the former seems more positive about membership, neither has a popular majority for membership. Swedish polls show just under 50% for membership while polls in Finland show under 30% for membership. The two nations are likely to move together. Meanwhile they are both thickening their web of bilateral and multinational security relationships to the point where they are paying the NATO insurance premium without having the effective insurance policy. One fear expressed in both countries is that there would be a long time gap between when their national decisions for membership are made and when they become full members with Article 5 protection, a gap which Russia would exploit. One possible way to ease the path for these two countries that might be considered at Brussels is to create expedited accession procedures under which the time between their decision and membership is minimal.

---

## *Next step in the Open Door Policy: Sweden and Finland.*

---

In addition to the northern non-aligned, NATO needs to consider the Open Door as a tool to bring greater stability to the western Balkans. If a path to membership could be found for Bosnia and Herzegovina, Macedonia, Serbia, and Kosovo, then these common NATO ties would undercut Russian efforts to destabilize the region.

## PROJECTING STABILITY

**19. Defense Capacity Building (DCB):** At Warsaw NATO again highlighted Defense and Related Capacity Building, with an emphasis on defense reform, training local forces, and defense education. Georgia, Iraq, Jordan and Moldova have each benefited from new or enlarged programs. DCB is at the heart of NATO's notion of "projecting stability." NATO is pursuing this mission by creating individually tailored roadmaps for partners. At issue is: 1) whether the resources are adequate, 2) whether NATO has organized itself to efficiently provide DCB assistance, and 3) which other countries should be the focus of DCB assistance. A more structured program with lead nations responsible for organizing the effort might be developed for Brussels.

**20. Afghanistan and Stabilization Operations:** In a separate declaration at Warsaw, NATO agreed to continue with Operation Resolute Support in Afghanistan beyond 2016 and pledges for financial assistance were extended through 2020. Much will depend upon the willingness of the next U.S. President to retain significant forces in Afghanistan for training and ultimately as a rapid response force. While most NATO nations are very reluctant to engage again in major stability operations in the Middle East, the situation in Syria, in Libya, and elsewhere may require some level of stabilization operations again in the future. The Warsaw summit noted the continuing importance of the comprehensive approach to deal with such missions. NATO needs to better assemble and disperse the key lessons learned from Afghanistan and Iraq, using the NATO's Civil-Military Cooperation Center of Excellence in The Hague and its Joint Analysis and Lessons Learned Center in Lisbon. And NATO needs to retain a scalable capability to return to such operations if that becomes necessary.