Opening the Aperture on Resilience

Hans Binnendijk and Daniel S. Hamilton

Progress at the Warsaw Summit

Russia's hybrid attacks on NATO members and partners, plus indigenous terrorist attacks and those emanating from Da'esh, al-Qaeda and other radical Islamist groupings and individuals have placed the spotlight on the need to enhance national resilience and civil preparedness. In addition, the new Trump Administration in the United States will be looking for signs that European allies are taking steps to protect and defend themselves. Strong European support for efforts to enhance European resilience may help shape the U.S. Administration's attitude towards the NATO alliance.

NATO's 2016 Warsaw Summit initiated a critical start to this effort. It recognized that national resilience not only strengthens defenses, it can also create a more effective deterrent.

Resilience efforts begin with a renewed focus on Article 3 of the Washington Treaty, which calls on members to "maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack." Resilience Guidelines were agreed by Defense Ministers at their June 2016 ministerial meeting. NATO Baseline Requirements for National Resilience were also developed. At Warsaw, Heads of State and Government issued a separate commitment to "continue to enhance our resistance against the full spectrum of threats, including the hybrid threat, from any direction." Resilience against cyber attacks was the subject of a separate Cyber Defense Pledge which focused on securing national cyber systems.

Thus far, this resilience-building activity has focused primarily on NATO members. Through their resilience commitment, allies stated that they will protect their "populations and territory" in four areas: continuity of government, continuity of essential services, security of critical civilian infrastructure, and civilian support for military operations. Other NATO documents have elaborated on this list to include resilient energy supplies, management of the uncontrolled movement of people, access to food and water supplies, dealing with mass casualties, and communications and transport systems.[1]

---

[1] See NATO Warsaw Summit documents on "Resilience and Article 3".

The Warsaw Summit recognized that while resilience is primarily a national responsibility, NATO support can be useful to assess and, upon request, to facilitate national progress.[2] Small Advisory Support Teams are being considered to implement the allies' resilience pledge. Cyber resilience efforts are more mature but still need strengthening. While NATO focuses primarily on military networks, mechanisms exist to share cyber security information and to deploy rapid reaction teams if needed.

In addition, a NATO-EU joint declaration issued at Warsaw highlighted the importance of these two institutions working together to counter hybrid threats and to enhance resilience.[3] If NATO is to be effective in enhancing resilience, it is clear that it must engage much more closely with the EU, which has undertaken a range of activities and initiatives aimed at improving its military and civilian capabilities and structures to respond to crises spanning both societal defense and societal security, including cross-border cooperation on consequence management after natural and manmade disasters. Unless the two institutions develop more effective ways to work together, each will continue to evolve separately generating considerable waste in scarce resources, political dissonance, growing areas of unnecessary duplicative overlap, and increased potential for confusion and rivalry. Fortunately, there seems to recognition that new efforts to implement stronger NATO-EU cooperation are required, and are under development.

Progress in understanding the importance of resilience has been significant. It is sound that NATO has focused first on its members and that the scope of resilience-building efforts is fairly narrow for now. Implementation needs to follow rapidly. But as the transatlantic community looks to the future, the current aperture needs to be opened in three areas.

- NATO allies and EU member states will need to look beyond their respective national borders and place greater emphasis on providing forward resilience for their partners and neighbors.
- The scope of resilience needs to be expanded and the categories of resilience need to be better defined.
- NATO and the EU must create more effective tools to project resilience forward and to deal with the full scope of requirements.

Prioritizing Forward Resilience Partners

NATO allies and EU member states share a keen interest in the resilience of partners and neighbors, particularly those with whom they share considerable interdependencies, since strong efforts in one country may mean little if a neighboring country is susceptible to disruption.

The Warsaw Summit did not neglect the importance of projecting stability to NATO's partners and neighbors, but it was not the primary focus. The Summit noted that "if our neighbors are more stable, we are more secure...we are ready to do more to help our partners provide for their own security, defense against terrorism and build resilience against attack."[4] So both allies and partners are to be covered by this NATO initiative.

---

[2] Warsaw Summit, "Commitment to enhance resilience," paragraph 4.

[3] Warsaw Communique, paragraphs 121 and 122.

[4] The Warsaw declaration on Transatlantic Security, paragraph 7.

An important first step in managing the breadth and scope of the resilience enhancement effort will be to organize and prioritize those countries that might need assistance. To begin this process, this chapter offers five categories of countries that appear to need some outside support in strengthening their resilience. We do not include countries (allies or partners) with strong economies and societal structures that might indeed benefit from absorbing best practices. On balance, such countries will be producers rather than consumers of resilience. Nor do we include Middle Eastern countries currently engaged in significant internal conflict, such as Syria, Libya, or Yemen. These countries in many cases receive direct combat support from the West, but their wars need to be settled before resilience programs such as those envisioned in this chapter would be effective.[5] Afghanistan and Iraq are special cases given the high degree of U.S. and/or NATO involvement over the past decade and a half, and so are also not included in this survey.

For the purposes of this chapter we may distinguish between five categories of priority countries for forward resilience. Two groups encompass NATO allies and EU member states; two groups include countries outside the EU and NATO; and one group includes a mix of NATO/EU members and non-members.

The top priority should be the Baltic states, because they are the most vulnerable members of both the EU and NATO. They have been the target of Russia's destabilization campaign of intense propaganda and efforts at intimidation. Estonia and Latvia have large and potentially unstable Russian minorities. They have traditionally relied heavily on Russia for their energy supply. They are particularly vulnerable to cyber attacks. Their proximity to the Russian border and relatively weak border security provides Moscow with additional advantages to create mischief.

The second priority encompasses three so-called Eastern Partnership states -- Ukraine, Georgia and Moldova.[6] Russian operations in Ukraine are a model for the Kremlin's hybrid warfare efforts. All three countries have Russian troops on their soil and political parties that tend to be pro-Russian. They are particularly vulnerable to Russian hybrid warfare. Their security is of course not covered by Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, but NATO's Bucharest Summit communiqué indicated that one day Georgia and Ukraine would become members, a position repeated at the Warsaw Summit. Russia's annexation of the eastern Ukrainian region of Crimea and its military intervention, including through proxies, in a second Ukrainian area in the Donbas make it clear that events in this area fundamentally affect European security.

A third priority is the western Balkans. This category includes a mix on NATO members, NATO aspirants, EU members and other countries such as Serbia that would benefit from a greater Western orientation. Two decades ago, instability in this region led to Europe's largest wars since NATO was created. Many of the issues underlying those conflicts have not been fully resolved. And Russia has sought to destabilize this region as well. Yet the region could be conducive to resilience-building given their general desire to be part of Western institutions.

---

[5] Indeed, if peace can come to Syria, Libya, Yemen and Somalia, major stabilization and reconstruction operations may be needed to keep that peace. But those operations would be of a different scale and nature than the operations to enhance resilience considered here. And there is limited will in the West to take on additional massive stability and reconstruction operations.

[6] Belarus, Armenia and Azerbaijan might also be considered in this category, but governments in those countries are not NATO aspirants and are often aligned with Russia.

A fourth priority for projecting resilience is the group of vulnerable nations of North Africa (Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and Egypt) plus Jordan. They are particularly important both to contain future flows of migrants and terrorists to Europe and also to maintain current peace arrangements between Israel and its neighbors. The defeat of the Islamic State is probably a precondition for successful resilience operations in these states, but it is not sufficient. Current NATO plans to build the defense capacity of these nations is a step in the right direction, but more is needed in the area of civilian preparedness.

Finally, there are several other NATO allies in central Europe that could benefit from enhanced resilience, for example Poland and the other Visegrad states, Romania, Bulgaria and even Greece. They are less vulnerable to instability created by Russian hybrid warfare than NATO nations in the Baltic states and in the western Balkans, but they could use additional support nonetheless. Many still rely on Russian military equipment and Russian energy supplies.

This set of priorities means that other allies or member states are on balance less vulnerable, not less important. It is worth noting, however, that in some areas of resilience, such as managing terrorist attacks or mass casualty events, all European nations could use help from their neighbors.

The Scope of Resilience

NATO has identified several categories of resilience, but a more comprehensive assessment is needed. This section suggests six broad categories of resilience, each of which is needed to withstand possible future challenges. Together they encompass and expand the scope of NATO's resilience categories. They do not replace the need for countries to spend resources on traditional common defense. Nor do they address economic resilience, which require a separate set of tools.

The first category is *societal resilience.* This grouping has to do with political cohesion, agreed values, and questions of identity. It involves reducing the risk of internal conflict and mitigating the impact of misinformation and propaganda. To achieve social resilience, countries will need to maximize minority rights and freedom of the press, develop police and judicial systems deemed to be fair to all, and develop conflict resolution techniques to manage internal crises should they occur. Countries with strong societal resilience will be able to withstand efforts by adversaries to divide their countries with malign influence and infiltration. Countries in the top three priorities above in particular need to strengthen societal resilience.

The second category might be called *resilient homeland defense.* This category deals more with protecting a country's territory. It is not necessarily about traditional defenses such as tanks aligned along the border, although that might be included in a country's overall defense package. But resilient homeland defense is a broader concept that might be called making a country "hard for an occupier to to digest." It ranges from effective border security, to maintaining highly trained special forces that can manage an initial crisis without necessarily escalating it, to making it clear that an occupation will be resisted by guerrilla forces. This is particularly important to those frontline states near Russia.

Third, countries need ***resilient critical infrastructures***. These include cyber security for the country's network; protection of electrical grids and water supplies, including dams; a secure transportation system; access to food supplies; and a sound financial system. Traditional civil defense efforts as well as recent efforts by the EU and NATO have focused on enhancing resilient critical infrastructures. Given the transnational nature of Europe's critical infrastructures, maintaining this category of resilience will need a high degree of international collaboration. Instead of re-inventing the wheel, such efforts could build upon the EU's Critical Infrastructure Warning Information Network (CIWIN), which facilitates the exchange information on shared threats, vulnerabilities and appropriate measures and strategies to mitigate risk in support of critical infrastructure protection.[7]

A fourth category of resilience is ***limiting a society's dependency*** on resources controlled by a potential adversary, or addressing a society's reliance on critical flows abroad so that it can avoid being trapped into vulnerabilities that could endanger lives or vital societal functions. In the case of some NATO/EU members, dependency on Russian gas, oil, and electricity has been reduced but not enough. Russian has a history of using its gas production as a political weapon. The Baltic States in particular are still part of the Russian controlled "power ring." The Baltic states have made some recent progress by developing an offshore LNG terminal in Lithuania, by building a gas pipeline from Poland, and by connecting to the European electrical grid through Poland, Sweden and Finland. Cooperation among the three Baltic countries has not been exemplary, but it has been enhanced by EU investments in trans-European energy infrastructure projects. Finland, Bulgaria, Germany, the Visegrad states, Greece, and even Italy are also uncomfortably dependent on Russian gas supplies. Another example of dependency relevant to resilience has been central European reliance on Soviet-made military equipment. This dependency is being corrected, but only slowly, given the long life cycles of major defense equipment.

A fifth type of resilience, as highlighted by the Warsaw Summit, is ***continuity of government and essential services***. The United States, for example, has established elaborate means to ensure the continuity of government, even in case of a major nuclear attack. This requires a combination of a clear chain of command in time of crisis, advanced delegation of authority, evacuation plans and safe havens for leaders, and civil preparedness to maintain services at the grass roots level. Maintaining continuity of government can deter an adversary who may feel that decapitation of a nation/s leadership would give them an opportunity to gain control.

In the context of requirements for forward resilience, however, particularly with regard to fragile neighboring states, it may be equally important to consider the degree to which such societies have effective governance, not simply effective government. Government is one important pillar of society, but any individual society's ability to anticipate, prevent and ultimately withstand and bounce back from disruption may depend equally on its governance capacity, i.e. how other sectors of society are engaged, how rules and norms are structured, implemented and enforced, how actors are held accountable, and whether the processes by which these activities are conducted are stable and sustainable. Governance challenges are often at the heart of weak or fragile governments, and

---

[7] For more, see http://www.ppbw.pl/fotki/files/files/Aktualno%C5%9Bci/2016-05-23%20prezentacje%20konferencja/Alberto-Pietro%20Contaretti_Komisja%20Europejska.pdf.

can reveal vulnerabilities to disruption. Tackling these broader challenges of governance, rather than just government, is an important consideration for efforts at forward resilience.

The last resilience category is ***management of mass casualty attacks*** or a massive natural disaster. This may be the most developed of the six categories, as it is the classic core of civil defense. Most countries have developed plans to deal with natural disasters, including establishing exit routes, creating shelters, or providing medical care. Now response to massive terrorist incidents must be added to the list. In the defense field, NATO a decade ago developed guidelines for first responders to treat the results of chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear attack. These NATO Response Guidelines are supplemented by international training and by Advisory Support Teams. While important steps have been taken to enhance this category of resilience, the sheer magnitude of these potential catastrophes is such that constant attention is needed.

Delivering on Resilience

A review of these six categories of resilience plus the five sets of countries that may need priority assistance in building resilience indicates that NATO allies and EU member states have taken on a major task. To deliver on this promise, priorities need to be set, assistance programs need to be tailored, and support efforts need to carefully organized. Here are a Top Ten set of recommendations that might help the transatlantic community organize for this task.

1. **Conduct a survey of resilience requirements.** NATO's newly adopted resilience guidelines provide an opportunity to survey NATO members and partners to identify how countries believe they measure up against these guidelines. The results can be used to guide further support efforts.

2. **Set priorities.** NATO analysts might create a matrix using the country priorities and functional requirements suggested in this chapter along with survey results to establish a list of priority activities. For example, the matrix might show that border control in the Baltic states is the top priority. NATO might then use the results of this matrix to identify immediate- and longer-term resilience requirements. This effort could complement the recommended survey.

3. **Identify those who can strengthen forward resilience.** NATO's Civil Emergency Planning Committee has compiled a list of civilian experts who could be called upon to support the enhancement of resilience. But given the magnitude of the task, much greater efforts will be needed to identify others who can strengthen and project resilience. No single organization or country has the breadth and capability to deliver on all of these requirements for enhancing resilience. This effort would include identifying those international institutions, non-governmental organizations, nations, and individuals that have a particular expertise in some element of resilience. For example, NATO's Cyber Center of Excellence and its Computer Incident Response Capability are already helping countries with their network security resilience, while OSCE and institutions such as the U.S. National Endowment for Democracy or the European Endowment for Democracy might be well suited to support societal resilience.

   This list of value-added actors should extend beyond NATO members to include countries such as Sweden and Finland. Finnish experience with territorial defense and institutions such

as border guards, for example, or Swedish expertise with addressing asymmetrical dependencies on external forces, may mean that these countries could be leaders in cooperative efforts as neighbors seek to enhance their efforts in such areas.

4. **Develop mechanisms for institutional cooperation**. Once priorities are set and producers of resilience are identified, an effort needs to be made to link the capabilities of NATO, the EU, OSCE and other relevant institutions. Creation of a "NATO-EU Resilience Coordinating Council" might prove useful to drive this effort. The NATO International Staff and some combination of the EU's External Action Service and the European Commission's Directorate-General for Migration and Home Affairs should develop an inter-service mechanism to engage regularly on exchange of good practice, identify and address critical vulnerabilities, situational and threat assessments, and early warning and early action procedures. This may be a good way to test the Warsaw Summit pledge to develop closer NATO-EU cooperation.

5. **Work with host nations to tailor programs.** Resilience-building efforts will not work without the active cooperation of a host nation. Those who require or desire assistance with their own resilience efforts will need to take a major role in tailoring programs to fit their own needs, based in part on the recommended survey. The NATO-EU Resilience Coordinating Group suggested above might take the lead in working with priority host countries through Individually Tailored Resilience Planning and Review procedures.

6. **Expand the functions of NATO's Civil Emergency Planning Committee (CEPC).** NATO's CEPC currently has a mandate to plan for contingencies that involve civilian casualties and to provide civilian expertise in the field of terrorism preparedness, consequence management, disaster response, and protection of critical infrastructure. If the expanded scope of resilience requirements suggested above is accepted, CEPC's responsibilities need to be expanded and more resources will be required. There would be a corresponding shift in its emphasis towards enhancement of national resilience.

7. **Create Forward Resilience Advisory Support Teams.** NATO has periodically used Advisory Support Teams for civilian emergency planning purposes. The resilience commitments made at the Warsaw Summit will require a revitalization and expansion of these Advisory Support Teams. Efforts to build these teams should be accelerated, and consideration should be given to pooling EU and NATO resources for such teams. They might be used to address the highest priority needs, for example in the Baltic states, in Ukraine, and in the western Balkans. Host nations could be encouraged to establish working group-type secretariats to coordinate defense activities with overlapping civil authority and private sector key critical infrastructure functions to enhance national capacity to anticipate, prevent, respond and recover from disruptive scenarios and to provide a key point of contact for Forward Resilience Advisory Support Teams.

8. **Create a NATO Center or NATO/EU Joint Center of Excellence in Resilience**. Such a Center, dedicated specifically to resilience, could serve as a clearing house for good practices. It would be an inexpensive way to share ideas and could be located in a non-NATO member such as Sweden or Finland to make the point that this is an effort that extends beyond traditional defense.

9. **Create "Partnership Programs" for Resilience**. This concept would be modeled on the current U.S. National Guard "State Partnership Program" which now operates in 22 European countries and five Middle Eastern countries. In the first instance, these U.S. National Guard programs might be expanded to focus more on resilience issues. But more ambitiously, national partnerships might be created on a framework nation basis to connect NATO members and NATO partners For example, Italy might serve as a framework nation to develop a resilience partnership with a country in North Africa. Sweden might serve as a framework nation to develop a resilience partnership with a country in eastern Europe. This concept could help to decentralize the resilience-building effort and significantly expand its scope.

10. **Encourage the Establishment of Regional Working Groups.** Host nations could, in addition to creating national working groups as points of contact for Forward Resilience Advisory Support Teams, could establish working groups with like-minded allies and partners in their region to facilitate shared resilience and interoperable efforts. The Nordic and Baltic states, for instance, might consider a regional approach to forward resilience efforts, somewhat similar to such regional mechanisms as Nordic Defense Cooperation (NORDEFCO) or the Southeast European Defense Ministerial.