

Government Communication

2003/04:84

Sweden's cooperation in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) and Partnership for Peace (PfP)

Communication
2003/04:84

The Government submits this Communication to the Riksdag.

Stockholm, 11 March 2004

Marita Ulvskog

Laila Freivalds
(Ministry for Foreign Affairs)

Main contents of the Communication

In this Communication the Government provides an account of the activities in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) and the Partnership for Peace (PfP). The Government also sets out its assessment of the significance of the Partnership to Sweden as well as how Sweden's interests in the future Partnership can best be met.

Main contents of the Communication.....	1
Introduction.....	3
Developments within NATO.....	4
The development and adaptation of NATO to new circumstances ...	4
NATO enlargement.....	6
Cooperation between the EU and NATO	6
Cooperation between NATO and Russia.....	7
Cooperation in EAPC and PfP.....	8
History and principles.....	8
Trends within the Partnership.....	9
Swedish participation in EAPC and PfP activities	11
NATO led PfP operations.....	11
Insight and influence	12
Defence planning, capability development and interoperability	12
NATO's defence planning process.....	12
EAPC/PfP Planning and Review Process (PARP).....	13
Exercises	15
Security policy dialogue and consultations	16
Security-sector reform etc.....	16
Civil emergency planning.....	16
Sweden's presence in NATO structures	17
Activities of the Delegation to NATO.....	17
PfP secondments to NATO's staffs and international secretariat.....	18
The Government's overall assessment	19
Crisis management.....	19
Military and civilian interoperability.....	20
Insight and influence.....	20
Support to security-sector reform	20
Appendix 1.....	21
Appendix 2.....	23
Extract from the minutes of the Cabinet Meeting, 11 March 2004	25

For several years the security policy environment in and around Europe has been characterised by extensive processes of change. Old threats have been replaced by new. Old relationships have been replaced by new. Opportunities for cooperation have increased. As far as NATO is concerned the years after the end of the Cold War have meant far-reaching changes. A central element of this process has been the extensive cooperation programmes, the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) and the Partnership for Peace (PfP). Cooperation within the EAPC forms a framework for PfP cooperation and a forum for consultations between NATO and the Partner countries. The EAPC strengthens the political dimension of the practically oriented cooperation in the PfP, and plays a central part in the efforts to develop this cooperation. The PfP has become particularly important as an instrument for the participating countries when coordinating, preparing and training their forces for peace-keeping operations.

The EAPC and PfP are not independent institutions, but are linked with NATO structures. Cooperation within the EAPC and the PfP takes place on a voluntary basis and in accordance with the principle of self-differentiation, which means that the individual Partner countries decide for themselves to what extent and in what way they wish and are able to participate in the various activities covered by the cooperation. Sweden's participation in EAPC/PfP is based on our policy of military non-alignment..

EAPC and PfP are central to NATO's cooperation with countries that are not members of the Alliance. For some countries the partnership with NATO is a preparation for membership, while for others, such as Sweden and Finland, it constitutes the prime instrument for developing the military and civil interoperability that countries must have in order to be able to contribute to international crisis management and peace support operations. Exercises and the Planning and Review Process strengthen the Partner countries' capacity for international crisis management operations regardless of whether they take place under the auspices of the UN, the EU or NATO

Sweden's membership of PfP is part of our endeavours to promote a pan-European security order. EAPC/PfP is also an instrument for upholding Euro-Atlantic security cooperation in practice. The Swedish core interests within the framework of the Partnership can briefly be described as:

- 1) The need to maintain a high level of military and civil capacity to cooperate in international crisis management operations (interoperability) and to carry out the internationalisation of Swedish forces, including as a troop contributor to peace-support operations.
- 2) The need for influence on the activities we carry out together with NATO in the capacity of Partner country and troop contributor.
- 3) A more general interest in insight into the activities and development of NATO.

The NATO Summit in Prague in 2002 was the start of another new phase in the development of the Alliance, with the main focus of adapting the

organisation to a wider range of threats that also includes terrorism, weapons of mass destruction and fragile states. This will also have implications for cooperation within EAPC and PfP. The summit in Istanbul is expected to take decisions that will give the Partnership a more diversified focus.

This Communication sets out the Government's assessment of the significance of the Partnership to Sweden as well as how Sweden's interests in the future Partnership can best be met.

Developments within NATO

The development and adaptation of NATO to new circumstances

Since the end of the Cold War NATO has undergone a rapid and fundamental transformation. An important part of this process is the various partnerships that NATO has developed with countries that are not members of the organisation. The role of NATO as a defence alliance with mutual security guarantees remains in place. NATO remains the central multilateral body for matters concerning strategic transatlantic relations in the area of security policy. But increasingly the Alliance is also functioning as a platform for broad security policy cooperation focusing on military crisis management. In addition, cooperation in NATO includes a broad security policy dialogue and support to a number of Partner countries for democratisation and institution-building in the area of defence. This support has been provided both as a step towards preparing candidate countries for NATO membership and in the form of support to security sector reform to Partner countries without a membership perspective.

The development of NATO in the 1990s focused both on the challenge of developing a cooperative relationship with countries in the former Warsaw pact, including Russia, and on managing the conflict in former Yugoslavia.

In 1995 NATO intervened to end the fighting in Bosnia and Herzegovina and to facilitate the peace agreement. For the first time, NATO was involved in international crisis management. The NATO-led peace-keeping force IFOR, subsequently SFOR; was NATO's first "out of area" mission (i.e. a mission outside the territories of NATO countries) and has since formed a central component in the efforts of the international community to implement the peace agreement. After many years of efforts by the international community to reach a peaceful solution of the Kosovo issue, developments culminated when it was felt that Milosovic was trying to drive the Kosovar Albanian population out of Kosovo and that their situation was life-threatening. NATO started an air campaign, first against targets in Kosovo but subsequently also in the rest of Serbia and Montenegro. The absence of a decision on military intervention by the UN Security Council made the mission controversial. Since then NATO's long-term involvement in the region as a whole has mainly been manifested through the peace-support operations KFOR and SFOR.

The terror attacks on 11 September 2001 had significant implications for the development of NATO. They caused NATO to activate the collective defence guarantee, article 5 of the Washington Treaty, for the first time ever. This was chiefly seen as a very strong expression of political solidarity – the practical follow-up of the Article 5 decision was very limited.

Then during the Iraq Crisis Article 4 of the Washington Treaty was invoked by Turkey. Under this Article a member country that experiences a threat to its security can request special consultations. NATO decided to take some contingency measures in the event that the conflict spread to Turkish territory. However, the decision was preceded by difficult discussions in NATO, reflecting the tensions prevailing at that time in transatlantic relations. mainly because of the Iraq crisis. The crisis in NATO was serious, but cooperation has largely recovered, with a renewed focus on NATO's role in international crisis management.

The NATO summit in Prague in 2002 opened a new phase in the development of the Alliance, a phase whose main focus is to adapt the organisation in political and military terms to the threats and challenges that have become particularly relevant since 11 September 2001. The Prague summit adopted a reform programme that will be implemented over the next few years and will entail major changes in the capability of NATO and of individual NATO countries

One of the most important reforms is to make the military capabilities of NATO countries more flexible, more usable and better equipped for crisis management operations over long distances. It was decided in Prague that a rapid response force (*NATO Response Force*) with over 20 000 troops, would be fully operational by 2006. An initiative to modernise and strengthen the military capability of European NATO countries (*Prague Capabilities Commitment*) is intended to contribute over time to reduce the military imbalance between Europe and the United States. An initiative was taken to enhance protection against weapons of mass destruction. A reform is being carried out of NATO's military structures to adapt them to an environment in which threats are not territorially predictable and in which NATO must be able to operate with smaller but effective units over long distances. The summit also agreed to study the feasibility of a common missile defence.

A central element of NATO's adaptation to more complex threats is an emerging insight in the Alliance that it must be possible to meet the new threats wherever they arise (i.e. also outside of the territories of NATO countries, or "out of area"). This means that functional rather than territorial points of departure define NATO activities. A step of fundamental importance was the assumption of responsibility for leading the UN mandated peace-keeping force in Afghanistan (ISAF) in August 2003; this also applies to NATO assistance to Poland in exercising its command responsibility for the multinational brigade in one of the sectors in Iraq. Discussions are under way on further involvement in Iraq. This type of NATO contribution to broad multinational peace-support operations will also be one of the main components of the activities of the Alliance in the future. Here benefit is derived from the established military interoperability and the integrated military structure in NATO.

At the same time there is an increasing need for cooperation with other actors, such as the UN, the EU, the OSCE, NGOs and troop-contributing countries. The crisis management mission in Afghanistan has been described by NATO's new Secretary-General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer as an important symbol of the new NATO and the new partnership between troop-contributing countries in EAPC and PfP. Some countries participating in ISAF are not members of either NATO or EAPC/PfP.

At the same time new threats and risks place greater demands on NATO for thorough political consultations before decisions can be taken on action. This is in distinct contrast to the Cold War's more predictable demands on member states. Frictions concerning the Iraq issue during 2003 are a clear illustration of this. Agreement is required in two stages both on the perception of the threat or situation and on suitable action.

NATO enlargement

At the Madrid summit in 1997, NATO opened its door to the membership of countries of the former Warsaw Pact for the first time when it invited Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary to become members of the Alliance. Enlargement took place in March 1999.

At the summit in Istanbul in June 2004 another seven new countries will participate as members of the Alliance – Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia. This means that NATO has completed the second phase of its enlargement process. Another three countries aspire to membership: Albania, Croatia and Macedonia. In addition, some Partner countries in Central Asia and southern Caucasus have made it clear that their long-term objective is full integration in the structures for Euro-Atlantic cooperation, including NATO membership. NATO has made it clear that the "open door" policy still applies – however, no indications have been given about when the next round of enlargement may take place. The indications are that NATO is now entering a relatively long consolidation phase with 26 members.

Enlargement will contribute to the Alliance's continued development towards a broad security policy forum with a wide-ranging security policy agenda. The mutual defence obligations are still in place, but are no longer at the forefront in the same way as during the Cold War. At the same time, it should be noted that the security guarantees have been a crucial driving force for the new members in their membership endeavours.

Cooperation between the EU and NATO

A strategic partnership is developing between the EU and NATO in the area of crisis management. In concrete terms, this involves the development of EU crisis management capability in close cooperation with NATO, the ability for the EU to use NATO resources in crisis management operations and the avoidance of unnecessary duplication. The basic idea is for the two organisations to reinforce one another. Cooperation between the EU and NATO also involves regular

consultations between the secretariats of the two organisations and, at ambassador level, between the EU Political and Security Committee (PSC) and the North Atlantic Council (NAC).

The British-French Saint Malo Declaration of 1998 and the decisions taken at the EU and NATO summits in 1999 and 2000 laid a foundation for the development of European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). One central objective was for the EU to be better able to contribute to the management of crises with civil and military measures through its own crisis management capability and closer relations with NATO. Both the NATO summit in Washington in 1999 and the EU summit in Nice in 2000 confirmed the ambition to ensure EU access to necessary NATO resources when conducting crisis management operations. The principles for how this cooperation would function in practice, the "Berlin plus" arrangements, were finally adopted after protracted negotiations in an agreement between the EU and NATO in March 2003.

On the basis of the Berlin plus agreement the EU started its first crisis management operation in March 2003, Operation Concordia in Macedonia, which replaced the NATO-led peace-support operation in the country. Concordia was concluded in December of the same year and was replaced by a police mission led by the EU.

EU has also begun planning to be able to assume greater responsibility for the peace process in Bosnia and Herzegovina. For example, the EU is making plans to take over from the NATO-led SFOR operation in the country at the end of 2004. This is expected to be the largest crisis management operation under EU leadership and the first EU-led crisis management operation intended to include both civil and military elements at the same time. Cooperation with NATO is assured through the Berlin plus agreement.

Cooperation between NATO and Russia

NATO and Russia have succeeded in making important progress with regard to developing a partnership. The increasingly close relationship is reflected in the NATO Russia Council (NRC), which was established in May 1992 as a reinforcement of the previous forum for cooperation between the parties. The Council is unique in that a country that is not a member of NATO, Russia, participates fully in decision-making here. Thus, in this respect cooperation in the NATO Russia Council is more far-reaching than Partner cooperation in EAPC/PfP. The establishment of the NRC therefore means that Russia can act on a more equal footing in relation to NATO countries. In practice, the NRC has therefore probably contributed to Russia's acceptance of NATO enlargement.

The NRC cooperates on the basis of a broad security policy agenda that involves disarmament and non-proliferation issues, civil and military exercises, peace-support operations, the development of doctrine, training of military officers, combating terrorism, civil emergency planning and defence environment cooperation.

It remains to be seen what potential NRC cooperation will have in the long term, and to what extent Russia and large NATO countries will

choose this forum for security policy cooperation rather than separate bilateral channels. Skr. 2003/04:84

Since 1998, Russia has had diplomatic relations with NATO. Until the summer of 2003 Russia contributed troops to the NATO-led PfP operations SFOR in Bosnia and Herzegovina and KFOR in Kosovo. In February 2001 NATO opened an information office in Moscow.

Cooperation in EAPC and PfP

History and principles

Cooperation in EAPC and PfP has its roots in the initiative taken by NATO after the end of the Cold War to develop a cooperative relationship with the former Warsaw Pact countries. In 1991 a political consultation body NACC (*the North Atlantic Cooperation Council*) was set up, to which all former Warsaw Pact countries were invited. In 1994 the Partnership for Peace (PfP) came into existence, focusing on concrete military and confidence-building security cooperation in Europe. Within its framework NATO and its Partner countries have together tried to improve the capacity for participation in international crisis management, improve rescue services, streamline civil defence and emergency planning as well as strengthen democratic control of the defence sector. For the countries aspiring to membership of NATO the PfP has been a crucial instrument in the preparations for membership. In addition, through its link to the NATO structures in such fields as exercises and defence planning for international crisis management, the PfP has also become the central cooperation body for other participating countries as regards to military interoperability,.

The basic principles of the PfP cooperation, voluntary participation and self-differentiation, mean that each Partner country determines for itself the level of ambition of its cooperation. Thus it is based entirely on voluntary commitments, summarised in an annually updated Individual Partnership Program – IPP. For Sweden it is self-evident that cooperation be based on our policy of military non-alignment. The Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) was established in 1997 to provide a political framework and dimension for PfP cooperation. A total of 46 countries (from April 2004 26 NATO members and 20 Partner countries) participate in EAPC. Within its framework an extensive committee structure has been established – in practice a mirror image of NATO's own structure – in which military, security and defence policy issues are discussed.

EAPC holds annual meetings of foreign and defence ministers in connection with NATO's ministerial meetings. From 2005 annual informal EAPC ministerial meetings will also be introduced. Summit meetings at the level of heads of state and government are usually held in connection with NATO's own summit meetings. EAPC is not a standard setter or decision-making body. Participation in the forms of cooperation and activities adopted is, as has been mentioned, voluntary for the Partner

countries and each Partner country decides for itself the extent to which it wishes to participate in the various components of the cooperation. The decisions as to how cooperation with Partner countries in EAPC/PfP is to take place are, however, NATO's preserve.

Trends within the Partnership

In parallel with the work on change within NATO, for some time now work has been in progress to adapt cooperation within EAPC and PfP to new conditions. The most important of these are the new enlargement round NATO is facing, and the altered threats emerging after 11 September 2001.

The Prague summit in 2002 laid the foundation for such an adaptation of the Partnership. A review was made of the Partnership as a whole and an overriding aim for the future is to gear cooperation more closely to various countries' and country groups' needs and wishes. Such a development is necessary in the light of the entirely different conditions that will apply to the remaining partner countries after the enlargement.

In the progress report adopted at the summit meeting in Prague, NATO agreed to further strengthen participation of EAPC/PfP countries in relevant decision-making processes, as well as review the possibilities of involving Partner countries more closely, more directly and more regularly in NATO's work with regard to Partnership issues. A special Action Plan against Terrorism was also adopted. Together with Finland, Sweden was a strong driving force in the work that led to these decisions in Prague.

At the forthcoming summit in Istanbul further steps are expected to be taken towards a more diversified Partnership, where the contents of the cooperation already differs from country to country. Cooperation with countries in Central Asia and southern Caucasus, as well as those in the Balkans, has a clear focus on security and institution building. The Western European Partner countries have other interests within the Partnership, which are enlarged on more below. EAPC countries Moldavia, Ukraine (which also has its own cooperation format with NATO – the NATO-Ukraine Commission) and Belarus are also countries with their own specific needs and conditions. In addition there are other countries that cooperate with NATO but outside the EAPC/PfP framework. This applies to countries participating in NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue as well as countries that are not part of NATO, EAPC/PfP or the Mediterranean Dialogue, including China and Japan.

The raised ambitions for the cooperation with Central Asia and southern Caucasus is one of the main elements of the discussion concerning the future Partnership. NATO sees close cooperation as a possibility of contributing to stabilisation in an unstable area with non-democratic constitutions and regional conflicts. Another aim is also the active involvement of these countries in the fight against terrorism. The proximity to Afghanistan, where NATO is now entering into an extensive and long-term commitment, is also an argument for increased efforts to develop closer cooperation with these countries. Such cooperation would largely focus on supporting the construction of democratically controlled

defence sectors, as well as institution building in a broader sense. For this purpose, decisions directed specifically at this circle of Partner countries are expected to be adopted in Istanbul. Sweden and other Western European partner countries will also have the opportunity to contribute to this work. The model here is the cooperation between NATO and the countries of Central and Eastern Europe since the middle of the 1990s. In the latter case, however, a fundamental driving force was achieving NATO membership. As regards the countries of Central Asia and southern Caucasus, a couple of them have certainly expressed aspirations to membership, but these would probably in any case be regarded by NATO in a very long-term perspective.

Another feature of the future Partnership is expected to be a further development of cooperation aimed at military interoperability in crisis management. Among the Partner countries this is primarily of interest to Sweden and other Western European partner countries. For NATO it is important to make it easier for the Partner countries to give substantial contributions to NATO-led crisis management. A central consideration here will be to what extent NATO chooses to invite partner countries to participate in the military transformation process started in Prague in 2002. The partner countries' relation to the NATO Response Force, the NRF, is of particular significance for development of interoperability.

The circle of partner countries may be extended. Ahead of the summit meeting in Istanbul NATO is considering the possibility of offering Bosnia and Herzegovina as well as Serbia and Montenegro membership of PfP. The countries' level of cooperation with the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia ICTY and efforts to bring alleged war criminals to trial are central in this context. There is also growing interest for closer cooperation with countries in the Mediterranean Dialogue. This trend is partly associated with the fight against terrorism, and partly with a growing insight that concerted efforts must be made to solve the problems in the Middle East.

Within the framework of the Action Plan against Terrorism that was adopted at the NATO summit in Prague, civil emergency planning has assumed much greater importance, in particular measures to strengthen the protection of the civilian population against the consequences of terrorist actions. Sweden and other Nordic countries have played an active role here. Other areas associated with terrorism that have been given increased attention in the NATO and partnership circle are exchange of intelligence information, air position information, border surveillance and reform of the security sector in a broad sense. The Partnership's role in preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction has also been strengthened. In September 2003 an EAPC seminar on protection of peace-keeping troops and the civilian population against weapons of mass destruction was held in Sweden.

NATO led PfP operations

In the period of less than ten years since Sweden became a member of the Partnership for Peace, international crisis management has partly changed form. A shift in the pattern of conflict towards more internal conflicts, in combination with the new opportunities for action brought by the end of the Cold War, have obliged the international community to develop new and more effective methods of conflict management. The UN has a special role, as the only organisation with a global mandate under the UN Charter to be able to lend legitimacy to military crisis management operations. Swedish participation in international crisis management is based on public international law.

An important prerequisite for coping with the new pattern of conflict has been the contributions that regional security organisations such as NATO/PfP, the EU and ECOWAS have been able to make to operations under the UN mandate.

Sweden has supported the trend towards more regional responsibility for conflict management in support of the UN, mainly by active participation as a partner country in PfP operations in the former Yugoslavia. Already a short time after the Dayton Peace Accord and the Security Council Resolution 1031 (1995) Sweden could thus send a battalion to the International Implementation Force IFOR, later SFOR, in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Since 1999 Sweden, together with thirty or so other NATO and non-allied countries, has taken part in the same way with a mechanised battalion in KFOR in Kosovo. It is important that Sweden can contribute actively in this way to international peace and security. This also promotes Sweden's security.

Another important objective for Sweden's participation in peace-support measures in PfP has been to give the Swedish Armed Forces the opportunity to develop and maintain its capacity for international crisis management in large and complex operations. As stated above (section 3.1), in the 1990s NATO's organisation and procedures developed into an international standard for military interoperability in crisis management. In that way participation in NATO operations as part of the PfP membership has also become very important in allowing Sweden to develop and – sometimes under demanding conditions – test its crisis management capability. At present Sweden is responsible for leading one of the four multinational brigades in KFOR.

In August 2003 NATO's crisis management took an important step when it took over leadership of the UN mandated peace-keeping force in Afghanistan (ISAF). NATO's assumption of command of ISAF means that Sweden, which was already active in ISAF, is participating from the start in the first PfP operation outside Europe and its immediate vicinity. Experience from our participation in international operations contributes to the development of the restructured Swedish Armed Forces, both as regards international assignments and our national defence capability.

A constant Swedish endeavour is to strengthen the insight and influence of Partner countries in activities where they participate and contribute. The formal decision-making authority lies with NATO, and the scope of consultation with Partner countries varies.

A special Political-Military Framework (PMF) regulates the insight and influence of non-allied troop contributors in NATO-led PfP operations. Sweden took an active part in preparing this framework. It gives access to relevant documents, the opportunity to submit viewpoints and influence planning and implementation of operations as well as participation in consultations with NATO countries concerning the operations. Planning of Swedish contributions to NATO-led crisis management is thereby considerably facilitated. The principles of the PMF have won wide acceptance and the insight and influence of non-allies has successively improved.

The Swedish Delegation at the NATO headquarters is important for Sweden's opportunities for insight and influence in EAPC and PfP cooperation (see also point 5.1). Another opportunity for insight into NATO's activities is when the Partner countries put staff at the disposal of NATO's military structures, known as Partner Staff Elements. These Partner officers serve on NATO's staff on assignments concerning the PfP (see also item 5.2).

Defence planning, capability development and interoperability

NATO plays a central role in defence planning and in developing interoperability capability in international peace-support missions. Through Sweden's membership of the PfP we can participate in this work on the basis of self-differentiation. The defence planning exercises within PfP are a means for the Swedish armed forces to establish interoperability and develop their international crisis management capability. This experience also contributes to developing the Swedish Armed Forces' national capability.

NATO's defence planning process

NATO's defence planning process has long been and still is the hub of NATO's defence cooperation. NATO's level of ambition and force requirements are determined through the process and the NATO countries are thereafter expected to contribute military units to meet these needs. During the Cold War it was a mechanical process in which the threats were clear and the level of ambition simpler to determine. In addition, NATO countries were expected to contribute all their defence resources in the event of a crisis or war.

The conditions applying to the defence planning process have changed as a result of the changed security policy situation and as a result of the requirements for new capabilities imposed by crisis management operations outside the NATO countries' territories. The lack of key capabilities has been identified through the defence planning process but

this has not resulted in sufficient inclination on the part of the individual NATO countries to contribute the necessary resources to make good the deficiencies. National priorities have continued to steer the individual NATO countries' defence planning. The gap between NATO's level of ambition and available resources has therefore resulted in initiatives such as the *Prague Capabilities Commitment* (see section 2.1). The hope expressed within NATO is that initiatives at a high political level will force reforms and new capabilities, as well as an increased degree of role division and niche capabilities.

In preparation for the summit in Istanbul a review is being made of NATO's defence planning process for the purpose of increasing the political pressure on NATO members to contribute the capabilities and units that the organisation believes it needs to meet the changed threats.

NATO's defence planning process also aims at securing interoperability. Interoperability will be achieved by the allies guaranteeing through the defence planning process that the units to be used for NATO operations fulfil NATO's standards.

Standardisation and improvement of equipment are central areas for NATO's capability development and interoperability within the Alliance. The standardisation activities act as a guide for processes, systems, functions and equipment. NATO's standards also act as references for Swedish military norms. NATO's standardisation organisation has also started cooperation with and coordination of civil standardisation activities. Research and technology development activities are a sub-function in the field of equipment development. The defence industry is also involved in these activities.

NATO's defence planning process, as well as the PfP activities, have been assigned a central role in the EU's military capability efforts. EU-NATO cooperation in this area is aimed at ensuring transparency and coherence between the organisations' planning as regards capacity. The cooperation between the EU and NATO helps avoid unnecessary duplication of capabilities at present available for military crisis management, as well as imposing the same requirements regarding interoperability on units listed for both the EU and NATO.

EAPC/PfP Planning and Review Process (PARP)

Partner countries do not take part in NATO's defence planning process. In 1994 the Planning and Review Process – PARP – was created instead to give Partners access to those parts of the process that are aimed at interoperability. PARP gives Sweden and other Partner countries access to standards and can thus develop units that can be used effectively in international crisis management operations whether they are led by the UN, the EU or NATO. Participation in PARP, as other parts of the Partnership cooperation, is on a voluntary basis.

The main purpose of PARP is to improve interoperability for the units that the Partner countries can put at the disposal of NATO-led peace-support operations. PARP has been an integrated part of Swedish defence planning for several years and has a wider application than for the units being prepared for international operations. NATO's staff organisation

principles, for example, are generally applied in the Swedish Armed Forces.

At present Sweden has accepted 63 partnership goals that cover marine, air and army units. The partnership goals include staff personnel for civilian-military cooperation, two mechanised infantry battalions, a military police company, an engineer company with ammunition and mine-clearance capability, a submarine unit, a corvette unit, a marine mine clearing unit, an airborne unit JAS 39 Gripen for reconnaissance and air defence, a radio intelligence aircraft S-102B and an air transport unit.

It should be emphasised that participation in PARP does not mean that the country must automatically put units at NATO's disposal. Decisions concerning involvement of armed troops in a crisis management or peace-support operation are made in each individual case by the country in question. This applies to both Partner countries and NATO countries. A decision that Sweden should contribute armed troops to a NATO-led operation would be preceded by a decision in the Riksdag.

The customary consultations between NATO and Sweden take place in the spring of 2004 concerning the adoption of new goals or changes in existing ones. The upcoming defence decision will influence the forms these consultations take.

Apart from the fact that PARP is the only existing process for developing international interoperability of units it is an important instrument for increased transparency. Extensive information is provided about the Partner countries' defence planning and as a result of this exchange PARP has a confidence building effect. The PARP dialogue is a bilateral process between NATO and the individual Partner country but as of a couple of years ago it has been possible to invite all the Partner countries involved in PARP to observe or take active part in the consultations. This provides a good insight into other countries' defence planning and is a positive spin off from PARP. Sweden has made use of the possibility of increased transparency by inviting other EU Member States that are militarily non-aligned to our consultations with NATO.

There is a strong connection between PARP and the EU's growing military capability efforts. NATO's defence planning and review process or the PARP should not be duplicated by the EU; both organisations' defence planning for international crisis management operations should take place transparently to avoid conflicting planning signals. Furthermore, the EU will not develop its own standards: interoperability between the EU Member States' units is to be secured through NATO's standardisation work. A consequence of this will be that the units listed in the EU's Helsinki Force Catalogue are to be interoperable through PARP.

An important Swedish interest is that PARP will continue to be able to meet Sweden's needs for improved capacity for military cooperation with other countries. The process has no equivalent anywhere else at present, and is therefore of fundamental importance for Sweden's ability to participate in international crisis management. This also applies from an EU perspective.

Sweden has been participating in international exercises for a long time. This participation has been aimed at training Swedish capabilities for international crisis management and has also indirectly contributed to our national defence capability. In addition, participation has been aimed at training joint capabilities in international marine and air safety together with other countries.

Swedish involvement in international peace support activities constitutes an important part of our security, foreign and defence policies. In order to be able to participate in international peace-support and humanitarian operations, Sweden must have a high level of international interoperability. Hence, since 1990 exercises aimed at peace-support have played an increasingly dominant role in the exercises of the Swedish Armed Forces. Sweden's participation in international training exercises is of crucial importance for developing the capacity for international interoperability.

A number of factors will contribute to future changes in the international range of exercises. These include the enlargement of NATO, the new military command structure of the Alliance and the establishment of the NATO Response Force, NRF. NATO has previously offered a large range of exercises specially created for PfP, the Cooperative exercises. In the light of the above factors, it is reasonable to assume that there will be fewer Cooperative exercises in the future.

At the same time international developments and NATO's ongoing restructuring imply an increased need for NATO to train for international crisis management rather than collective defence. For that reason a change is taking place in exercise patterns and contents of NATO exercises. NATO has opened a number of its restructured exercises for Partner countries, provided that certain quality criteria are met. In the long term, after completing the restructuring referred to above, it is expected that NATO will open up most of its exercises to Partners.

This development within NATO coincides with Sweden's need to be able to train for the full range of crisis management operations, even those that are more demanding, within the framework of the EU's "Petersberg Tasks". The EU does not carry out any troop exercises with units, only staff exercises at a high military and political level.

The Government considers that, on the basis of Swedish needs, as also reported previously to the Riksdag in the Government bill 2003/04:1, the Budget Bill for 2004, volume 5, Expenditure Area 6; Defence and contingency measures, the Swedish Armed Forces may participate in those NATO exercises that are open to PfP countries and consistent with our policy of military non-alignment Swedish participation with troops and groups in international exercises shall be determined by the Government in each individual case.

An ongoing security policy dialogue is taking place within the framework of EAPC. A major part of the consultations are devoted to military crisis management and interoperability between Allies and Partner countries. Questions as to how the practical cooperation can be developed take up considerable time, but some questions of a more general security policy interest are also discussed. EAPC is an important forum for gathering and exchanging information between NATO and the Partner countries. With its broad membership and extensive agenda, EAPC makes important contributions to the Euro-Atlantic security order and to a vital transatlantic link. Active Russian participation in EAPC/PfP is also of particular interest to Sweden.

Security-sector reform etc.

For several years, NATO/PfP has had an instrument for security-sector reform support to Partner countries in the southern Caucasus, Central Asia and the Western Balkans, where several countries are undergoing far-reaching defence reforms. Within the framework of NATO/PfP's Trust Funds, efforts are taking place in these countries to destroy mines and armaments, as well as to conduct environmentally adapted clearance and conversion of former military bases for civilian purposes. In the past year NATO/PfP has set up Trust Funds for projects in Georgia and Azerbaijan. Sweden has contributed to the PfP Trust Fund project for destroying ammunition in Georgia and earlier to a similar project in Albania.

Swedish authorities also make substantial annual contributions to PfP cooperation by arranging seminars, courses, training and exercises that are open to participants from all EAPC countries. The Swedish Armed Forces International Centre Swedint has been a PfP Training Centre since 1997. The extensive Swedish contribution to PfP cooperation gives Sweden the opportunity to spread knowledge and experience.

Civil emergency planning

The EAPC and PfP is the only forum that offers the possibility of integrated discussion and coordination of the 46 countries' civilian emergency planning. The civilian cooperation with NATO constitutes a substantial and concrete part of the Swedish EAPC/PfP cooperation. The civilian cooperation is the part of EAPC cooperation in which the Partner countries are most integrated and have the greatest chances of exerting influence.

CEP (*Civil Emergency Planning*) in NATO covers civil emergency planning in a wide sense. CEP within NATO has developed in the past ten years from having been a civilian resource in support of the military to being a relatively high priority activity with very extensive Partner cooperation.

After the terrorist attacks in the USA on 11 September 2001 civil emergency planning cooperation within NATO has acquired a clearer focus. An action plan for civil emergency planning against weapons of mass destruction has been drawn up. Its purpose is to improve the capacity to protect the civilian population against weapons of mass destruction. Within the framework of this action plan, Norway, Sweden and Finland are promoting a project to draw up minimum standards for emergency planning against weapons of mass destruction.

Ever since Sweden joined EAPC/PfP civilian cooperation with NATO has played an important part. Several Swedish authorities are involved and participate in working groups and committees. The Swedish authorities that have experts on NATO's civilian committees include the Swedish Rescue Services Agency, the Swedish Emergency Management Agency, the Swedish Maritime Administration, the Swedish Civil Aviation Administration, the Swedish Board of Agriculture, the National Food Administration, the National Post and Telecom Agency, the National Board of Health and Welfare, the National Road Administration and the Swedish National Rail Administration. The Swedish authorities are active and every year arrange a number of courses and seminars open to all the 46 Partner countries.

NATO is one of few organisations that perform international civilian rescue service exercises. Sweden's participation in planning and implementation of the exercises has been extensive. At present there is discussion on how these exercises can be developed and improved.

One of the most important instruments for NATO's civilian activities is the EADRCC - *Euro Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre*. Put simply, this is a coordination centre with the capacity to coordinate resources from all the 46 countries. From the time the centre was established in 1998 and until 2002 Sweden had staff on secondment to the centre on a permanent basis.

NATO's cooperation with the UN in this area functions well. The UN/OCHA has staff at the EADRCC, which contributes to the cooperation between NATO and the UN. NATO regularly invites other organisations such as the WHO, IAEA, OPCW and EU to seminars and to the civilian rescue service exercises.

Both the EU and NATO have an established structure for civil emergency planning and extensive activities in these areas. Cooperation between the EU and NATO is still relatively undeveloped. Contacts take place at secretariat level and the organisations have informed each other concerning such matters as measures to increase protection against weapons of mass destruction.

Sweden's presence in NATO structures

Activities of the Delegation to NATO

At the NATO summit in Madrid in 1997 Partner countries were invited to appoint ambassadors to NATO and to establish delegations at NATO Headquarters in Brussels, which Sweden did in May 1998. In addition,

Sweden has a national liaison officer at SHAPE, the strategic operative headquarters, in Mons, Belgium.

Today nine officials with civilian and military competence from the Ministry for Foreign Affairs and the Ministry of Defence serve at the Swedish Delegation. Formally the Delegation is part of the Swedish Embassy in Brussels and it has its office in the premises of Partner countries adjacent to NATO Headquarters. Since 2003 the functions as bilateral ambassador to Belgium and permanent representative to NATO (NATO Ambassador) have been split between two officials.

The activities of the Delegation include representing Sweden in various EAPC committees, maintaining contacts with the secretariat concerning Swedish contributions to NATO-led operations, monitoring NATO's own development, ongoing contacts with the delegations of other NATO and Partner countries and a large-scale information service for Swedish visitors (including the Government Offices, government agencies, the political parties, interest organisations, universities and upper secondary schools).

PfP secondments to NATO's staffs and international secretariat

In 1997 NATO invited Partner countries to make officers available for service in several NATO military staffs and in its international secretariat. The form this takes is that the officers are put at the disposal of NATO as international officers; this means that they do not have a formal role as liaison officers for their home countries. This is the same principle as is applied for the officers from NATO countries who man the Alliance's permanent command structure. The role of the PfP officers is to work together with NATO officers on matters directly related to the Partnership cooperation. In this way Partner officers learn NATO's working methods and can spread this knowledge when they return to their home countries after completing their service, thereby promoting interoperability.

Sweden has welcomed, and made use of, NATO's offer to place officers in NATO's military staffs who work on PfP-related matters and international crisis management.

Up to now the officers have served in special "cells", known as *Partnership Staff Elements* (PSE), that are grouped in these staffs. In order to further enhance the opportunities for Partner officers to contribute to the work, consideration is being given ahead of the summit in Istanbul to how the forms for cooperation can be developed to better integrate Partner country officers in these staffs.

Since the PSE concept was established some 20 Swedish officers have served in this kind of post. At present six officers are serving in various NATO staffs. The intention is for officers who have completed their service abroad to be placed in positions in staffs and colleges in Sweden where the knowledge they have gained can benefit the Swedish Armed Forces.

It is also possible to make staff available for service in the international secretariat at NATO Headquarters to work on matters related to the Partnership. These officials are placed at the disposal of NATO as

international personnel and, like the staff officers, they have no formal national role. Sweden has made use of this possibility on several occasions. Skr. 2003/04:84

The Government's overall assessment

The Government's assessment:

The Government attaches great importance to cooperation in EAPC/PfP and considers that Sweden should continue to work for close and comprehensive cooperation with NATO that is in accordance with our security policy, that meets Swedish interests and that does not include mutual defence obligations. For the future it is a central Swedish interest that the substance of cooperation in EAPC/PfP continues to be such that this cooperation can contribute to an enhanced Swedish capability to take part in international crisis management.

Reasons for the Government's assessment:

Today Sweden has close and broad cooperation with NATO on the basis of our policy of military non-alignment.. This cooperation has two dimensions. One is membership of EAPC/PfP, which also includes the NATO-led crisis management operations that Sweden participates in. The other is cooperation between the EU and NATO, including the EU-led operations where NATO's resources and command structures are used; in these cases Sweden participates in its capacity as an EU Member State.

Sweden's membership of EAPC and PfP should also be viewed in a broader perspective. EAPC/PfP is part of the efforts to promote a pan-European security order. Membership extends from North America to Central Asia. This cooperation is also an instrument for upholding the Euro-Atlantic security system in practice and a vital transatlantic link.

EAPC/PfP is part of the NATO system and the only cooperation forum that enables countries outside NATO to participate in activities and cooperation areas that are run under the auspices of NATO.

Swedish interests within the framework of EAPC/PfP can be summarised as follows.

Crisis management

EAPC/PfP is the principal instrument for participating in NATO-led peace-support operations as a non-NATO country. For several years Sweden has taken part in crisis management operations under NATO command. By contributing to these operations Sweden is helping to promote international peace and security and thereby also our own security. Sweden is commanding a brigade in the NATO-led operation in Kosovo and is participating in the NATO-led missions in Bosnia and Afghanistan. Experience from our participation in international operations contributes to the development of the restructured Armed Forces, as regards both international assignments and our national defence capability.

The Swedish defence system needs to maintain a high level of military capability to cooperate in international crisis management operations. In the areas of civil emergency planning and disaster relief Sweden also has considerable cooperation with NATO within the framework of EAPC/PfP. It is therefore a vital Swedish interest that partnership in EAPC/PfP can fulfil our needs of developing military and civilian capability to cooperate with other countries in crisis management. Defence planning in the planning and review process, civilian and military exercises and standardisation work are central components in this context. The process has no equivalent anywhere else at present, and is therefore of fundamental importance for Sweden's capability to participate in international crisis management. This also applies from an EU perspective.

Exercises are also of great importance for our national defence capability. To meet the future need of exercises the Government considers that Sweden can participate in the part of NATO's exercise activities that is open to PfP countries and that is consistent with our policy of military non-alignment. Swedish participation with units and groups in international exercises shall be determined by the Government.

Insight and influence

Sweden also has a fundamental interest in being able to continue to exercise influence on the activities in which we cooperate with NATO, not least the crisis management operations we participate in, and to have insight into the work of NATO. Through EAPC/PfP Sweden participates continuously in consultations on the operations that Swedes are participating in and on other PfP-related activities. Sweden also participates actively in the multilateral security policy dialogue on important issues that is conducted within the framework of EAPC. A consistent Swedish endeavour is to strengthen the insight and influence of non-allied troop contributors prior to and during operations. It is also important to follow up the decision of the Prague summit to improve the participation of Partner countries in decision processes on EAPC/PfP issues.

Support to security-sector reform

In addition to the crisis management operations being undertaken to stabilise the situation in the Western Balkans and Afghanistan, NATO has developed a programme for security-enhancing support to Partner countries in the Western Balkans, southern Caucasus and Central Asia. Sweden has made certain contributions. Sweden's participation in this cooperation on security sector reform remains important. As part of an intensification of Sweden's contribution to security-sector reform efforts in these regions Sweden should be able to contribute to security sector reform within the framework of PfP, where NATO's special expertise can be used.

Abbreviations:

Skr. 2003/04:84

Bilaga 1

CEP	Civil Emergency Planning
CFE	Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE) Agreement)
EADRCC	Euro-Atlantic Disaster Response Coordination Centre
EAPC	Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council
ECOWAS	The Economic Community of West African States
EU	European Union
FYROM	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia
IFOR	Implementation Force (NATO-led peace- keeping force in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Predecessor of SFOR.)
IPP	Individual Partnership Programme
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force (NATO-led force in Afghanistan)
KFOR	Kosovo Force (NATO-led force in Kosovo)
NAC	North Atlantic Council
NACC	North Atlantic Cooperation Council (predecessor of EAPC)
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation
NRC	NATO-Russia Council

NUC	NATO-Ukraine Commission (NATO's special partnership with Ukraine)	Skr. 2003/04:84 Bilaga 1
OSCE	Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe	
PARP	Planning and Review Process	
PfP	Partnership for Peace	
PMF	Political Military Framework	
PSC	Political and Security Committee	
SFOR	Stabilisation Force (NATO-led peace-keeping force in Bosnia and Herzegovina)	
UN	United Nations	
UN/OCHA	United Nations - Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian affairs	
WHO	World Health Organisation	

EAPC's 46 participating states

Albania
Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Belarus
Belgium
Bulgaria
Canada
Croatia
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
Finland
France
Georgia
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Kazakhstan
Kyrgyz Republic
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Macedonia (Former Yugoslav
Republic of Macedonia,
fYROM)
Moldova
Netherlands
Norway
Poland
Portugal
Romania

Russia
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Tajikistan
Turkey
Turkmenistan
Ukraine
United Kingdom
United States
Uzbekistan

Ministry for Foreign Affairs

Extract from the minutes of the Cabinet Meeting, 11 March 2004

Present: [*Minister Ulvskog, Chair, and Ministers Freivalds, Sahlin, Pagrotsky, Messing, Engqvist, Lövdén, Ringholm, Bodström, Sommestad, Karlsson, Lund, Andnor, Johansson, Hallengren, Björklund, Holmberg, Jämtin*]

Minister responsible: Freivalds

The Government adopts Communication 2003/04:84 Account of the activities in the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council (EAPC) and the Partnership for Peace (PfP).