

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

7 June 2010

PO(2010)0074-REV2
Silence Procedure ends:
8 June 2010 18:00

To: Permanent Representatives (Council)

From: Secretary General

Subject: **Recommendations from the Deputy Permanent Representatives' Group on Committee Review**

1. You will find attached the latest version of the Committee Review paper. The attached paper is identical to the version that was circulated on 3 June 2010.

2. Final recommendations for Council approval on an Arms Control Committee, including its chairmanship arrangements and internal structure, will be made by the Deputies Committee, with Council approval to be sought no later than 15 July 2010.

3. Taking into account the advice of the Military Committee, I would like to ask for your formal approval of this paper. Assuming that there is no break of silence, the new committee structure will come into effect on Monday, 14 June 2010. **If I do not hear to the contrary by close of business on Tuesday 8 June 2010, I will assume that you have agreed the attached report.**



Anders Fogh Rasmussen

9: Annexes

Original: English

NATO UNCLASSIFIED

-1-



HEADQUARTERS REFORM - COMMITTEE REVIEW

REPORT TO THE COUNCIL

Background

1. The committee review process has included both an in-depth examination of the existing committee structure and the establishment of best practices to help guide committee work. It has been led by Deputy Permanent Representatives.

2. In early 2009, an initial examination of the committees contained within the committee database revealed a number of committees that were dormant and were subsequently removed from the committee structure. A set of questions were then drawn up to facilitate an in-depth review of the committee structure. These included for example whether a committee was the only one dealing with an issue, whether its products engaged all relevant players and whether a committee needed to be permanent. Every active committee responded to this questionnaire, and upon that basis the former Secretary General's Special Representative drew up a detailed set of recommendations for changes.

3. The Deputy Permanent Representatives Group on Committee Review has examined these recommendations, as well as others which have been brought forward during the process. These final recommendations are included in the annexes, and are grouped according to the functions primarily performed.

Objectives

4. Based on guidance given by the Council in December 2009, the objectives of the review included:

- to ensure the provision of improved advice to the Council;
- to ensure that committee work can help deliver the overall value expected by NATO of its Headquarters, including the ability to deliver on priorities and objectives established at Summit and Ministerial meetings;
- to provide an examination of the value that individual committees deliver and how their work should best be taken forward;
- to reduce fragmentation of issues and propose a more rational structure;
- to clarify the committee structure;
- to enable more efficient use of International Staff and International Military Staff resources without increasing overall personnel numbers;

Outcomes

5. As part of this review, the Deputy Permanent Representatives have identified the different types of bodies which together make up the overall committee structure. *Policy committees* have a direct working relationship with the Council. They play a policy development and advice role, which eventually leads to a Council approved policy or provides the basis for informed consultations at the Council. *Working Groups or sub-committees* directly support the policy committees and meet as necessary. *Capability Development Groups* exist to develop capabilities, in different areas, for the Alliance. They do not seek to develop policy advice or to relate directly to the Council - they share information, and develop standards and capabilities. All are actively governed by their parent committees (see Annex 8). *Panels* provide technical or scientific expertise in a specific area and are directly governed by a parent body.

6. The key outcomes of this committee review process include:

- The Committee structure has been simplified and lead responsibilities identified, allowing the Council to demand more accountability from its committee structure;
- Greater coherence has been introduced across policy areas, with links established between previously isolated pockets of work conducted on the same subject, while lead responsibilities have been assigned to ensure the effective management of work taken forward;
- The committee structure should be better able to produce an integrated and swift response to Council taskings;
- The number of committees with which the Council may need to interact has been reduced;
- The number of committees and working groups has been substantially reduced, with a total reduction of 50%. When the review began, NATO had 413 committees in its committee database. With the deletion of dormant committees or staff only formats, 84 were removed from the database. With the implementation of the attached recommendations, there are 80 policy committees and working groups; 116 Capability Development Groups and 7 Panels. Of the policy committees, 22 report directly to the Council (see Annex 9.)
- A set of review processes have been put into place to identify additional synergies which should further reduce the number of committees in the structure.

7. A series of best practice documents to help guide committee work have been promulgated by Council. They cover committee procedures, use of information technology to support committees, and best practices for supervisory and lead committees.

Way ahead

8. One year after their implementation, the Deputies Committee should review these changes and make any additional recommendations to the Council. This review should include an examination of how the best practice guidelines have been integrated into the work of committees. Any new working groups or sub-committees which need to be created in the future should include either a time or task limited sunset clause in their terms of reference. The Council may wish to task the Deputies Committee to conduct further reviews of these changes and the committee structure.

9. Changes in this document affect the terms of reference of many committees. To avoid the need for the Council to agree amended terms of reference for each individual committee, these changes should simply be appended to a committee's existing mandate and take precedence over any previous decisions.

SENIOR POLICY ADVICE GROUPS

DEPUTY PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES

1. The Group examined the various formats under which they as Deputy Permanent Representatives engage. They consider that it would be beneficial to have one title for their group which would capture the breadth of work undertaken and highlight their engagement on issues because of their role as Deputy Permanent Representatives. To better reflect this and simplify the current structure, the Council agrees:

- 1.1 Deputies should meet as the “Deputies Committee” to cover cross-cutting issues, and all other formats which currently cover their work can be deleted;
- 1.2 that while opportunities for informal high-level consultations bringing together Allied delegations as well as staff from capitals remain important, such consultations should be held in the form of symposiums. The Atlantic Policy Advisory Group therefore no longer needs to be considered as part of the committee structure.

POLITICAL AND PARTNERSHIP ISSUES

2. In order to further enhance NATO's partnership policies, the internal management structure on partnerships has been improved. A myriad of senior committees were managing different partnership policy issues. Under SG(2010)0259, the Council established the Political and Partnerships Committee (PPC) as the new single politico-military committee to manage partnerships. In addition to its partnerships responsibilities, the PPC would also deal with all issues currently handled by the Political Committee, as well as some of those currently managed by the Senior Political Committee. It would also handle NATO's relations with other International Organisations.

DEFENCE POLICY

3. On the committees dealing with defence and defence policy issues, the Group recommends consolidation of existing work as well as renaming of existing bodies to better describe their work. The Council agrees that:

- 3.1 The Council, both in Permanent Session and in Defence Ministers' format, will continue to address the full range of defence and defence planning issues on a regular basis. Taking that into account, the Defence Planning Committee can be dissolved;
- 3.2 with the evolution of NATO's defence planning process, the Defence Review Committee can also be dissolved and its work taken over by the Executive Working Group (Reinforced);

- 3.3 the Executive Working Group, including its reinforced format, therefore becomes the key committee working in this area. To better describe its work, as well as capture the breadth of issues with which it is charged, it should be renamed the “Defence Policy and Planning Committee” and will report directly to the Council.

WMD PROLIFERATION

4. Allies agree that political and defence efforts to tackle WMD proliferation constitute a vital part of NATO’s agenda, and that the importance of these efforts will continue to grow. Different aspects of these efforts are currently taken forward by different committees. Greater synergy of effort from all relevant disciplines, leading to a more integrated approach will be an important part of ensuring NATO’s ability to meet the WMD proliferation challenges. However, any changes to the committee structure must ensure that all strands of current work continue to be taken forward and that no elements are lost, and that nations continue to engage actively and at a senior level in this area. To enable a more integrated approach to be taken forward, the Council agrees that:
- 4.1 To combine the work of the Senior Politico-Military Group on Proliferation and the Senior Defence Group on Proliferation into the “Committee on Proliferation.” The Joint Committee on Proliferation, which met periodically to draw together the work of the two current groups, should be dissolved.
- 4.2 The new committee, as the single policy development focal point, will work closely with other bodies active in the proliferation area as well as with partners.
- 4.3 When reporting to Ministers is necessary, reports from the Committee on Proliferation would be submitted in parallel to both Foreign and Defence Ministers, in line with established practice.
- 4.4 The new Committee on Proliferation will be chaired by the International Staff when discussing politico-military aspects of proliferation, and by national co-chairs based on the current arrangements in the Senior Defence Group on Proliferation, when discussing defence-related issues.

OPERATIONS POLICY

5. The current Policy Coordination Group advises the Council on the range of operational policy issues. At present, it spends the bulk of its time working on Afghanistan-related issues. While it is the primary policy advice committee on Afghanistan, it is not the only body working on these issues. All the various strands of policy eventually converge at the Council, but there is merit in ensuring that all relevant aspects of issues are comprehensively considered before they reach the Council. This also applies to work on all Operations. In order to promote greater coherence on Afghanistan and all other operational issues, the Council agrees that:

- 5.1 To better reflect its role, the Policy Coordination Group should be renamed the Operations Policy Committee (OPC);
- 5.2 the Operations Policy Committee will meet as a political-military body and should seek to enhance collaboration between the political and military sides of the Headquarters; it will continue to meet in troop-contributing formats.
- 5.3 the committee should play a leading and coordinating role on operations related policy development and implementation. Its objective should be to ensure that the Council is provided with coherent and timely advice.
- 5.4 While the Council will often wish to specifically task the Operations Policy Committee to integrate strands of work, it should seek to pro-actively interact with other committees and bodies working on operational issues to ensure that all relevant factors, in particular resource considerations, are taken into account;
- 5.5 Individual committees will continue to work on issues related to operations which fall within their respective areas of expertise, so that for example resource questions are addressed taking into account overall resource prioritisation needs. These committees should take forward such issues in coordination with the Operations Policy Committee;
- 5.6 As the leading body on Afghanistan, the Committee would regularly provide comprehensive political-military updates to the Council and would follow-up on the implementation of the CSPMP. In accordance with decisions taken by the Council on the new Political and Partnerships committee, the Operations Policy Committee will take over direct responsibility for the Afghanistan Cooperation Programme.

ECONOMICS

6. Many of the key policy issues dealt with by NATO have an important economic dimension - from NATO's engagement in Afghanistan through to the financing of terrorism networks. The Economic Committee which currently addresses these issues is supported by an extensive network of experts from Allied capitals, including economic intelligence experts, and experts from relevant international organizations. To ensure that economic expertise made available to the Alliance can best be integrated into the Alliance's policy-making process, the Council agrees that:

- 6.1 A network of economic experts, both from Allied capitals and from other international organizations, must be maintained and strengthened;
- 6.2 Economic expertise should be fed directly into policy discussions in NATO committees to ensure that critical economic aspects are considered in their proper context;
- 6.3 The Political Affairs and Security Policy Division, which both provides economic expertise and will be responsible for maintaining the network of experts, should pro-actively liaise with committee chairmen to ensure that economic aspects are fully taken into account. The Emerging Security Challenges Division will be responsible for supporting work on Energy Security;
- 6.4 Based on the above, the Economic Committee can be dissolved and its work transferred to the relevant policy committees. For example, economic intelligence issues would be dealt with by the Civilian Intelligence Committee in response to the Council-agreed list of intelligence requirements; the Operations Policy Committee should take over responsibility for work on the “Afghan First” policy; while the Deputies Committee will continue to take forward its leading role on Energy Security, in conjunction with the Political and Partnerships committee as necessary. The International Staff will produce a yearly list of priorities to ensure that economic expertise can be most usefully integrated into the Alliance’s policy-making process. This list of priorities should be discussed by the Political and Partnerships Committee.
- 6.5 To allow for in-depth preparation of economic inputs into discussions, the International Staff will, as necessary, call together a working group of economic experts, to include both Allied experts and experts from international organizations.

AIR DEFENCE

7. The NATO Air Defence Committee is the senior multinational policy advisory and co-ordinating body reporting to the NAC regarding all elements of NATO air defence and relevant air power aspects. The NATO Air Defence Committee is supported by two working level bodies: the Panel on Air Defence and the Air Defence Representatives. In order to streamline the structure in this area, Council agrees that:
 - 7.1 Only one working level body is necessary. Details will be decided by the NADC.
 - 7.2 The MCWG(Air Defence) and the NADC should interact closely, as necessary.

RESOURCES

1. Since late 2009, NATO bodies have been engaged in an intensive review of Alliance resource management processes. Reforms already agreed and others still under deliberation are aimed at attaining the necessary balance between requirements and resources, as well as enhancing resource management processes to improve accountability, responsibility, transparency, and efficiency; to better integrate financial decision making, particularly with regard to the Military Budget and the NATO Security Investment Programme (NSIP); and to ensure that resource implications are fully taken into account in Council decisions.

2. While existing budgets (civil budget, military budget, NATO Security Investment Programme) need to be kept distinct, there is a need to rationalise the structure of resource committees to ensure greater accountability, transparency and integration of budgetary decisions. A new resource committee structure should be informed by the results of the ongoing resource reform initiatives and help facilitate their implementation. To that end, Council agrees that:

2.1 A resource committee structure should be created to oversee and manage all NATO resources to include the Civil Budget, the Military Budget, the NSIP and manpower. Its objective should be to ensure that the Council is provided with coherent and timely resource advice. There are different possible models to achieve this, for example:

2.1.1 One model foresees the Senior Resource Board as the senior resource policy body. The Civil Budget and the Military Budget Committee would be merged into a single Budget Committee and the MCWG(Manpower) would be moved under the Senior Resource Board. In this model, the Infrastructure Committee would continue as a separate committee reporting to the Senior Resource Board;

2.1.2 Another model foresees a resource policy board as the senior resource policy body. In a first phase, the Civil Budget and the Military Budget Committee would be merged into a single Budget Committee and the MCWG(Manpower) would be moved under a resource policy board. In a subsequent phase, the Infrastructure Committee would be merged with this Budget Committee into a combined implementation committee;

2.1.3 Another model foresees the creation of a single Resource Committee which would play the leading and coordinating role on all resources including policy development and implementation. Given the distinct resource management functions to be performed, the Resource Committee could meet in different formats to address budgets, on implementation of military capabilities funded from the NSIP, and on manpower;

2.1.4 A further model foresees the passage from the current structure to a new one in which there would be only two committees dealing with military and civilian resources respectively. These two committees would examine relevant budgets with a global overview of planning policy aspects and implementation outputs and should report to the Council.

- 2.2 Final recommendations for Council approval on a resource committee structure should be made by the Deputies Committee following the review of resource reform initiatives at the June 2010 Defence Ministers' meeting, with Council approval to be sought no later than 15 July 2010. Other factors to be considered in reaching a final decision include the relation of the resource committee structure with the NATO Office of Resources and the IMS Resource Staff; the means by which the Military Committee would receive resource support; committee chairmanship (one possibility is that the Chairs should be elected by nations but, as a guarantee of independence during the mandate, should have international status); and the general objective of the committee review process to reduce the overall number of committees throughout NATO.
- 2.3 Pending these changes, the three existing working groups of national technical experts which provide support to the NATO Office of Resources and the implementing committees can be amalgamated.
- 2.4 Given that various Military Committee groups work on different aspects of manpower issues, the NATO Defence Manpower committee and its working group can be dissolved with their work subsumed by the MCWG(Manpower).
3. The Advisory Group of Financial Counsellors (AGFC) considers issues of financial regulation and human resources management on a NATO-wide basis. In doing so, it reports directly to the Council. In practice the Council is unable to provide much active guidance, so its work is undertaken with little supervision. The human resources issues with which it deals have strategic impact that go beyond budgetary and regulatory matters. Their importance calls for senior level involvement in a forum that is able to connect the goals that Allies set for the Alliance with the policies guiding how the International Staff should function in order to help reach those goals. This active involvement of Allies in human resources matters must be balanced against the need to allow the administration sufficient flexibility to manage its staff resources. Against that background, the Council agrees that:
- 3.1 Given the need for a senior-level forum on NATO-wide human resources policy and regulations, the Deputies Committee should meet periodically to review human resources policy and strategy, based on the broader needs and objectives of the organisation;
- 3.2 If needed, the Deputies Committee will be able to directly task the CBC/MBC¹ to undertake research on the budgetary implications of any human resources decisions;
- 3.3 The financial regulatory work of the AGFC should be handled by the SRB², which should operate with a NATO-wide mandate on these issues. With these changes, the Advisory Group of Financial Counsellors can be deleted.

¹ Taking into account decisions to be made on the other Resource committees.

² Ibid

INTELLIGENCE

1. While the details of how intelligence work at NATO Headquarters should be conducted are being reviewed in the NATO Headquarters Intelligence Steering Committee (NHISC), the main outlines of the intelligence committee structures that are necessary to support the Council and the Military Committee have been under discussion by Allies for some time. We need to provide the civilian external intelligence services with a forum in which their expertise and advice can be made available to NATO. At the same time, we must ensure that the counter-intelligence and counter-terrorism missions of the Special Committee remain. The goal should be to provide the NAC and MC with joint civil-military intelligence and advice on intelligence issues. The role of the NHISC, as recently agreed by the NAC, is to co-ordinate all intelligence work across the Headquarters. All intelligence committees/bodies will report to the Council and the Military Committee through the NHISC, which acting as an interface, should respect the integrity of the professional judgements made by the intelligence committees. With that background, the Council agrees that:

- 1.1 In order to clarify its role, the name of the NATO Intelligence Board (NIB) should be changed to the Military Intelligence Committee (MIC);
- 1.2 Work on military intelligence should be supported by one working-level body. The work of the Deputy Heads of Delegation committee can therefore be subsumed by the Military Committee Working Group on Intelligence, meeting in different formats as necessary;
- 1.3 The work undertaken on MC161, MC165, and MC166 by separate working groups should be brought together under the Military Committee Working Group on Intelligence;
- 1.4 The mandate of the NATO Special Committee should be expanded to include all civilian intelligence issues, both internal and external. Allies are encouraged to ensure appropriate representation of all of their civilian intelligence agencies/services in this committee. In order to better explain its role, its name should be changed to the Civilian Intelligence Committee (CIC);
- 1.5 The intelligence mandate currently carried out by the Economic Committee will become the responsibility of the Civilian Intelligence Committee so that all civilian intelligence issues are handled in one committee;
- 1.6 The Civilian Intelligence Committee and Military Intelligence Committee should meet in joint session at least twice per year, in order to discuss the key intelligence issues pertinent to the work of the Council and the Military Committee. The proposed annual joint politico-military threat assessment for the Council should be produced by the two committees meeting jointly;
- 1.7 The name of the NATO Headquarters Intelligence Steering Committee should be changed to become the Intelligence Steering Board (ISB).

LOGISTICS

1. NATO has valuable expertise in multinational logistics and movement. Work in this area is led by the Senior Logisticians' Conference (SNLC), which is an operationally focused civil-military forum co-chaired by the IS and IMS. It is the key body in this area which deals with all aspects of logistics including interoperability and standardization, and with particularly close links to the Operations Policy Committee advising on resource prioritisation of logistics activities. It will retain its current advisory role on Logistics to the Military Committee. As such, the SNLC should, within its remit, act also as the lead committee for all transport and movement issues. In this respect, Council agrees that:

- 1.1 The SNLC should be renamed the Logistics Committee.
- 1.2 The Logistics Committee should supervise and oversee all standardization work related to logistics - both on the military and civilian side. It already works with the relevant Transport Group under SCEPC, but it should directly task the transport group when necessary and offer guidance to civilian experts through its Vision and Objectives document, ensuring a coherent approach across the entire spectrum of transport and movement issues.
- 1.3 The Logistics Committee, in cooperation with the NATO Committee for Standardization, will study options to improve the Logistics Committee's visibility, coordination and control of all logistic standardization activities. This review should aim to identify mergers which will improve coherence in how these issues are addressed. It should report to Council on the results by the end of 2010.
- 1.4 As a first step towards ensuring coherence in standardization activities, it would make sense to have bodies dealing with ammunition safety issues involved in the Logistics Committee's standardization structure. Subgroup 4 on Ammunition Transport and Logistics of the Movement and Transportation Standardization Group should therefore report to the Logistics Committee.
- 1.5 Dormant bodies should be deleted from the Logistics committee structure on the understanding that they can be reconstituted if necessary using the established Terms of Reference, strictly on a time and task limited basis with an automatic sunset clause. The SNLC has kept tight control over its sub-structure.
- 1.6 The NATO Petroleum Committee should be renamed the Petroleum Committee. It currently reports directly to the Council. It makes more sense for it to report to the Logistics Committee, but should also interact closely with the resource committees on financial matters. The Petroleum Policy and Planning Working Group can be deleted from the committee structure on the understanding that it can be reconstituted if necessary using the established Terms of Reference, and strictly on a time and task limited basis with an automatic sunset clause.

CIVIL EMERGENCIES GROUPS

1. NATO's current and recent involvement in complex stabilisation and humanitarian operations highlights the increasing importance of civilian expertise. Within the NATO structure, the Senior Civil Emergency Planning Committee (SCEPC) coordinates the work of 8 civilian technical bodies (known as the Planning Boards and Committees or PB&Cs) which in turn manage a group of approximately 380 national experts covering the fields of transport, civil protection, communications, food and agriculture, industrial planning and medical issues. The use of this valuable pool of expertise should be streamlined, including making it directly available to other parts of the organisation. With this background, the Council agrees that:

- 1.1 The SCEPC should be renamed the Civil Emergency Planning Committee (CEPC);
- 1.2 The Civil Emergency Planning Committee should remain the lead committee in the Civil Emergencies family responsible for taking forward the five agreed CEP roles. However, to ensure a coherent application of policy, other committees also have a valuable role to play. The Executive Working Group (Reinforced) and the Defence Group on Proliferation have worked closely with SCEPC. The Operations Policy Committee should also work closely with the CEPC on civil support to military planning, while the Political and Partnerships Committee should work closely with the CEPC on cooperation with partners. Provision should be made for joint meetings to pursue these objectives.
- 1.3 The review agreed during the development of the Ministerial Guidance for Civil Emergency Planning 2010-2013 should be initiated before the end of 2010 and should be based upon additional guidance to be given by the Council.
- 1.4 Much of the expertise provided by technical bodies under the CEPC PB&Cs should be made available to other committees in the NATO structure. In particular, the Logistics Committee and the COMEDS should directly task the individual PB&Cs and issue guidance to them when necessary, whilst keeping the CEPC informed.
- 1.5 The PB&Cs themselves should be restructured to ensure greater coherence. First, the functions of the Civil Communications Planning Committee (CCPC) and the Industrial Planning Committee (IPC) should be merged into an Industrial Resources and Communications Services group. Second, the Food and Agriculture Planning Committee (FAPC) and the Joint Medical Committee (JMC) should be merged into a Public Health and Food/Water group. Third, the Civil Aviation Planning Committee (CAPC), the Planning Board for Ocean Shipping (PBOS) and the Planning Board for Inland Surface Transport (PBIST) should be merged into one Transport group. The Civil Protection Committee would remain the unique body in the Civil Protection group. These groups would be able to meet in different formats, meetings will be agenda driven so as to also allow Partner involvement. Any ad hoc groups which provide support to this structure should be strictly time and task limited.

MEDICAL GROUPS

1. NATO can play a unique role in the field of multinational military medicine. There are currently several bodies addressing different aspects of military medicine including providing medical support to current operations, fostering co-operative research in medicine and developing long term medical standards and doctrine. There are considerable gains to be made by ensuring greater coherence of effort. To achieve that, the Council agrees that:

- 1.1 The Committee of Chiefs of Military Medical Services (COMEDS) should be the senior medical committee in the NATO structure responsible for oversight of all medical bodies. The COMEDS would oversee the development of operational medical requirements, medical standardization and civil-military relations in the medical field, as reflected in the military medical domain envisaged in the new Defence Planning Process. The COMEDS would routinely report to the MC and could be tasked directly by the NAC.
- 1.2 To simplify its structure, the Military Medical Steering Group which supports the COMEDS should be subsumed as a format of the COMEDS, as should the four COMEDS sub-groups. With the COMEDS taking on a leading role, the Military Committee Working Group on Medical issues which has not met for some time can be dissolved.
- 1.3 The COMEDS should continue to work closely with the Research and Technology Board Panel on Human Factors and Medicine (AC/323(HFM)) to identify priority areas for research by the Panel. The COMEDS should also be closely involved in Science for Peace and Security research on medical issues. The Political and Partnerships Committee may wish to directly seek COMEDS advice when taking decisions on that programme.
- 1.4 To encourage greater civil-military cooperation in medical matters, the COMEDS should be able to give direct taskings to the Public Health and Food/Water Group. Although this group would remain under the SCEPC, direct taskings would enable the COMEDS to have direct access to the required civilian medical expertise.

SCIENCE AND RESEARCH GROUPS

1. The NATO Science for Peace and Security (SPS) programme provides a tool for enhancing cooperation with partners through research on civil science and technology. The Science for Peace and Security programme also has a public diplomacy benefit. The programme is currently overseen by the Science for Peace and Security Committee (SPSC), composed of national science and technology experts. It is not however the only programme conducting scientific research at NATO. The Research and Technology Organisation (RTO) conducts co-operative research and information exchange, develops a long-term NATO research and technology strategy and provides advice on research and technology issues. As such, it has access to a large number of scientists across several fields of study. There is already a good degree of cooperation between the two programmes, with the Chairman of the SPSC attending as an observer meetings of the Research and Technology Board, the governing body of the RTO. To encourage the sharing of expertise and to strengthen the synergy between all science and technology activities NATO-wide, the closest possible coordination between the SPS programme and the RTO should be encouraged.

2. Aside from its scientific research value to NATO, the benefits of the Science for Peace and Security Programme for cooperation with partners should be maximised by ensuring that the projects chosen for funding are fully aligned with NATO's partnership and overall strategic objectives. To that end, Council agrees that:

2.1 Strategic and political guidance for the Science for Peace and Security programme should be provided by the Political and Partnerships Committee (PPC). At the beginning of the project award cycle, the PPC would draw up a concrete set of priorities which should guide funding decisions.

2.2. Once the priorities for the programme have been established by the Political and Partnerships Committee, there is a need for an independent evaluation of the scientific merit of the proposed projects to be pursued under the SPS programme. The existing network of Allied and partner scientists both under the SPS Committee and the RTO should be maintained and strengthened. The Assistant Secretary General for Public Diplomacy who leads on the SPS programme, will be responsible for conducting an independent scientific evaluation of the proposed projects by utilising the scientific expertise currently available within the Science for Peace and Security Committee and drawing upon the RTO.

2.3 The scientific evaluation would be presented back to the Political and Partnerships Committee which would take the final decision on the selection of projects. Periodic updates on the progress of the Science for Peace and Security Programme should be made to the PPC. The Science for Peace and Security Committee can therefore be dissolved.

3. The Von Karman Institute undertakes and promotes research in the field of fluid dynamics. 12 Allies currently provide approximately 40% of its revenue, funding it on a bilateral basis. Its supervisory committee, which is part of the NATO committee structure, was established to promote contributions to it by Allies, although its purpose now is simply to screen the part of the budget that individual Allies fund. The Council agrees that:

3.1 To carry out this budgetary screening function, there is no need for a standing NATO committee. Instead, a working group composed of those nations contributing financially to the Von Karman Institute should undertake the financial screening task. The annual report which it produces could then be assessed by the Civil Budget Committee before being transmitted to the Council for information and formal approval by the contributing nations. To help promote potential contributions by Allies to the institute, the Institute should be encouraged to provide a yearly briefing to Allies at NATO Headquarters on its work. It should continue to deepen its strong links with the Research and Technology Organisation which is best placed to exploit synergies with the work of the Von Karman Institute. A proposal to grant the Institute "Centre of Excellence" status is currently under review.

I. CAPABILITY DEVELOPMENT GROUPS

Introduction

1. One of the major objectives of the committee review has been to simplify the committee structure and thereby enable the Council to better direct it. This objective would be helped by establishing a clearer definition of which bodies make up the Headquarters decision-making structure and therefore need to have a working relationship with the Council.

NATO Headquarters policy committees

2. The key characteristics of NATO Headquarters policy committees and working groups underneath the Council can be captured as follows:

- Exist to facilitate decision-making by Allies, with decisions made by consensus;
- Bring together all NATO Allies;
- Play a policy development and advice role, which eventually leads to a Council approved policy or provides the basis for informed consultations at the Council;
- Meet regularly – often each week;
- Meet at the Headquarters, and are attended by Allied staff based in delegations at Headquarters;
- Are (mainly) chaired by the IS or IMS, or jointly;
- Are supported by a number of IS or IMS staff;

Committee Review

3. As it has examined the full range of bodies currently included in the NATO HQ committee structure, the committee review has brought to light some fundamental differences in how committees operate and the role that they seek to play. These differences include the way in which they work, their composition, their outputs and their relationship to the Council. The current structure includes a considerable number of bodies which exist solely to develop capabilities, in different areas, for the Alliance. The term that best encompasses their work is “Capability Development Groups”. A list of their key characteristics highlights considerable differences from the category above.

Capability Development Groups

4. The key characteristics of Capability Development Groups are:

- Do not seek to develop policy advice or to relate directly to the Council - they share information, develop standards and capabilities;
- Within NATO policies and guidelines, they set their own working rules;
- Allies decide upon their own participation - for example, not all nations are engaged in developing certain capabilities, and groups working on maritime capabilities engage nations with navies;

- In many cases, most or all of their work is open to active participation of partners; Meet only rarely, once or twice a year;
- Bring together experts from capitals, with delegation staff serving as points of contact;
- Often chaired and supported by nations, with the IS and IMS providing continuity but actual support varying depending on the needs of the group;
- Particularly suited to virtual or remote working, which is being actively pursued in many of these domains.

5. The bodies working underneath the Conference of National Armaments' Directors, the Committee for Standardization, the Military Committee groups on Standardization and those supporting the NATO C3 Board all fall within this category of Capability Development Groups. In each case they are actively managed by their parent body which does report to the Council or the Military Committee as appropriate.

Recommendations

6. As part of the overall review, a series of recommendations have been made to bring greater synergy and coherence to the work of Capability Development Groups. These proposals should reduce their number through merging groups which work on different aspects of the same overall capability. Based on experience gained, a further review process will then determine the feasibility of additional mergers. In the area of C3, the recommendations foresee a significant new approach to how work is conducted, with flexible capability groups taking the place of static committees. This approach will in turn be subject to a lessons learned process, which will allow a decision on whether to adopt it more widely in the other areas of capability development.

7. Through the parent bodies in each area - the C3 Board, the Committee on Standardization, the Conference of National Armaments' Directors and the Military Committee - the work of the Capability Development Groups will be tied into the NATO Defence Planning Process. These parent groups will continue to actively manage the capability development groups which fall within their areas of responsibility and are requested to seek all opportunities to bring further coherence and synergy to their work. In addition to the specific reviews referred to above and in line with the guidance given by Council, each parent committee should review their subordinate working structures every two years.

8. The committee review has examined closely the work of these Capability Development Groups. Given their structure, working methods and purpose which sets them apart from Headquarters policy committees, there is no reason for the Capability Development Groups themselves to have a working relationship with the Council. To help simplify and better explain the committee structure, the Capability Development Groups should therefore be regarded as a separate category from Headquarters Policy committees. The IS and the IMS will continue to support these groups, as necessary.

II. C3 GROUPS

9. All bodies covered in this area below the NATO C3 Board are part of the overall group known as "Capability Development Groups".

10. The NATO Consultation, Command, and Control Board (NC3B) is responsible for policy and technical advice on a wide variety of communications, information services, and security matters. The NATO C3 Board is undertaking an in-depth Business Process Review. Part of this review has examined the sub-structure of the Board, and a set of recommendations have been produced for a new organisational approach. The basic tenet of this approach is that the current NATO C3 structure should be aligned to deliver on the Council agreed strategic objectives set out annually in the C3 Capability Strategic Overview. While the final details need to be determined by the NATO C3 Board, the Council agrees that the C3 structure should be streamlined in the following manner:

- 10.1 The NATO C3 Board should be renamed the C3 Board.
- 10.2 The NATO C3 Board should remain the leading C3 committee of the Alliance, accountable to Council and the Military Committee for advice on all C3 related matters, continuing to meet in various formats to plan and coordinate the work plan managed by C3 staff.
- 10.3 The existing sub-committees and working groups would be collapsed into a significantly fewer number of capability panels under the leadership of the C3 Board, focused to deliver on the C3 Capability Requirements of the Alliance as mandated by the Council and aligned to the C3I work plan. The highly important work currently performed by the existing sub-structure would be migrated to the new capability panels and aligned to the mandated C3 Capability Requirements, and executed under the leadership of the C3 Board. These capability panels would be composed of staff, national experts, both Strategic Commands, Agencies and contractors as necessary. They would follow a short-range life-cycle of creation, expansion, stability, contraction and dissolution/dormancy matched to defined requirements.
- 10.4 A more flexible task allocation system, using a “balanced matrix” method of management, would allow more freedom for the allocation of resources matched to the demands of the tasks to hand.
- 10.5 Following the implementation of the above changes, expected in the fourth quarter 2010, the C3B should review the operation of this new structure after one year of operation. The lessons learned would be made available to the Council and the parent bodies of the other Capability Development Groups. As part of their ongoing work to reform their own structures, the parent bodies should determine whether they could also adopt this model and report to the Council on their proposed way ahead.

III. CAPABILITY HARDWARE DEVELOPMENT GROUPS

11. All bodies covered in this area below the Conference of National Armaments Directors are part of the overall group known as “Capability Development Groups”.

12. The Conference of National Armaments Directors works on information exchange between national experts and managers, the development of interoperability through standardization and multinational equipment programmes. It actively supervises the groups reporting to it, and has shifted from a services-based structure towards a capability-based approach, taking into account the new NATO Defence Planning process. While CNAD focuses on the materiel (armaments and equipment) issues, the Standardization groups under the Military Committee deal with doctrine and training and the Committee for Standardization focuses on Standardization policy and terminology. The work in these two areas, when combined with that of other bodies dealing with aspects like personnel and training, results in the development of a complete capability. There is scope for merging and rationalising groups working on capability development and capability support. This is addressed in the next annex.

13. In practical terms, the CNAD is also making increasing use of joint, rather than single-service groups. Council agrees the following specific changes:

13.1 To aid clarity, where single-service groups are actually working on a joint-service capability, this should be clearly reflected in the title of the group.

13.2 Where there are single-service groups working on capabilities in the same field, they should be merged. Building on the approach used in the CBRN Joint Group, the groups working on Command and Control should be merged into a joint capability structure. All the groups working on Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance should be merged into the Joint Capability Group on Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance. The Groups working on Electronic warfare should also work in a more coordinated fashion, although the scope of their work argues against a straight consolidation. These mergers should allow nations to rationalise their own representation at meetings, although decisions on participation remain the exclusive remit of nations.

13.3 The functions of the Capability Group which serves the NATO Air Armaments Group as a management group can be assumed by the main Group itself, and the management group should therefore be dissolved.

13.4 CNAD is asked to closely monitor the changes to working methods proposed in the C3 capability development area. As in the area of C3, CNAD structures bring together national experts from capitals to work on capability development. Following the review in the C3 domain, CNAD should assess the scope for adopting a similar approach and make proposals to the Council within six months.

IV. CAPABILITY SUPPORT GROUPS

14. All bodies covered in this area below the Military Committee and the Conference of National Armaments Directors are part of the overall group known as "Capability Development Groups".

15. This group of bodies covers work on standardization, which is a crucial part of capability development. They work to develop and approve operational standards, doctrines, procedures and terminology for the use of capabilities. While CNAD focuses on the materiel (armaments and equipment) issues, the Standardization groups under the

Military Committee deal with doctrine and training, and the groups under the Committee for Standardization work on Standardization policy and terminology . The work in these three areas, when combined with that of other bodies dealing with aspects like personnel and training, results in the development of a complete capability. There is scope for merging and rationalising groups working on capability development and capability support. The Council agrees the following changes:

- 15.1 The NATO Committee for Standardization should be renamed the Committee for Standardization.
- 15.2 To ensure that clear links can be drawn between the work of the CNAD Main Armaments Groups and the Standardization Boards, the groups working under the Standardization Boards should be renumbered and renamed to better match their CNAD counterparts. The Military Committee and the CNAD should work to achieve this.
- 15.3 Many of the Standardization groups can be merged with their CNAD counterparts. This has already happened in several cases, for example in the fields of Electro-Magnetic Radiation Hazards and Air Armaments. The exact reporting lines of the merged group - whether primarily to the CNAD or to the Military Committee - is indicated below. The following groups should be merged with immediate effect: The Naval Mine Warfare Working Group with the Maritime Capability Group 3 on Mines, Mine Countermeasures and Harbour Protection (CNAD); the Artillery Working Group and Land Capability Group 3 on Fire Support (CNAD); the CBRN Operations Working Group with the Joint Capability Group on CBRN (CNAD); Joint Capability Group on UAVs with the Joint Unmanned Aerial Vehicle Panel (CNAD); the Maritime Capability Group 7 on Environmental Protection, its mandate expanded to also include land and air aspects, with the Environmental Protection Working Group (MC); The Land Capability Group 7 on Battlefield Mobility and Engineer Support with the Military Engineering Working Group (MC); the Interservice Geospatial working group with the NATO Geospatial conference (MC). All of these mergers will be subject to an 18-month review process, to be conducted jointly by the Military Committee and the CNAD, with a view towards identifying other mergers.
- 15.4 To better explain its work, the Life Cycle Management Group is considering options for a new name. The duties of its operational management committee can be assumed by the Group itself.
- 15.5 The Military Committee and the CNAD are asked to closely monitor the changes to working methods proposed in the C3 capability development area. As in the area of C3, standardization bodies bring together national experts from capitals to work on elements of capability development. Following the review in the C3 domain, the Military Committee and the CNAD should assess the scope for adopting a similar approach and make proposals to the Council within six months.

COMMITTEES REPORTING TO THE NAC

