



Wargame 15-01: NATO Futures Analysis STRATEGIC WARGAMING SERIES

December 10-11, 2014



UNITED STATES ARMY WAR COLLEGE
Center for Strategic Leadership & Development
650 Wright Ave
Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013

The findings contained in this report are based on the results of an academic wargame conducted at the United States Army War College December 10-11, 2014. Except where expressly indicated, the ideas presented are derived directly from the comments of wargame participants. The views contained in this report are intended to inform senior Army and Defense leaders including, but not confined to, members of the Army Staff, Geographic Combatant Commands and Army Service Component Commands. This report does not express the policies or official views of the United States Government, the Department of Defense or the United States Army.

Report Author:	LTC Ned Ritzmann	ned.c.ritzmann.mil@mail.mil
Lead Analyst:	Mr. Chip Cleckner	william.h.cleckner.civ@mail.mil
Chief, Strategic Wargaming Division:	COL Jack Pritchard	jack.k.pritchard.mil@mail.mil

STRENGTH *and* WISDOM

Executive Summary

On December 10-11, 2014, the U.S. Army War College Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD) led an unclassified strategic tabletop wargame to develop insights into how the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's internal challenges impacted the Alliance's ability to perform collective defense, crisis management, and/or cooperative security and explore how the U. S. Army should think about the Landpower implications of this analysis. Seventeen subject matter experts from the U.S. Army War College faculty and staff, resident students (including several International Fellows), NATO, academia, and from think tanks in both the U.S. and Europe participated in the wargame.

Overall, the participants found that NATO is an effective and needed Alliance. However, NATO was conceived during the early Cold War, and its structure and processes were designed for that environment. The security environment has changed over the last two decades -- end of the Cold War; different threats and perspectives; emergence of hybrid threats (conventional, unconventional, cyber, etc.); creation of the European Union; and the rise in power of non-state actors and organizations.

These changes in the strategic environment informed the examination of NATO's internal challenges. The most relevant internal challenges were categorized as related to:

- **Values and interests**
- **Economics and demographics**
- **Capabilities and capacities**
- **Internal NATO structure**
- **Perceptions.**

These challenges make the Alliance less effective in the following ways: they inhibit the ability to respond at the speed of crises, they decrease NATO's ability to effectively operate in a 21st century hybrid war environment, they cause an overreliance on a few NATO members, they impede its ability to assure Alliance members, and they make it more difficult to provide a credible deterrence.

Wargame participants suggested that NATO could mitigate these negative impacts by refining the founding documents to ensure that they match the current security environment, addressing how Article V applies in modern environments, re-examining the importance of the 2% GDP metric, expanding NATO partnerships into new areas, continuing to seek efficiencies in force utilization, and increasing mission command capacity. The United States can mitigate incorrect perceptions about how it perceives NATO by talking concrete actions to demonstrate commitment to the Alliance.

Implications for the U.S. Army were identified following the examination of the new strategic environment and NATO's challenges. To better prepare for operating with NATO partners and to counter incorrect perceptions, the Army should maintain two combat brigades in Europe, increase NATO instruction in PME, increase exchange officer positions with NATO partners, and participate in more NATO and U.S. European Command multinational exercises. The Eurasian landmass is clearly relevant geography for Landpower, where vital national interests are at stake.

Introduction

On December 10-11, 2014, the U.S. Army War College Center for Strategic Leadership and Development (CSLD) conducted an unclassified strategic tabletop wargame to develop insights into how NATO's internal challenges affected its ability to perform its three-fold purpose of collective defense, crisis management, and/or cooperative security. Participants included seventeen subject matter experts from the U.S. Army War College faculty and staff, resident students (including select International Fellows), NATO, academia, and think tanks in both the U.S. and Europe.¹

There were five supporting objectives of the wargame:

- Identify and prioritize the internal challenges that adversely affect NATO's ability to fulfill its three-fold purpose in the next 10 years
- Determine how those challenges actually impacted NATO's ability to conduct collective defense, crisis management, and/or cooperative security
- Recommend solutions to address identified challenges or mitigate impacts
- Determine the effectiveness of the mitigation strategy
- Determine the consequences of impacts and of the mitigation strategy on the U.S. specifically on the U.S. Army.

This wargame did not examine external threats to NATO, (e.g. ISIS, Taliban, piracy, etc.), rather, it examined internal challenges to NATO's ability to respond to those threats. What might they keep NATO from being able to do or do effectively?

¹ See Annex A for a complete list of participants.

Methodology

Prior to their arrival at the actual wargame, the participants completed a survey, asking them to rank order a list of pre-identified internal NATO challenges, and to identify any additional challenges that were not included on the survey. At the start of the event, the participants reviewed these results as a group. This resulted in more challenges being added to the list.² The participants were then divided into two groups that were similar in size, expertise, and experience. Each group began categorizing and prioritizing their impact on mission accomplishment, identifying the level of risk the challenges posed to NATO's three fold mission, as well as developing solutions and mitigations. The game concluded with an opportunity for each group to brief their insights to their colleagues in the other group and to senior members of the War College faculty and staff.

Major Findings

NATO was conceived during the early Cold War era, and its structure and processes were designed for that environment. The security environment has changed over the last two decades, however, with changes in individual member nations' understanding of security threats, the emergence of hybrid threats (conventional, unconventional, cyber, etc.), and the rise in power of non-state actors and organizations.

² See Annex B for a list of identified challenges.

The United States is the critical keystone member within NATO. Without the United States, NATO cannot be effective in all aspects of its three-fold mission. If the United States attempts to shift more responsibility to other capable NATO members, it must not underestimate its leadership role.

The wargame participants “binned” NATO’s internal challenges into four broad categories: **values and interests, economics and demographics, capabilities and capacities, and internal NATO structure.** CSLD’s post-wargame analysis revealed that NATO is also challenged by **perceptions.**

Values and Interests

Participants observed three challenges within the values and interests category: a **lack of political cohesion** in support of the values and interests articulated in the North Atlantic Treaty (Washington Treaty), **cultural challenges**, and member countries’ **bilateral relationships with Russia.** Participants viewed these challenges as high risk given that they had both a high likelihood of occurring and a high severity of impact.

This lack of political cohesion within NATO manifests itself in limited national interest and commitment to NATO priorities by individual members, diminished domestic popular and political support for NATO, and decisional paralysis of NATO leaders when responding to events.

NATO also faces different culturally influenced ideas about using a range of soft and hard power options. These ideas in-turn affect political will and defense spending. (A counter point was made that these cultural differences may in fact be much more reflective of economic realities.)

NATO members are affected by Russian political, economic, and informational influences. Bilateral relations with Russia, particularly economic relationships affect voting, adherence to spending agreements etc. Some participants even asserted that bilateral relationships between Russia, Germany, and Italy prevented a NATO Crisis Management response to the Baltics. Russian informational influence on member nations precipitates a changing narrative which weakens NATO's reputation and encourages a lack of support from non-NATO partners. Furthermore, this hinders the NATO decision making process causing a potential gap or seam in the Alliance. Russian information campaign can shape the environment making all NATO missions much harder when there is a bilateral agreement in place with a member nation. This type of information warfare against NATO can cause both a lack of political cohesion within the Alliance, and a lack of support to NATO by non NATO countries.

These challenges could lead to an environment where national interests, manifested as national priorities and bilateral arrangements outside of NATO, produce diminished domestic popular and political support for NATO, and thus limit commitment to NATO priorities. They negatively impact NATO's ability to respond to new threats at the speed of crisis, with adequate capabilities, and weaken the solidarity of the Alliance. These challenges also place an increased requirement on the U.S. for leadership, resources, and capabilities. Some examples of these capabilities are expeditionary logistics (even though this by doctrine and policy is a national responsibility), robust communications, reconnaissance assets, rotary wing aviation, and aerial refueling. The challenges associated with national values and interests also limit NATO's ability to implement a comprehensive approach (a broader view of security initiatives than those NATO has historically taken), placing the Allied Command Operations (ACO) headquarters in a reactive mode. These challenges can also impede NATO's ability to operate

in a 21st century hybrid war environment,³ as member nations have different interpretations of Article V.⁴ This makes response to certain scenarios, like Russia’s activities in Ukraine, hard to respond to, as they are difficult to attribute and do not clearly meet the Article V standard of “armed attack.”

The wargame participants recommended potential actions to address these challenges. One suggested approach was to refine the founding documents to ensure they match the current and emerging global security environment. Analysis and discussion of the founding documents brought to the forefront that they were developed in 1949, prior to the inclusion of many current NATO members, and were focused on nuclear deterrence. This dialogue included discussion on topics that included geographic limitations (Who is eligible for Alliance membership?), GDP influenced contributions, planning protocols and a host of other issues. Another idea was to increase strategic communication efforts with the intent of creating a shared vision of NATO for all Alliance members.

Participants stated that Non-Article V interactions and implications should be part of a discussion associated with the future maturation of NATO. Participants discussed capturing and leveraging lessons learned, "business practices", and effective partner interactions, as well as

³ Our definition of “hybrid warfare” comes from a statement by Secretary of Defense Hagel on 15 October 2014. “Where adversaries marry the tactics of insurgents with the tools of advanced armed forces and their sophisticated technologies.”

⁴ The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all and consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense recognized by Article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area. Any such armed attack and all measures taken as a result thereof shall immediately be reported to the Security Council. Such measures shall be terminated when the Security Council has taken the measures necessary to restore and maintain international peace and security.

those that were not as effective, for possible inclusion into future Article V considerations. Participants stated that the non-Article V interactions may be a significant opportunity to strengthen NATO.

Another proposed solution was strengthening NATO's liberal anchor. A participant asserted that some members in the Alliance are non-liberal regimes, and that NATO must hold these governments to the values and interests articulated in the preamble to the original treaty.⁵ NATO should also consider relationships with liberal regimes outside of Europe (e.g. Brazil or India).

The participants felt that by enacting these mitigation measures, NATO could reduce the likelihood of these risks, but not their severity.

Economics and demographics

Changing economic and demographic factors of NATO members create an environment of decreasing defense budgets (money spent of defense), national reprioritization of defense spending (how smaller defense budgets are allocated e.g. pay, weapons systems, etc.), increased spending on social programs, and alternative career options for military-aged people.⁶ Changing demographics also creates a decreased pool of available manpower, as well as fewer people who have experience with, or appreciation for the importance of, NATO. These challenges result in decreasing support for common funding,⁷ which exacerbates difficulties in burden sharing. They also threaten the defense technical and industrial bases in Europe.

⁵ The Parties to this Treaty ... are determined to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law.

⁶ Our interpretation of "alternative career options for military aged people" describes the end of mandatory service in some NATO members and more military aged people seeking employment outside the military.

⁷ Common funding arrangements are the only funds where NATO authorities identify the requirements and set the priorities in line with overarching Alliance objectives and priorities. All 26 member countries

Some participants felt that strategic communication could mitigate these challenges. For example, member nation leaders could communicate and prove to their populations that adequate defense spending now would be less costly than paying for a crisis later. NATO might also look at changing the *importance* of the 2% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) metric to accurately reflect contributions by member nations. The current metric of percentage of GDP spent on defense is a necessary, but insufficient measure since it does not assure a member is buying the right capabilities. A suggested way to measure member nation contributions is to focus on capabilities provided, rather than funds allocated, in order to demonstrate a more equitable share of contributions among NATO members. NATO should shift focus to capabilities that member nations actually provide and missions they perform (or contribute to), rather than looking only at how much money nations contribute. The participants that championed changing the importance of the GDP metric noted that this was most applicable to the smaller members of NATO. Their assertion was that smaller member nations (when compared to other NATO members) budget contributions were so small, that their actual operational involvement would be a better metric of a country's contributions to NATO.⁸

Other participants countered this suggestion, however, arguing that adequate funding is critical for NATO. This opposing group of participants did not advocate allowing member nations to substitute services for money.

participate. For those elements directly related to the Alliance's integrated military command structure, participation is limited to 25 members. *Common funding focuses on the provision of requirements which are over and above those which could reasonably be expected to be made available from national resources*". Common funding amounts to just under \$2 billion per year.

⁸ While no specific members were mentioned by name during the wargame, there are anecdotal examples of NATO members that do not meet the 2% standard, but still provide well trained, equipped, and led forces that provide great operational utility.

Another way to mitigate the impacts of changing economic and demographic factors is to pursue increased efficiencies in force utilization through SMART Defense,⁹ the Connected Forces Initiative¹⁰, and adherence to the NATO Defense Planning Process.¹¹ Other mitigation measures included improved resourcing and development of a mechanism to balance burden sharing with risk sharing. It was also suggested that NATO include current partners in NATO operations and expand partnerships (e.g. South America, Africa, ECOWAS, African Union, etc.). The inclusion of international organizations and other relationships (NGOs) was also considered, with a recommendation for further study; NATO would need to make clear the benefits of partnership to potential new partners. An example of this engagement beyond the borders of member nations is NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue¹². However, limits and constraints may have to be applied to new partnerships thus limiting feasibility, acceptability, and suitability. NATO should also continue its ongoing partnership efforts with the European Union to help alleviate tensions between the two organizations and better align efforts.

Participants saw economic and demographic challenges as creating high risk to NATO's ability to achieve its threefold purpose in the future, as they are both likely and have severe consequences. While the specific mitigation measures listed above reduced likelihood slightly,

⁹ SMART Defense is a NATO burden sharing mechanism.

¹⁰ This is designed to be a coherent set of deployable, interoperable and sustainable forces equipped, trained, exercised and commanded so as to be able to meet NATO's level of ambition and able to operate together and with partners in any environment. NATO's current level of ambition is defined as NATO being able to provide command and control for two major joint operations (such as the NATO-led operation in Afghanistan) and six smaller military operations (such as Operation Active Endeavour in the Mediterranean) at any one time.

¹¹ The NATO Defense Planning Process (NDPP) is the primary means to identify the required capabilities and promote their timely and coherent development and acquisition by Allies. Participation by NATO members is voluntary.

¹² NATO's Mediterranean Dialogue was initiated in 1994 by the North Atlantic Council. The Dialogue reflects the Alliance's view that security in Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean. It currently involves seven non-NATO countries of the Mediterranean region: Algeria, Egypt, Israel, Jordan, Mauritania, Morocco and Tunisia.

they were insufficient to reduce likelihood enough to move this challenge out of the high risk category.

Capabilities and capacities

Challenges identified in this category include **reduced military capability and capacity, interoperability challenges, and a lack of readiness**. This combination of challenges again creates high risk to NATO being able to fulfill its three-fold mission. Reduced military capabilities/capacities and lack of readiness are, to a large extent, related to the previous two categories. The significant interoperability challenge does not focus on tactical interoperability, but rather on operational and structural interoperability, specifically in areas of doctrine and operational mission command (some tactical level interoperability gaps do exist, however; for example, U.S. Army mission command systems are not fully compatible with NATO systems, with differences in hardware, software, policies and procedures).

Taken together, these challenges hinder NATO's ability to perform its threefold mission by slowing reaction time due to increased training requirements, by limiting NATO's operational portfolio, potentially causing an overreliance on single NATO members, or, in the worst case, preventing a NATO military response. If the operational portfolio of NATO continues to suffer, participants expressed skepticism of NATO's ability to respond in an era of compounding complexity faced with the elements of hybrid warfare, such as that evident in the current situation in Ukraine.

The proposed mitigations focused on procurement, maintenance, and strategic communication. The procurement mitigations included encouraging nations to give priority to fulfilling NATO-identified minimum capability requirements and interoperability; leveraging commercial solutions to offset expensive military research and development (R&D) efforts; and

creating greater interoperability and systems capabilities through common procurement. There were also suggestions to begin a cooperative maintenance program and allows other nations to maintain U.S. equipment and vice versa.

Even with these mitigations in place, the participants still evaluated these challenges as high risk. The mitigation measures lowered the likelihood of these challenges having an impact, but not enough to move the challenges out of the high risk category.

Internal NATO structure

The challenges identified in this category included a **mismatch between command and control capacity and the level of ambition** and shortfalls in the area of **internal NATO decision-making process**. NATO's stated level of ambition is the ability to simultaneously execute two Major Joint Operations (MJOs) and six Small Joint Operations (SJOs).¹³ The capacity of the NATO's Integrated Command Structure (ICS) does not allow it to meet this level of ambition. While there are two Theater Commands (Joint Force Command Brunssum and Joint Force Command Naples) there is only a single set of functional commands to support them (Allied Maritime Command, Allied Air Command, and Allied Land Command). Reductions in the number and size of member nation headquarters have exacerbated this problem. Thus, the required mission command capacity may be absent if Allied Command Operations requires additional capacity. In addition, participants felt that the ICS is not structured or prepared to conduct operations in a hybrid war.

Another challenge is that NATO, by its nature, is a collaborative organization, constrained and restrained by the interests of multiple nations. NATO Article V situations will most likely

¹³ "Secretary General's Annual Report 2011" 2 April 2012, http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/opinions_82646.htm (accessed 17 Feb 2015)

involve a single adversary versus a multi-member NATO Alliance. This “one versus many” situation could prove advantageous to an adversary (e.g. shorter decision cycles, action-reaction advantage, and unity of purpose/intent).

The impact of the single functional command is that NATO can only provide domain/functional command to one MJO at a time, without functional commands being forced to reorganize, subordinate commands being “pre-certified” to serve as functional commands, or the creation of ad hoc headquarters. As a hypothetical example, if NATO was executing an operation against the so-called Islamic State (ISIS) from Turkey, it only has one land headquarters, NATO Allied Land Command (LANDCOM), available. If Russian actions in Eastern Europe required additional mission command capacity, ACO would be faced with the options of having to either request additional mission command capacity from member nations or to employ one of its rapidly deployable corps headquarters in a role for which it may not be staffed or trained.

A plausible mitigation measure is to maintain NATO’s nine rapidly deployable Corps Headquarters. Beyond just having the headquarters, it would be helpful to ensure that appropriate NATO staffs have expertise in areas such as cyber operations, information operations, energy trade and supply, etc. to help commanders and leaders understand and recommend options in areas that are not clearly defined as Article V violations.

Participants also provided specific examples of how to mitigate the “one versus many” threat advantage. Specific examples of these mitigations included reducing constraints on NATO exercises, giving the Supreme Allied Commander Europe (SACEUR) peacetime authority to collect intelligence, develop targeting data, conduct extensive real-world planning, and to deploy assessment teams to quickly assess situations in order to improve decision making. However, this list of suggestions does not reflect a consensus among both of the groups. One group felt

that the current limitations on SACEUR were not as significant as the second group concluded. Furthermore, the second group suggested that these limitations are necessary for NATO to continue with the success it has had in the past.

Participants initially judged these challenges to be high risk, but mitigation measures seem able to reduce that risk to medium by lowering the likelihood.

Perceptions

Wargame participants did not specifically identify this category of challenges, but post game analysis of the totality of participant dialogue revealed several commonly held perceptions challenging NATO's ability to fulfill its three-fold mission: a perception that the **U.S. rebalance to the Pacific infers an abandonment of NATO allies**; and **differing perceptions of the existence or level of particular security threats**.

The use of the term "pivot" to Asia, whether deliberate, binding, or accurately descriptive, has left a feeling of apprehension within NATO. When this is coupled with U.S. Defense Secretary Robert Gates' 2011 remarks about European members not providing enough military capability,¹⁴ it causes apprehension among some NATO members about whether the U.S. will continue to provide the bulk of the Alliance's military capability. If not, the onus will then be on European members to create the capabilities required to meet Alliance's level of ambition. The added challenges in this scenario would be the international fiscal environment and the political will of contributing nations to commit.

¹⁴ For example, "Despite more than 2 million troops in uniform – NOT counting the U.S. military – NATO has struggled, at times desperately, to sustain a deployment of 25- to 40,000 troops, not just in boots on the ground, but in crucial support assets such as helicopters, transport aircraft, maintenance, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, and much more." Secretary Robert M. Gates, "The Security and Defense Agenda (Future of NATO)," Brussels, Belgium, June 10, 2011

Participants posited that this difference in understanding of security threats was directly related to relationships with Russia, particularly economic relationships.

The U.S. can help mitigate these unhelpful perceptions by taking actions to demonstrate NATO's importance such as the recent announcement to station tanks and fighting vehicles in Europe. The U.S. must not dismiss NATO member concerns about the effects of the rebalance to the Pacific as somehow being "old news" that NATO partners have moved on from. The dialogue in the wargame indicated that this was still a major area of concern among some NATO partners.

Separately, an increased need for intelligence and information sharing among all NATO members was a common theme among participants. An increase in transparency would ensure better understanding across military and political members of the Alliance and could increase the level of interoperability during operations in support of NATO's three missions. Finally, participants noted that Russia's recent aggressive behavior is strikingly changing threat perceptions and other considerations, like proposed defense spending. Poland, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Norway, and Romania are all increasing defense spending in 2015.

Implications for the U.S. Army

While NATO operations in Afghanistan have resulted in operational and tactical understanding among NATO militaries, there are steps the U.S. Army could take to better prepare itself for multinational operations with NATO. Some of the following items were identified during the wargame, while others were identified during post game analysis.

The U.S. Army should retain adequate mission command capability, multiple ground combat brigades, and associated enablers in Europe. This may be challenging for the Department of

the Army if budget pressure continues to impact force structure, particularly in the face of political pressure to inactivate OCONUS forces ahead of CONUS-based ones. However, ground combat presence is crucial to demonstrating our commitment to the Alliance and deterring aggression, like the Russian activity in Ukraine. It also allows sustained contact, required to build and maintain relationships and trust with Alliance members and partners.

An additional measure the Army can explore is a periodic (but not necessarily annual) rotation of a U.S. Army corps, division, or functional command headquarters to participate in a major NATO exercise, or a major U.S. European Command multinational exercise. This could be sourced in a Total Force construct, providing opportunities for Army Reserve and National Guard participation.

The U.S. Army can improve NATO interoperability by additional education and training at units and by individuals, professional military education (PME), Combat Training Centers, exchanges, wargaming, experimentation, and so on). Regarding NATO units working together, recommendations were made to rotate U.S. Army units into Eastern Europe, to increase interoperability, capitalize on training opportunities found there, and deter aggression (without setting conditions for miscalculation). NATO units could also participate in US-based exercises, experimentation, and training.

Some participants recommended the Army increase awareness about NATO through professional military education. This would ensure a baseline of understanding and reduce the learning curve when Army forces are deployed in future NATO missions. Similar training could also target Army forces assigned, apportioned, allocated, or aligned to U.S. European Command. The Army might also be able to incorporate NATO scenarios in Corps or Division war fighter exercises and experimentation.

Additional recommendations for the Army were to refrain from making cuts to the U.S. Army Europe headquarters, manning existing -- and seeking additional -- exchange officer positions, seeking personnel contributions from NATO members to work on U.S. staffs to offset reductions in U.S. personnel, and improving compliance with NATO doctrine where applicable.¹⁵ The Army could also contribute to NATO mission command capacity by maintaining an Army division headquarters habitually regionally aligned to U.S. European Command.

Participants also recommended the Army assess the quality of soldiers assigned to NATO. Do we send the best and brightest to NATO assignments or to other areas? Is NATO service good for a career? Does it give an officer promotion potential? Most participants felt that NATO assignments were not career enhancing, but none of them said that a NATO assignment was detrimental.

Conclusion

NATO is performing its three fold mission every day, and remains a valuable and effective Alliance. The U.S. remains the key enabler of NATO. Although NATO is delivering, its processes and values still reflect the Cold War strategic environment under which it was conceived. The security environment has evolved sufficiently over the last two decades that NATO should adapt its structure and processes to better match the current strategic environment.

NATO continues to fulfill its mission in the face of internal challenges. The challenges are its lack of political cohesion, cultural challenges, member countries' bilateral relationships with Russia, changing economic and demographic factors, reduced capacities, interoperability

¹⁵ NATO doctrine applies to echelons above Corps.

challenges, the lack of readiness, mission command capacity, the NATO decision making process, and varying perceptions of both the level of U.S. commitment to NATO and different understandings of the threat environment.

These challenges present high levels of risk to NATO's ability to fulfill its mission. They inhibit the ability to respond at the speed of crises, they decrease NATO's ability to effectively operate in a 21st century hybrid war environment, they cause an overreliance on a few NATO members, they impede its ability to assure Alliance members, and they make it more difficult to provide a credible deterrence.

However, there are ways to mitigate these challenges including maintaining capacity, changing metrics, demonstrating commitment, expanding partnerships, and seeking employment and acquisition efficiencies.

The U.S. Army can contribute to a more effective NATO by maintaining ground combat forces in Europe; increasing exposure of U.S. personnel to NATO organizations, concepts, and processes; and through greater participation in NATO exercises.

Areas for future study

The following topics were not specific research objectives of the wargame, but were identified either during or after the game (post-game analysis) for future examination:

- What is the role of the European Union (EU) in European security? What are its approaches to European Security? Does it complement/reinforce NATO?
- Has globalization since the end of the Cold War impacted commitment to NATO by individual members? How?

- Have military operations in Afghanistan contributed to NATO members being reluctant to use the military instrument of power?
- If NATO cannot accept high risks to its threefold mission, what would have to be done in order to reduce risks to an acceptable level?
- Does NATO need a mechanism to remove members from the Alliance?

Annex A: List of Participants.

Lieutenant Colonel Mike Adelburg – U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute

Mr. Scott Anhalt -- Joint Staff J5 NATO Policy Division

Colonel Martin Botik – U.S. Army War College International Fellow

Colonel Scott Coon – U.S. Army War College faculty

Colonel Cory Costello – U.S. Army War College resident student

Dr. Alexandra de Hoop Scheffer – German Marshall Fund of the United States

Dr. John Deni – U.S. Army War College Strategic Studies Institute

Dr. Trine Flockhart – Danish Institute for International Studies

Lieutenant Colonel Chris Hickey – U.S. Army War College resident student

Dr. Joel Hillison -- U.S. Army War College faculty

Colonel Arturas Jasinskas – U.S. Army War College International Fellow

Dr. Mehmet Kinaci – Supreme Allied Command Transformation

Colonel Gertjan Kooij – U.S. Army War College International Fellow

Dr. Andrew Radin – RAND Corporation

Mr. Stanley R. Sloan – Middlebury College

Colonel David Sullivan -- Pentagon Liaison, U.S. Military Delegation to NATO/U.S. National Liaison Rep, Supreme Allied Command Transformation

Colonel Beniamino Vergori – U.S. Army War College International Fellow

ANNEX B: Obstacle Rankings. (These are recorded as they were written on the survey or as they were listed on the group session. They have not been edited.)

1. Different security threat perspectives. NATO member states have different perceptions of threats to their security. E.g. The Baltics may be worried about Russia, while Turkey may be more worried about Kurds/ISIL.
2. Decreasing defense budgets of member countries.
3. Different perceptions within NATO about the utility of force (under what conditions is force justified and for what reasons)
4. Funding allocation of NATO member countries. Is scarce funding being spent on the “right” things?
5. War fatigue. E.g. fatigue from a decade of combat operations in Afghanistan.
6. Increase in out-of-area missions.
7. Domestic political concerns within NATO members. (Internal Politics)
8. Political concerns/conflicts between NATO members. This includes EU rivalries playing out in NATO contexts/frameworks.
9. Energy insecurity.
10. NATO dependence on unique enabling capabilities and capacities that have to be provided by the United States (airlift, intel, logistics, stealth aircraft, etc).
11. Lack of definition/consensus on cyber sovereignty and Cyber/article 5.
12. NATO’s 28 member size makes it too unwieldy to gain concurrence
13. Atrophy of NATO interoperability standards (US MRAP, Turkey FD-2000 SAM).
14. Changing national demographics reducing the availability of people to perform military service.
15. Changing domestic perceptions within NATO members about the nature of military service (who in the society serves for what reasons).
16. Reduced NATO Command structure and HQ staff
17. Limits on SACEUR’s peacetime operational authority
18. Decision Making Process within NATO (Military and Political)
19. Retaining Trans-Atlantic Identity as demographics change
20. US/NATO/EU relationships
21. Internal EU rivalries
22. Officer quality within NATO billets/NATO proficiency of US officers
23. Original NATO missions vs recent missions
24. Training structure of joint operations
25. NATO role when responding to emerging threats
26. Capabilities reduction as ongoing issue
27. Connected Forces Initiative (CFI) resources pooling
28. Is 2% GDP correct measure of burden sharing
29. Russian’s initiative towards member countries
30. Budget disparities between members (2%)

31. US pivot to Asia (external factors)
32. Inter-operating with international organizations
33. Cultural obstacles (sovereignty and national)
34. Globalization - Compounding complexities (prioritization?)
35. US leadership (NATO priority?; manpower?; Asia Pivot?)
36. Readiness
37. NATO Capability
38. Russia