



Parliament of Australia

**Report of the Parliamentary Delegation
to the 65th Annual Session of the
NATO Parliamentary Assembly, London**

12 to 14 October 2019

© Commonwealth of Australia 2020
ISBN [978-1-76092-088-3] Printed version
ISBN [978-1-76092-089-0] HTML version

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0
Australia License.



The details of this licence are available on the Creative Commons website:
<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/au/>.

Members of the Delegation

Senator the Hon. David Fawcett
Leader of the Delegation

Senator the Hon. Kim Carr
Deputy Leader of the Delegation

Ms Peggy Danaee
Delegation Secretary

Introduction

The aims of the parliamentary delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in London were to:

- observe the 65th annual session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly;
- gain an understanding of the role, responsibilities and priorities of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly;
- renew and strengthen the Australian Parliament's ties with the Assembly; and
- exchange views with colleagues from other parliaments and gain diverse perspectives on matters related to foreign affairs, defence and security.

The delegation appreciated the opportunity offered by the Assembly to engage closely with parliamentary

colleagues in NATO member and observer country delegations. Delegates attended and participated in several key sessions of various committees, and also attended the plenary session.

Somewhat unusually for an observer delegation, this year Australia was given the opportunity to make a presentation to a committee. Details of the presentation given by Senator Fawcett are included in the section on the Defence and Security Committee

This report provides some background on the purpose of NATO and the structure and purpose of its series of meetings, and details the issues discussed at the sessions attended by members of the Australian delegation.



The delegation at the 65th Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in London.

Background

NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is an intergovernmental military alliance between the United States and European countries. It was established in 1949 with 12 member countries, which has steadily grown to 29 countries in recent years.

While not a member of NATO, Australia is considered a 'global partner' that cooperates and engages in dialogue with NATO.

NATO Parliamentary Assembly

Whereas NATO provides for cooperation between the Executives and militaries of member countries, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly is a body that facilitates cooperation between the parliamentary branches of those countries.

The Assembly formed in 1955 and started as a series of annual meetings between parliamentarians from NATO member countries.

Today, the NATO Parliamentary Assembly consists of 266 delegates from the 29 NATO member countries, as well as delegates from 12 associate countries, the European Parliament, four regional partner and Mediterranean associate member countries, and parliamentary observer delegations from eight other countries (including Australia) and three inter-parliamentary assemblies.

The NATO Parliamentary Assembly has five committees that examine

contemporary issues in their areas of responsibility, which are:

- Civil Dimension of Security
- Defence and Security
- Economics and Security
- Political
- Science and Technology.

Annual series of meetings

The NATO Parliamentary Assembly meets twice per year, in the (northern) Autumn and Spring.

The Assembly's committees produce reports with the assistance of various experts, and these reports are considered thoroughly in draft form at the Assembly's Spring Session each year. These reports are finalised by the committees at the Autumn Session (also called the Annual Session) and submitted to the Plenary for final adoption.

Alongside committee reports, committees formulate policy recommendations for NATO in the form of resolutions. As with the process for reports, draft resolutions are considered and finalised by committees during the Autumn/Annual Session and submitted to the Plenary for adoption.

Aside from the two large meetings each year, a range of delegations and site visits are undertaken by groups of NATO Parliamentary Assembly delegates. These include visits to military bases and NATO mission areas.

The Annual Session

In recent years, Australia has been represented at the Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, every second year.

The Australian delegation has observer status, and while delegates are welcome to ask questions or offer views on matters being discussed, the Australian delegation typically does not have a formal role in proceedings, such as suggesting amendments to resolutions or voting on decisions.

It should also be noted that, at the Annual Session, with the exception of the Plenary session on the final day, the five committee meetings take place in parallel. This means that, in light of the size of the Australian delegation, Australia can only be represented in one or two of the committee meetings at any given time. This report therefore provides a summary of the delegation's activities, rather than seeking to cover the full range of activities undertaken by the Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly.

Political Committee

The Political Committee's activities involved a series of presentations, each followed by a question-and-answer session. Interventions, or short presentations by delegates, also featured in the program. Key matters addressed in the sessions attended by the Australian delegation are summarised below.

Presentation by the Rt Hon. Dominic Raab MP, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs, United Kingdom

Secretary Raab emphasised the United Kingdom's ongoing commitment to NATO, and discussed some of the complex challenges facing the trans-Atlantic alliance. He emphasised the importance of Europe and North America continuing to work together to pursue shared interests, upholding the international rules-based system.

Secretary Raab noted that Russia does not respect the international rules-based system. He acknowledged NATO's conventional measures in an attempt to deal with threats from Russia, and noted that NATO needed to adapt to the changing threats presented by Russia.

Secretary Raab referred to Russia's role in cyber security threats and discussed some ways that the UK and NATO were working towards countering these threats.

Secretary Raab also discussed the importance of burden-sharing, acknowledged important progress that had been made in this area. He referred

to the commitment made by NATO countries to allocate at least two per cent of their GDP to defence spending by 2024, and urged all allies redouble efforts to achieve this goal.

Discussion ensued, much of it focussing on the recent activities on the Turkish-Syrian border.

Germany noted that NATO is an alliance of values, and referred to emerging reports of Turkey's military activity in Syria. Secretary Raab acknowledged the importance of shared values and actions, and emphasised the UK's opposition to Turkey's military incursion into Syria.

Belgium acknowledged the difficulties being experienced by Turkey, and expressed disappointment about the threatening language used by Turkey in relation to sending refugees to Europe. Belgium also referred to the difficulties associated with foreign fighters. Secretary Raab echoed concerns about the language used by Turkey in threats about refugees in Europe.

Turkey noted its longstanding relationship with NATO, and referred to its support in NATO-led operations. Turkey responded to the concerns raised by Germany and Belgium, and clarified that its operation was not an invasion, but a counter-terrorism exercise against the Kurdistan Workers' Party (PKK) and the People's Protection Units (YPG). Turkey noted that the two aims of operation were to fight terrorist groups threatening Syria and Turkey, and enable the return of two million refugees to their homes in Syria.

Turkey indicated that it had long sought assistance from allies to assist with the

refugee and security situation in the region. Turkey clarified that the remarks by President Erdogan about refugees were a result of deep disappointment about sustained inaction by allies these matters.

Secretary Raab stated that Turkey was a valuable partner and acknowledged Turkey's role in various NATO operations. Secretary Raab noted Turkey's legitimate concerns and the difficulties Turkey had been experiencing. Secretary Raab further noted that Turkey had been generous in hosting a large number of refugees from Syria. Nevertheless, Secretary Raab reiterated the need to exercise maximum constraint and work with international partners to keep the focus on Daesh and prevent the humanitarian situation from deteriorating. He emphasised the UK's view that the Turkish incursion is wrong. Secretary Raab disagreed with Turkey's characterisation of its recent military activities in Syria and disputed Turkey's characterisation of the potential outcomes of the operation. Secretary Raab asserted that Turkey's actions would negatively affect the battle against Daesh.

Relations with Russia were also discussed. Germany raised the issue of the G7 and the potential readmission of Russia. Secretary Rabb indicated that the UK did not have an in-principle opposition to Russia's readmission, but emphasised that Russia needed to take steps to demonstrate its conformity with and respect for the international rules-based system.

The UK delegation referred to the matter of NATO enlargement and Russia's political and practical

opposition to it. Ukraine noted its role as a potential NATO partner, and also a contributor of peace in the region, and indicated that that Russia would present challenges for former Soviet countries. Secretary Raab acknowledged that Russia's opposition in this area had always been a challenge, and emphasised the importance of Russia meeting its responsibilities under international law.

The matter of the British departure from the European Union (EU) was also discussed. Latvia noted the military mobility and interconnectivity between European countries in particular, and the UK's physical separation from continental Europe. Latvia queried whether Brexit was likely to affect interconnectivity. The European Parliament queried the impact of Brexit on various European initiatives. Secretary Raab characterised the UK's departure from the EU as a departure from a political club, and noted that the UK had formally asked the EU to work with it on a no deal exit. Secretary Raab expressed the view that political separation from the EU would enable the UK to continue to be strong allies to its neighbours.

Intervention by James Gray MP, Parliament of the United Kingdom

Mr Gray discussed an initiative by the UK Parliament to ensure better linkages between the Parliament and the Armed Services. These included weekly briefings, and placements for parliamentarians with the Armed Services, to help parliamentarians better understand the experiences of defence personnel on the ground in the UK and overseas.

Gerald E. Connolly, from the United States, presented the draft report of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Relations, *NATO @ 70: Why The Alliance Remains Indispensable*

Mr Connolly discussed some of NATO's contributions to maintaining peace and democracy and dealing with crises. He emphasised the importance of celebrating NATO's achievements, but also of considering and responding to challenges. He affirmed the importance of a continuing commitment to democratic principles. While noting the importance of defence cooperation amongst NATO allies, Mr Connolly characterised the alliance as being primarily political in nature, promoting the democratic, rules-based system of government, rather than the alternatives. Mr Connolly also noted disagreement and discord among NATO members, and indicated that this was a sign of NATO's health as a democratic organisation.

Mr Connolly referred to several of the security challenges being faced by NATO.

Chief among those challenges was the role of Russia and its disregard for international norms, and attempts to justify the unilateral use of force. Another challenge was a new distribution of power, with the rise of the People's Republic of China, and its breathtaking economic and technological developments, and military development. Mr Connolly contended that, much like Russia, China does not respect the rules-based system NATO helped build and defend. Mr Connolly also referred to challenges to NATO from the South, with widespread instability in Lybia, Iraq and

Afghanistan having created humanitarian crises and enabled the spread of violent extremist religious groups.

Mr Connolly addressed some of the challenges to NATO from within, including what he described as democratic backsliding being experienced in some alliance members and increasing polarisation in large parts of many of NATO members. Mr Connolly stated that the rise of nationalism around the world was at odds with the international solidarity underpinning NATO. Mr Connolly stated that it was therefore necessary to strengthen the resilience of NATO democracies or risk undermining citizens' faith in western values.

Mr Connolly referred to NATO's openness to partnerships, and underlined its approach of projecting stability through cooperation. He noted that the ascension of Montenegro sends a powerful message that Russia has no role in determining which countries enter the alliance.

Mr Connolly acknowledged that decision-making among a soon-to-be 30 member organisation can be challenging and time-consuming, but noted that this was the nature of democratic organisations.

The report made several recommendations, including:

- updating the NATO strategic concept to better account for the present role and challenges posed by Russia and China, and to give greater emphasis to cyber and hybrid threats, which were currently not accounted for

- establishing a Centre of Excellence on Military Mobility, similar to the existing Centre of Excellence on Hybrid Threats
- establishing a Democratic Resiliency Coordination Centre, to serve as an oversight body for common values and to assist Member States on matters such as election integrity and security, judicial independence, press freedoms, and other values important to NATO.

Discussion ensued, which focussed on challenges from outside the alliance, relations with other multilateral organisations, and recent developments on the Turkey-Syria border.

Germany queried China's challenges to NATO. Mr Connolly discussed some of China's activities, including in the Arctic, the Belt and Road Initiative, and establishing financial institutions that would compete with existing international financial institutions, and noted China's development towards becoming the biggest economy in the world. While not necessarily a threat in the traditional sense, Mr Connolly reiterated that China is a source of competition from a system diametrically opposed to democratic systems.

Germany expressed its agreement with recommendations to update the NATO strategic concept and establish a new Centre of Excellence, but raised doubts about the recommendation to establish a Democracy Resiliency Coordination Centre. Germany noted that, in Europe, the Council of Europe, the European Union, and other institutions are well placed to assist in this regard, and queried whether the recommendation

could be removed. Mr Connolly acknowledged Germany's point about existing organisations, but noted that some countries want NATO to be involved in this area. Mr Connolly reiterated the importance of having a resource focussed on assisting with the backsliding on democratic values within the NATO alliance.

France raised the matter of dealing with members of the alliance who have a different view to that of the majority of members. Mr Connolly discussed the importance of unity and noted that Russia does not have a role in determining who is, or seeks to be, a member of NATO.

Belgium called for greater emphasis on compatibility of military equipment purchased by alliance partners, noting that some partners purchase Russian equipment, which is not fully compatible with that of alliance partners. Mr Connolly noted that the sub-committee sought to focus on policy matters rather than mechanics, but agreed with the proposition put by Belgium and acknowledged the value of efforts to improve interoperability and compatibility.

Norway advised that the European Union is giving renewed focus to its own defence policies, with a view to establishing a Defence Secretary within the EU. Norway queried how NATO could ensure that it is not competing with the EU for money or resources, in light of these developments. Mr Connolly noted that the organisation of the EU was a matter for the EU itself. Mr Connolly observed that it had already been difficult to achieve the goal of NATO allies allocating two per cent of their GDP for their

military budgets, and expressed concern about changes that would add further pressure.

Belgium expressed its view that the recent Turkish action in Syria was more about serving Russian interests than serving NATO interests. Mr Connolly shared the concerns that activities in Syria could strengthen Daesh, and noted that all parties involved would have to account for their actions. Mr Connolly acknowledged that these were difficult and complex matters to discuss within NATO, but confirmed the value of such discussions being had. Turkey discussed its attempts to engage NATO on the matter of Daesh over several years, without success. Mr Connolly noted the difficulties being faced by Turkey, and stated that any incursion into Syria risked unleashing unintended consequences.

Defence and Security Committee

As with the Political Committee, the Defence and Security Committee's activities involved a series of presentations on Saturday 12 and Sunday 13 October 2019, each followed by a question-and-answer session. Interventions and administrative business also featured in the program. A summary of sessions attended by the Australian delegation appears below.

Roundtable discussion on Post-INF Challenges: Nuclear Deterrence and Arms Control in a New Strategic Environment

A roundtable discussion was held, presided over by Chairperson of the Defence and Security Committee, Michael R. Turner (United States), with panel participants including:

- Bruno Tertrais, Deputy Director, Foundation for Strategic Research, Paris
- Tom Plant, Director, Proliferation and Nuclear Policy, Royal United Services Institute (RUSI)

Mr Plant discussed the nuclear ambitions and capabilities of a range of countries, including China, North Korea, and Iran. He discussed nuclear proliferation, drawing on analogies from systems theory and related fields. He noted that multidimensional systems involve more complexity and can make it harder to determine whether a state is stable. He emphasised that shorter-term, more adaptable, more fluid agreements are likely to be more useful than grand, long-term alliances and agreements in this area.

There was discussion of Russia's violation of various undertakings and agreements, including a territorial integrity guarantee to Ukraine, and nuclear non-proliferation treaties. It was suggested that these violations were an indication of a shift in Russia's commitment to treaties and respect for international rule of law more generally. Mr Tertrais suggested that there had been a paradigmatic shift in Russia's behaviour, and suggested that Russia would return to arms control when it considers it to be in its interests, which was not likely to take place within the coming years.

The panel discussed the 8 August 2019 accident in Nyonoksa, which involved the purported test of failed test of a Burevestnik nuclear-powered cruise missile (NATO reporting name 'Skyfall'). Discussion referred to the Russian military industrial complex being given free reign, with public communication management by Moscow reminiscent of the Cold War era. The need to adopt a post-Cold War mentality in dealing with Russia.

France queried whether a new era of Russian proliferation was imminent and raised the possible implications for satellite countries, such as India, Pakistan, North Korea, and Iran. The rapidly developing dynamics among satellite states were noted, as was the fact that one of the countries – North Korea – was a supplier of arms. The network of cooperation and acquisition of missiles from North Korea was discussed, and it was noted that this phenomenon presented challenges particularly for Japan, South Korea and Taiwan, but not only for those countries.

Mr Tertrais noted that, despite Russian displays of military strength; its weaknesses remain intact.

Reports from subcommittees

Reports were received on the future activities of the Sub-Committee on Future Security and Defence Capabilities, and the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Defence and Security Cooperation.

Presentation by Michael Singh, Managing Director and Senior Fellow, The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, on *Iran's Regional and Global Challenge: Renewing a Multilateral Strategy Toward Iran*

Professor Singh presented the situation with Iran as involving crises three different types of crises:

- a nuclear crisis, represented by Iran's incremental retreat from the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA);
- a regional crisis, involving reprisal attacks between Iran, the Arab states of the Persian Gulf, and Israel; and
- a transatlantic crisis, with the United States threatening sanctions on European partners for adhering to an agreement to which the United States was itself a party.

Professor Singh noted that the JCPOA was very polarising in the United States, lacking a sufficient coalition supporting it domestically.

Professor Singh indicated that Iran's objectives could be interpreted in one of two ways:

- to convince the United States to change its policy, to convince the United States that the costs of the approach exceed any potential benefits; or
- to build up leverage in advance of any future negotiation.

As a transatlantic community NATO has been forced to respond to Iran's actions. There is recognition that some response is required, but overwhelmingly the transatlantic response has been one of paralysis. Professor Singh posited that NATO could either ignore Iran's actions or respond, the latter of which may bring on some sort of conflict that may not be beneficial.

Professor Singh proposed three strategic objectives in responding to Iran:

- limit Iran's nuclear capability
- limit and counter Iran's proliferation of missiles
- counter and contain Iran's opportunistic regional activities.

It was noted that these objectives are shared by the United States and NATO partners, although there may be different ideas on how these objectives might be achieved. The United States has taken a maximum pressure approach – giving preference to sanctions over dialogue or even military action – while NATO partners are pushing for greater dialogue. Professor Singh was of the view that the approach needs to be multilateral to succeed, because otherwise Iran will seek opportunities to drive wedges between various parties.

Discussion ensued, focussing on Iran's expectations of consequences, the JCPOA, and the possibility of regime change.

The United States observed that Iran had escalated actions in recent times, and must have expected that there would be consequences. Professor Singh noted that the United States' responses to regional activities had tended to be historically quite mild, and contended that Iran had perhaps calculated that the United States is more risk-averse than Iran is.

The United States observed that the most significant sticking point in relation to domestic support for the JCPOA was the sunset issue, and contended that any future agreement would need to address this issue in order to be supported and sustainable. Professor Singh agreed, and noted that any future agreement should focus on only nuclear issues. Professor Singh outlined some of the flaws of the JCPOA, which included the temporary nature of the agreement – Iran took the view that they would eventually be treated like any other country under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). Professor Singh also stated that the JCPOA should have focused on items Iran would need to clandestinely create a nuclear missile.

The United Kingdom observed that, in recent years, there has been an expectation that there might be regime change from within Iran. Professor Singh observed that this sort of thinking had endured since the mid-1980s. Professor Singh added that regimes can endure a tremendous amount of economic pressure, and for this reason

the basis of a future agreement cannot be a desire for regime change.

Joseph A. Day from Canada presented a draft report (*A New Era for Nuclear Deterrence? Modernisation, Arms Control, and Allied Nuclear Forces*) and a draft resolution (*Recent Developments in Afghanistan*)

Mr Day referred to the Skyfall incident and discussed Russia's developments in nuclear capability and the implications of the of the INF. Mr Day noted that the last remaining nuclear non-proliferation agreement with Russia was due to expire in less than two years. With this in mind, Mr Day informed the Committee that the draft report calls for a range of measures, and emphasised NATO's role in establishing clear nuclear deterrence, educating people within NATO countries, and noting the important role for parliamentarians in this education process.

Mr Day, in response to an interjection from the Republic of Korea, noted the the challenges being faced in East Asia, particularly on and around the Korean Peninsula.

The Committee considered the draft report, along with the draft resolution in relation to 'Recent Developments in Afghanistan'. There was discussion about the name of Daesh, with Turkey expressing sensitivities about the use of the word 'Islamic' in connection with Daesh. Afghanistan, a NATO global partner, also expressed some concerns about the resolution.

Following discussion, the report and resolution were adopted.

Mr Utuku Cakirozer, from Turkey, presented the draft report of the Sub-Committee on Future Security and Defence Capabilities, *NATO Exercises—Evolution and Lessons Learned*, prepared by Ms Lara Martinho from Portugal

Mr Cakirozer presented the draft report of the Sub-Committee on Future Security and Defence Capabilities. He discussed the range of NATO exercises and the benefits derived from them, including enhanced interoperability and rapid response capability.

Following Mr Cakirozer's presentation, the report was adopted, without discussion or amendment.

Mr Keir Giles, Research Director, Conflict Studies Research Centre, presented on *Russia is back! (where it started)*

Mr Giles discussed what he described as the deep-seated opposition of Russia to western values. He contended that better relations between Russia and Europe had only been possible when Russia was in a state of relative weakness, and that the period of relative stability was only ever going to be temporary.

Mr Giles recalled that, when he last presented to the committee in 2015, he had indicated that hostility between Russia and the West represented a return to historical default settings. He noted that enduring incompatibility between Russia and the West was

unsurprising given the widely differing geostrategic priorities on both sides.

Mr Giles cautioned against taking the post-Cold War era as a standard for Russia's relations with the West, and suggested that, once it is recognised that the differences between Russia and the West are irreconcilable, effort can be devoted to managing the relationship, rather than seeking to reset fundamental contradictions in priorities and values—on either side. Mr Giles stated that a consistent policy of de-escalation, taken to its natural conclusion, amounts to surrender.

Mr Giles was of the view that it would be a mistake to assume that Russia intends to cooperate with the West. Instead, the view should be that Russia needs to be contained—that is, determining what is needed for maintaining the relationship while protecting Russia's neighbours.

Discussion ensued, with views being shared about Russia's intentions and domestic situation, and the West's approaches to relations with Russia.

The United States observed that Russia appears to take the approach of 'escalating to de-escalate', although this is not part of Russia's stated policies. The United Kingdom raised examples of best practice on relations with Russia. Belgium expressed concerns about a lack of unity among western countries on how to deal with Russia.

Turkey raised the issue of China–Russia relations and the impact of intra-NATO tensions on these relations. It was observed that Russia's relationship with China is an area of uncertainty in relation to Russia's future. It was

suggested that Russia appeared to be in denial about some of the challenges facing it in coming years.

Mr Giles contended that there is a limit to the Russian population's patience in the face of declining living standards and economic conditions, although observed that predictions about the decline of Putin were routinely made.

The meeting discussed the fact that there is some variation between NATO allies both in their appetite to addressing relations with Russia, and the preferred approach for doing so.

Mr Giles, in responding to a query about recent trends in Russian adventurism, noted that Russia does value stability and security, and therefore does not seek to undermine relationships that are stable. However, more broadly, destabilisation is part of the Russian approach to securing its national interests.

Roundtable discussion on North Atlantic Security

Sir Nicholas Soams, from the United Kingdom, presented the report of the Sub-Committee on Transatlantic Defence and Security Cooperation, *Evolving Security in the North Atlantic*.

Sir Nicholas discussed some of the challenges posed by Russia's activities. He also stressed the critical importance of the North Atlantic for all NATO allies, and raised concerns about Russian activity in this area, particularly in relation to communications infrastructure. Sir Nicholas referred to increased activity by allies to help secure the region.

The report made several recommendations, including:

- Allies to consider revamping former or opening new bases in and around strategically important areas in the North Atlantic, for effective monitoring of adversary activity;
- further investment in Allied naval fleets and maritime patrol aircraft (MPA) fleets;
- increased anti-submarine exercises with Allies in the North Atlantic.

Sir Nicholas reinforced that the North Atlantic is essential for the military, economic and strategic needs of NATO Allies.

Discussion ensued. The United Kingdom raised the adequacy of NATO Allies' naval assets for securing the North Atlantic. Sir Nicholas noted that the United Kingdom has a significant program of ship purchases underway, and agreed that having a sufficient number of ships will be crucial in the coming years.

Iceland observed that the report indicates that access to Iceland is vital for any Ally's plan to protect the North Atlantic, but does not address the impact of climate change on Iceland. It was observed that climate change is one of the greatest threats to Iceland's national security, and that the loss of the Arctic not only be catastrophic for the global climate, but could also become an arena for greater conflict. Sir Nicholas commended the work of the former President of Iceland in convening a recent meeting on climate change, and agreed that the impact of climate change must be taken account of by military and political leaders

around the world, but particularly in Iceland.

Commander Marcel Halle, Deputy Chief of Staff Plans, Allied Maritime Command Northwood, presented on *NATO's Response to New Challenges in the North Atlantic*.

Commander Halle referred to the evolving security situation and increasing complexity in the North Atlantic. He referred to the illegal annexure of Crimea by Russia, and discussed Russia's growing maritime capability and recent developments in this area.

Commander Halle spoke about the relevance of strengthening maritime capability for NATO's overall capability, and noted upcoming plans, including additional command locations and equipment. He indicated that NATO improvements had focused on enhancing coordination and force readiness. Commander Halle emphasised the importance of ensuring freedom of navigation in the North Atlantic.

The United Kingdom observed that NATO is fundamentally about providing a counterbalance to other powers in the region. In relation to threats to submarine cables in the North Atlantic, the United Kingdom queried what might be effective counterbalances. Commander Halle advised that, in relation to capability in the maritime domain, the issue of joint capability was of critical importance. Commander Halle spoke of the need to understand the nature of threats and the capabilities available to adversaries. He also referred to a gap in anti-submarine warfare (ASW) capability, and noted

that Canada had made a major investment of over \$3.5 billion on a mid-life upgrade on its frigate program, which would make a significant contribution to NATO's work in the North Atlantic. Commander Halle also noted that there had been a 10 to 15 year build-up to the annexure of Crimea, where NATO did not keep pace with improvements in Russian military capability. He stated that he was heartened by action taken by NATO Allies to address the changed security and strategic environment.

The United States noted the pressures on domestic budgets, and queried how maritime investments should be allocated between carriers and submarines. Commander Halle noted that nations are best placed to make these decisions themselves, and noted that NATO priorities are determined through separate processes.

Spain queried whether NATO needed to review its posture and position in light of ongoing escalation in hostilities by Russia. Spain also raised the influence of China and how NATO might deter China from undertaking activities in the North Atlantic, particularly in the High North. Commander Halle noted that, in managing its posture, NATO seeks to strike the right balance: not wishing to escalate, but to deter so that NATO is not required to take defensive action. Commander Halle noted that it was important to maintain an awareness of all activities in the maritime domain, but in relation to China, which is a significant maritime actor becoming more global, China's activities are monitored and considered by NATO.

Consideration of amendments and vote on the draft resolution, Supporting NATO's Post-INF Treaty Defence and Deterrence Posture

Mr Joseph A. Day (Canada), General Rapporteur, spoke to the draft resolution, noting activities by countries like China and Iran to increase nuclear capabilities, as well as Russia's growing rhetoric in relation to nuclear weapons. Collapse of the INF treaty was caused by Russia.

The draft resolution was discussed, and adopted with some amendments.

Election of Committee and Sub-Committee Officers

The uncontested elections of committee and sub-committee officers were conducted.

Senator David Fawcett (Australia), presentation on *Countering Foreign Interference and Espionage*

As noted earlier, in a somewhat unusual development for an observer delegation, Australia was given the opportunity to make a presentation to the Defence and Security Committee.

Senator Fawcett provided some context around Australia's strategic and security environment and priorities. He spoke about hybrid warfare and the parallel investment Australia was making in conventional military capability as well as legislative steps Australia had taken in relation to securing infrastructure and updating espionage and foreign interference measures in a digital age.

Senator Fawcett noted the Australian economy's reliance on foreign investment, and discussed reinforcements that had been made to the resources and mandate of Australia's Foreign Investment Review Board to ensure a greater focus on national security when making decisions on foreign investments.

Senator Fawcett discussed aspects of the *Defence White Paper 2016*, noting that Australia had revised its strategic position. Senator Fawcett observed that there would be more than half of the world's submarines and advanced combat aircraft operating in the South Pacific. In this context, Senator Fawcett highlighted Australia's commitment to investing a minimum of two per cent of GDP in military expenditure. Importantly, included in Australia's military investment are enablers that are often an after-thought.

Senator Fawcett discussed Australia's defence industry, and noted that Australia's approach was to continue to develop a sovereign defence industry capability, while working with allies for off-the-shelf equipment. Senator Fawcett noted that Australia was one of the relatively large, friendly democracies in the region, and observed that this presents opportunities for other countries.

Senator Fawcett outlined Australia's marine, enabling, air and land capabilities. He encouraged NATO to also focus on federated networks and Estonia's Cyber Centre of Excellence, to ensure that the systems relied on are effective in their roles. Australia's cooperation with NATO allies in the

area of equipment provision was also highlighted.

Senator Fawcett shared with the Assembly the view from the south, that while recognising that current NATO priority is preparedness for a conventional conflict with Russia, this preparedness should extend to consider other nation states that do not abide by the global rules based order. He added that there was a need to understand the implications of hybrid warfare. Senator Fawcett emphasised that, as an enhanced opportunity partner, Australia looked forward to working with NATO.

Discussion ensued. The United States discussed concerns about state ownership of companies. The United Kingdom praised the Australian focus on its long-term defence program to respond to the local context, and sought further information on Australia's oversight mechanisms. Senator Fawcett discussed the operations and mandate of the

Australian Parliament's two main defence and security oversight committees: the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, of which he was Chair; and the statutory Parliamentary Joint Committee on Intelligence and Security, of which he was also a member.

Ukraine discussed foreign investment policies as they relate to national security settings, and observed that a balance needed to be struck to encourage and be open to international investment while maintain appropriate national security controls.

Senator Fawcett made some observations relating to this balance in the Australian context, noted that grey areas existed, and shared examples where there could be clear tensions between a desire for foreign investment and national security considerations. Senator Fawcett reinforced the importance of foreign direct investment, particularly where this is in the national interest.



Senator David Fawcett, delivering a presentation to the Defence and Security Committee.

Plenary Session

The Plenary Session was held on Monday, 14 October 2019, and was not held concurrently with any other formal meetings of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. The Plenary Session consisted of a range of addresses followed by question-and-answer sessions; tributes to members and staff; and the presentation and consideration of resolutions approved by the relevant committees. Some additional statements were also made, and a range of administrative matters were dealt with.

Matters considered by the Plenary are summarised below.

Address by Mrs Madelaine Moon, President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly

Mrs Moon gave an address to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, which is included in full at Appendix C.

Address by Rt Hon. Ben Wallace, Secretary of State for Defence of the United Kingdom

Secretary Wallace gave an address to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. He noted the history of NATO, and referred to its foundations based on mutual self-defence, not offence. Secretary Wallace observed that there are costs associated with maintaining NATO, and that this also has implications for

domestic defence budgets. The importance of momentum was also emphasised by Secretary Wallace.

Secretary Wallace referred to the Russian defence chief's statements in 2013 indicating that Russia's means of achieving strategic aims had grown. Secretary Wallace assured the Assembly that, whatever the outcomes of Brexit, the United Kingdom would continue to work cooperatively with Allies on matters of security and defence.

In response to a question from the United Kingdom, and in the context of Turkey's recent actions in the region, Secretary Wallace discussed contact he had had with Kurdish allies who are holding British Daesh fighters and children in camps, following the United States' withdrawal from Syria.

Germany raised recent actions by Turkey, and the implications for multilateral agreements and international principles. Greece sought clarification on the United Kingdom's position on the Syrian situation more broadly. Secretary Wallace acknowledged the ongoing issues and challenges for many countries in the region. He noted the threats to Turkey and the need for self-defence, but advocated a measured approach that respects international law and humanitarian considerations. Secretary Wallace also emphasised the importance of human rights being upheld, and bringing about a resolution to the Syrian situation and to bring peace and stability to the Middle East.

Address by Hon. Pedro Roque (Portugal), Vice-President of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean, President of the First Standing Committee on Political and Security-related Cooperation, and President Emeritus

Mr Roque referred to matters of shared concern with NATO, including the situation of foreign fighters in Syria, and their children, and continuing to promote a two state solution in Israel and Palestine.

Mr Roque noted that the Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean sees NATO as a natural partner, and applauded strengthening cooperation between the two organisations. He suggested that the Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean and NATO formalise the exchange of observer status to benefit the citizens of the organisations' respective nations. Mrs Moon spoke positively about NATO's increased cooperation with the Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean.

Address by H. E. Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of NATO and Chairman of the North Atlantic Council

Mr Stoltenberg gave an address to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, which is included in full at Appendix C.

Mr Stoltenberg made some additional remarks, noting serious concerns about Turkey's actions in Syria and the risk of escalating tensions and destabilising the region. Mr Stoltenberg acknowledged the genuine threats faced by Turkey, and noted that no other Ally has

experienced so many terrorist attacks, hosted so many refugees from Syria, was at such immediate risk from Syria. Nevertheless, Mr Stoltenberg emphasised the need for restraint and acting in coordination with other Allies in order to preserve gains made against the common enemy, Daesh.

Importantly, Mr Stoltenberg stressed that captured terrorists must not be allowed to escape. Mr Stoltenberg added that the international community needs to work towards an agreed solution in relation to foreign fighters in Syria.

Mr Stoltenberg also emphasised the importance of opportunities for him to meet with parliamentarians, noting that such opportunities underscore the fact that NATO is a democratic organisation.

An extensive question and answer session followed Mr Stoltenberg's address. Discussion covered a range of matters of relevance to NATO, including the situation in Syria, challenges facing NATO, internal matters such as NATO operations and expansion, relations with parties external to NATO, and matters of relevance to individual Allies. Some of these discussions are summarised below.

Recent developments in Syria attracted significant interest from NATO Allies. The United Kingdom discussed jihadist fighters and their families and children in conflict zones, and the relevant responsibilities of Allies. Italy described its work assisting Turkey to defend its airspace and, in light of Turkey's unilateral decision to invade Syria which would strengthen Russia's position in the region, queried whether Italy should withdraw its troops. Belgium raised the issue of a Kurdish human

rights activist murdered, allegedly killed by Turkish forces. Belgium noted that Kurds are not enemy forces, but are NATO's allies against Daesh in Syria.

Mr Stoltenberg acknowledged that there have been many reports of civilians killed in Syria, on both sides of the conflict, and that there have undoubtedly been civilian casualties and human suffering. Mr Stoltenberg spoke of the need for a political solution, and expressed support for United Nations-led efforts to reach a political solution in Syria.

Mr Stoltenberg noted that he had expressed his deep concerns about Turkey's actions in Syria, and recent developments had underlined those concerns. Mr Stoltenberg noted that NATO and its allies had made enormous progress by liberating territory controlled by Daesh, and warned Allies against jeopardising the progress made against this common enemy. Mr Stoltenberg informed the Assembly that he had conveyed to Istanbul his concerns that Turkey's actions may see Allies' progress undermined and compromised. Mr Stoltenberg further noted that Turkey is important for NATO, not least in the fight against Daesh—all Allies had used infrastructure and assets in Turkey in their operations to defeat Daesh. Mr Stoltenberg stated that the most immediate concern was Daesh fighters at risk of being released. Mr Stoltenberg called for stronger efforts and a more coordinated approach from the international community in dealing with foreign fighters in Syria.

For its part, Turkey affirmed its commitment to eliminating the threat

of terrorism in Syria, which it noted was also a threat to NATO Allies. Turkey reassured Allies of its willingness to listen and to explain its legitimate security concerns. Mr Stoltenberg again acknowledged that no NATO Ally is as exposed to the turmoil in Syria as Turkey is, and noted Turkey's role in hosting almost four million refugees as a result of the conflict.

The United States referred to internal and external challenges being faced by NATO, in particular domestic backsliding on some of the alliance's shared values. Mr Stoltenberg affirmed that NATO is based on core values, such as liberty, democracy, and the rule of law. Mr Stoltenberg observed that NATO cannot force decisions on national parliaments, but can provide a platform for discussion of concerns, such as those expressed by the United States. Despite these concerns, Mr Stoltenberg reminded Allies of NATO's contribution to the spread of democracy and the rule of law, especially throughout Europe after the Cold War. He added that the enlargement of NATO and the development of the European Union had made significant contributions.

Spain referred to challenges posed by countries south of the Mediterranean. Similarly, Portugal raised the issue of instability in Sub-Saharan Africa. NATO's 360-degree approach was affirmed, noting that areas south of NATO, including North Africa and the Middle East, are relevant for the whole alliance. Mr Stoltenberg referred to military activities in Iraq and Afghanistan to assist with stability and fighting terrorism, and noted fruitful cooperation with partners in Africa. He noted that NATO has the capacity to do

more, but that this must be by agreement of all Allies.

The European Parliament noted the importance of multilateralism, which was at the core of both the NATO alliance and the European Union, and observed recent increases in unilateralism around the world, which undermines the security of entire regions. Mr Stoltenberg affirmed the importance of multilateralism, noting that in a more unpredictable and uncertain world, there was a greater need for stronger multilateral organisations.

Estonia raised concerns about Russian deployment of medium range nuclear missile brigades. Mr Stoltenberg responded that NATO had no intention of deploying new land-based nuclear missiles in Europe. He spoke of NATO's desire to avoid triggering a new arms race, and discussed alternatives including enhanced conventional responses. Mr Stoltenberg framed Russia's actions as part of an ongoing pattern of behaviour, which NATO had responded to by strengthening its capability, and reinforcing its approach to Russia as comprising: deterrence, defence and dialogue.

Lithuania referred to reports of Russian actions to destabilise Europe, including through murders and murder attempts. Mr Stoltenberg acknowledged that Russia is using hybrid tools, interfering in democratic elections, using cyber tools and disinformation, which are all of great concern. Mr Stoltenberg reported that NATO responses to hybrid threats included significantly increasing intelligence capabilities, strengthening cyber defences, improving force readiness, and

increasing the presence of NATO forces in the eastern parts of the Alliance. NATO was also improving the resilience of its telecommunications and energy infrastructure.

Norway referred to the growth of the Chinese economy and discussed China's role in the future, noting the possibility of links between the transatlantic and Asia. Mr Stoltenberg noted that, historically, NATO had been focussed on the Soviet Union and Russia, but that over time Allies had become aware that the rise of China had security implications. These included activities in South China Sea, China's domestic considerations, Hong Kong, and military investment. Mr Stoltenberg observed that China was moving closer to NATO Allies, investing in critical infrastructure in Europe, in cyberspace, and activities in the Arctic Sea. Mr Stoltenberg welcomed the fact that NATO allies were considering how to most effectively respond to the rise of China.

Germany raised current operations in Afghanistan. Mr Stoltenberg expressed the view that there was no contradiction between a military presence in Afghanistan and working towards a political solution. Relations and negotiations with the Taliban, and the role of the United States, were discussed.

Iceland discussed the impacts of climate change, noting the potential impacts on the Arctic and the consequent security implications. Mr Stoltenberg noted longstanding concerns about climate change, and in particular its security-related consequences, including impacts on military infrastructure. Mr Stoltenberg noted NATO efforts to address energy use in military

operations, and noted the roles of other international bodies in addressing climate change.

Several Allies referred to NATO's relations with other countries or bodies, and discussed plans for NATO expansion.

Greece discussed formal cooperation between NATO and the security and defence bodies of the European Union. Mr Stoltenberg stated that NATO cooperates with the European Union on defence and security matters, and welcomed the European Union's efforts in this area, but noted that such efforts were complementary to rather than a replacement for NATO.

Slovenia expressed its support for the enlargement of NATO. North Macedonia and Georgia also praised NATO and spoke of their desire to join the Alliance. Mr Stoltenberg noted that NATO's door was open, as demonstrated by Montenegro and North Macedonia's moves towards the Alliance in recent years. He applauded North Macedonia on its progress towards membership, and noted that Georgia would become a member in time, but would need to strengthen its institutions to meet NATO standards.

Ukraine spoke of its battles, over many years, against Russia for sovereignty. Ukraine noted that it was encouraged by NATO's door being open, and saw the enhanced opportunity program as a step towards membership. Mr Stoltenberg expressed NATO's strong solidarity with Ukraine. He referred to Russia's actions to illegally annexe Crimea and continued destabilisation of parts of Ukraine. Mr Stoltenberg encouraged Allies to

support Ukraine, which he saw as part of upholding a rules-based order.

Serbia referred to its cooperation with NATO. Mr Stoltenberg affirmed that NATO's relationship with Serbia is very positive and strong. Mr Stoltenberg relayed NATO's assessment of Serbia as a neutral country, noting that NATO respects Serbia's sovereignty and ability to make its own decisions about its relationship with NATO.

Latvia referred to the potential impacts of a no deal Brexit, questioning whether this could affect military mobility and cooperation. Mr Stoltenberg noted that these issues had been considered by NATO and the European Union, and discussions had been had about how defence mobility could be improved.

Election of Officers of the Assembly

The uncontested elections of Assembly officers were conducted.

Tributes

Tributes were paid to departing colleagues, including Marc Angel (Luxembourg); Vitalino Canas (Portugal); Joseph A. Day (Canada); and Julio Miranda Calha (Portugal).

Tributes were also paid to David Hobbs, the outgoing Secretary General of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, upon his retirement.

**Lord Campbell of Pittenweem
(United Kingdom), on the Draft
Revised Rules of Procedure**

Lord Campbell presented the Draft Revised Rules of Procedure, and noted that the proposed revisions related to changes that have taken place within organisations over time. Lord Campbell also recommended that the rules be reviewed regularly.

The Revised Rules of Procedure were adopted, with one Member opposed and one abstention.

The President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly noted that the revised rules represented a considerable body of work. She noted that the rules are now clearer, more robust, and will make the Assembly's operations easier to navigate.

**Presentation by Susan Davis, General
Rapporteur of the Science and
Technology Committee, on the text
adopted by the Committee on
*Strengthening NATO cyber security,
defence, and deterrence***

Ms Davis presented the draft resolution and spoke to it.

The Plenary adopted the resolution as Resolution 459. The final text is included at Appendix D of this report.

**Presentation by Julio Miranda Calha,
General Rapporteur of the Political
Committee, on the text adopted by
the Committee on *NATO @ 70:
Celebrating 70 years of peace and
security through unity***

Mr Calha presented the draft resolution and spoke to it.

Amendment 1, from Latvia, was moved by Ojars Eriks Kalnins. The amendment sought to insert a new paragraph after paragraph 3, as follows:

Welcoming the meeting of NATO Heads of State and Government in London in December 2019 to celebrate NATO's anniversary as an opportunity to ensure that the Alliance is prepared for future security challenges;

Amendment 1 was agreed to. The resolution, as amended, was agreed to by the Plenary (with two Members voting against).

**Presentation by Julio Miranda Calha,
General Rapporteur of the Political
Committee, on the text adopted by
the Committee on *Tackling security
challenges from Africa***

Mr Calha presented the draft resolution and spoke to it.

The Plenary adopted the resolution (with one Member voting against) as Resolution 458. The final text is included at Appendix D of this report.

**Presentation by Ulla Schmidt,
General Rapporteur of the
Committee on the Civil Dimension of
Security, on the text adopted by the
Committee on *Reaffirming
commitment to NATO's founding
principles and values***

Ms Schmidt presented the draft resolution and spoke to it.

Amendment 1, from Italy, was moved by Luca Frusone. The amendment sought to delete sub-paragraph (a) in paragraph 11. Objections to the sub-paragraph were discussed, noting that there are other organisations which are well placed to assist allies with strengthening democratic institutions. On the other hand, some member countries supported retaining the sub-paragraph, referring to the importance of bolstering democratic institutions within NATO Allies.

Amendment 1 was defeated.

The Plenary adopted the resolution (with two Members voting against and two Members abstaining) as Resolution 454. The final text is included at Appendix D of this report.

**Presentation by Joseph A. Day,
General Rapporteur of the Defence
and Security Committee, on the text
adopted by the Committee on
*Supporting NATO's post-INF treaty
defence and deterrence posture***

Mr Day presented the draft resolution and spoke to it.

Mr Day noted that the Alliance is dealing with a changing and in many ways deteriorating nuclear weapons

environment. He further noted that China is improving its capability and there will soon be a nuclear triad. Mr Day commented that the rhetoric from Moscow is destabilising and asserted that Russia was responsible for the demise of the INF treaty. Mr Day observed that hopes for extending the only remaining treaty (New Start) were fading, and that in this new security environment NATO parliamentarians must continue to support new nuclear deterrence.

The Plenary adopted the resolution as Resolution 455. The final text is included at Appendix D of this report.

**Presentation by Joseph A. Day,
General Rapporteur of the Defence
and Security Committee, on the text
adopted by the Committee on *Recent
developments in Afghanistan***

Mr Day presented the draft resolution and spoke to it.

The Plenary adopted the resolution (with three Members voting against) as Resolution 456. The final text is included at Appendix D of this report.

Statements by delegations

The delegations from Iraq and Ukraine had requested the opportunity to address the Plenary.

The Iraq delegation expressed its thanks for the invitation to participate in the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. Iraq acknowledged the ongoing training provided by NATO Allies to Iraqi police and army officers. Iraq noted that it had taken the lead in the fight against ISIS

with support from NATO, and that it continues to work with NATO with a view to increasing security and stability domestically. Iraq requested that NATO assistance be extended to include the establishment of training academies.

The Ukraine expressed its thanks for five years of support from member states in one of the most difficult situations Ukraine had faced due to Russian aggression. Ukraine stated that the Alliance's success in countering Russian aggression will determine the safety and security of all of Europe.

Presentation of the 2020 Draft Budget by Treasurer Marc Angel

Mr Angel presented the budget, which was adopted unanimously by the Plenary.

Announcement by Karl A. Lamers, Head of the German Delegation, of the winners of the Karl Lamers Peace Prize

Dr Lamers, member of the German Bundestag and former President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, provided background on the essay competition he had founded. Dr Lamers spoke of the importance of youth engagement with NATO and its contributions, noting that the last three generations of citizens had grown up without witnessing war in Europe.

Dr Lamers announced the three winners of the 2019 Karl Lamers Peace Prize: Ana Šurpickaja, Kipras Adomaitis, and Laura Antanavičiūtė.

Presentation by Osman Askin Bak, Head of the Turkish Delegation, and video of delegates and refugee children football match during the Mediterranean and Middle East Special Group Seminar in Antalya

Mr Bak discussed the benefits of sports for assisting refugee children to assimilate into their new environments. The Plenary viewed a video clip of the football match.

Address by Yehor Cherniev, Head of Ukrainian delegation

Mr Cherniev presented a promotional video for the Spring Session 2020, which would be held in Kyiv.

The President thanked attendees for their contributions to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly annual session. She noted that there had been profound disagreement on some matters during the Assembly, and commended how those disagreements had been addressed in a way that preserved the unity and dignity of the organisation.

Other meetings

In addition to the meetings described earlier, during the visit program the delegation also attended a range of functions at the invitation of the hosts of the 65th Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, the Parliament of the United Kingdom. Delegation members appreciated the opportunity to make connections with parliamentary colleagues from other countries, and to learn more about the challenges and opportunities facing NATO Allies.

On Friday, 11 October 2019, the delegation also received a range of briefings from the Australian High Commission in London. These briefings helped the delegates better prepare for discussions at the Annual Session and to gain additional insights into the domestic considerations in the United Kingdom and the issues facing NATO member countries.

Side meeting with Iraqi delegation

On Sunday, 13 October 2019, the delegation from Iraq sought a meeting with the Australian delegation.

Iraq was represented at the meeting by Mr Basheer Tofiq (Deputy Speaker), Mr Gatah Alrakabi MP, Mr Ahmed Yassien MP, and

Mr Hussen Almaleky MP. The delegation was accompanied by representatives from the Iraqi Embassy to the United Kingdom, who also provided interpreting services.

Discussions at the meeting affirmed the good relations between the two countries, and Iraq expressed its appreciation for Australia's ongoing cooperation in the areas of security, military, agriculture, and education.

The Iraqi delegation called for continued and strengthened cooperation in a range of areas, including in the use of cyber technologies, agriculture and dryland farming, financial services, and construction and infrastructure.

The Australian delegation expressed its appreciation for the opportunity to meet with delegates from Iraq. Australia recognised the trauma faced by Iraq, and acknowledged the opportunities that lay ahead. The delegation also noted Australia's ongoing commitment to assist Iraq through the university system, scientific agencies, and industrial cooperation.

The delegation noted the requests made by the Iraqi delegation, and undertook to communicate these to the relevant Australian ministers.



The delegation with representatives of the delegation from Iraq, 13 October 2019.

Conclusion

The delegation's attendance at the 65th Annual Session of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly in London, in October 2019, was a useful continuation of the Australian Parliament's engagement with parliamentarians of NATO member countries and additional delegations.

As an observer delegation, the Australian Parliament's contributions to formal proceedings are naturally somewhat limited. Nevertheless, the Annual Session represented a valuable opportunity to gain a better insight into the workings of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and gain an insight into the concerns of member countries and how these are resolved or expressed within NATO.

The 65th Annual Session took place shortly after the commencement of the October 2019 Turkish offensive into north-eastern Syria. The military operation, and the circumstances surrounding it, were of particular interest to NATO member countries. There was significant disagreement on the approach taken by a member country, and the delegation observed with interest how openly and frankly various views were communicated during formal and less formal aspects of the Annual Meeting.

Additionally, this year the Australian delegation gave a presentation to the Annual Session, which was relatively unusual. Senator Fawcett took the opportunity to share with the Defence and Security Committee some recent developments in Australia that may be of interest to NATO member countries. The presentation was well received, and the delegation appreciated the opportunity to provide some information on Australia's approach to strategic matters that NATO is starting to grapple with.

In the delegation's assessment, the visit achieved its aims and was a successful demonstration of the benefits of the Australian Parliament's international program.

The delegation notes with gratitude the generous hospitality provided by the Parliament of the United Kingdom, and the excellent arrangements put in place by the NATO Parliamentary Assembly Secretariat.

The delegation records its appreciation for the work of the Department of Foreign Affairs and Australia's High Commission in London for the support provided during the visit.



Senator David Fawcett
Delegation Leader

26 March 2020

Appendix A: Delegation Program

LONDON, UNITED KINGDOM

Friday, 11 October 2019

5.05 am Arrive London

1.30 pm NATO Parliamentary Assembly registration

2.30 pm Briefing by officials from the Australian High Commission to the United Kingdom

Saturday, 12 October 2019

9.30 am NATO Parliamentary Assembly, committee meetings
to

5.30 pm

Sunday, 13 October 2019

9.00 am NATO Parliamentary Assembly, committee meetings
to

4.00 pm

1.00 pm Meeting with parliamentary delegation from Iraq

2.30 pm Reception for Commonwealth countries
Hosted by the Rt Hon. Richard Benyon MP, Leader of the United Kingdom
Delegation

8.00 pm Reception for all participants
Hosted by the Rt Hon. Richard Benyon MP, Leader of the United Kingdom
Delegation

Monday, 14 October 2019

9.00 am NATO Parliamentary Assembly, plenary session
to

3.30 pm

Tuesday, 15 October 2019

12.10 pm Depart London

Appendix B: Delegations of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly

NATO Members

Albania
Belgium
Bulgaria
Canada
Croatia
Czech Republic
Denmark
Estonia
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Italy
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Montenegro
Netherlands
Norway
Poland
Portugal
Romania
Slovakia
Slovenia
Spain
Turkey
United Kingdom
United States

Associate delegations

Armenia
Austria
Azerbaijan
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Finland
Georgia
North Macedonia
Republic of Moldova
Serbia
Sweden
Switzerland
Ukraine

European Parliament

Regional Partner and Mediterranean

Associate Member Delegations

Algeria
Israel
Jordan
Morocco

Inter-Parliamentary Assembly

Delegations

Parliamentary Assembly of the
Organization for Security and
Co-operation in Europe (OSCE PA)
Parliamentary Assembly of the Council
of Europe (PACE)

In addition to the delegations above, a range of observers attended the NATO Parliamentary Assembly. Some of these were individuals, and some were delegations from observer countries, including Australia. Other observer countries included Afghanistan, Iraq, Japan, and the Republic of Korea.

Appendix C: Addresses

Address by Mrs Madeleine Moon MP, President of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly, delivered at the plenary sitting on 14 October 2019

As President of the Assembly, it is a great pleasure and privilege to be presiding over our Annual Session which is taking place during the year in which we commemorate NATO's 70th anniversary here in London.

As a member of the delegation of the United Kingdom, it is also a welcome relief to be focusing on something other than domestic politics! However, it is also a reminder that none of us can afford to focus only on domestic problems. We cannot just think nationally: we must think regionally, and even globally.

This annual session has been a complex one, with colleagues eager to consider the volatile nature of conflicts, tensions and threats affecting the Alliance.

Turkey has long expressed concerns about a terrorist threat from YPG groups in north-eastern Syria, and as we have seen it has now launched an operation against those groups.

NATO member states have clearly expressed their concerns that this action could result in further instability in the region. They, too, have legitimate security concerns: preventing further civilian deaths and displacement, along with fears of thousands of Daesh fighters escaping from custody and re-igniting a wider conflict.

This matter should therefore, in my view, have been the subject of full Article 4 consultations since it is clear that many here feel their territorial integrity, political independence and security are threatened. Let us hope that this consultation begins now.

At the same time, I fear that many nations—while being critical of Turkey—are failing to address their responsibility for their own citizens who have fought for Daesh, and for Daesh's innocent children.

A lot of dialogue has taken place at this session, some of it in the open, and some in private.

I hope that this dialogue will continue and will be extended. It is not our place to solve the conflict, nor is it NATO's. But we all need to promote the dialogue which is, ultimately, the only way that this matter will be resolved.

Our Alliance is an outstanding success story. Throughout the profound changes in the international security landscape, NATO has adapted and evolved to remain as the cornerstone of its members' security, and as a beacon of stability for its many partners.

This 70th anniversary year is an opportunity to reflect on NATO's success and celebrate its many achievements. But it is also an opportunity to examine its current and future courses to ensure that it continues to adapt to today's and tomorrow's challenges so that NATO will remain as the indispensable foundation of our security for the next 70 years as well.

I remain deeply concerned that in many of our nations, the public remains unaware of the role NATO plays in our defence and security, and in addressing the threats and challenges we continually face.

We must do all that we can to raise public awareness about NATO, and devote particular attention to working with our younger generation.

Almost five years ago, there were two upheavals in international security. The first one should not have surprised us: we had seen the cyber-attacks against Estonia in 2007 and the occupation of Georgian territory in 2008. Yet we were surprised in 2014 when Russia used force against its neighbour and occupied the Ukrainian territory of Crimea. It then launched a campaign to foment conflict in Eastern Ukraine. Russia's blatant violations of international law and norms were accompanied by efforts to undermine western democratic societies and institutions. At the same time, Daesh made huge territorial gains in Syria and Iraq, and for a time established, in effect, a terrorist state which it governed with sickening brutality while also conducting appalling atrocities wherever else it could.

NATO's responses—elaborated at the Wales Summit in 2014—were far-reaching and effective, and the effects are there for all to see.

To counter terrorism, as well as joining the Global Coalition to Defeat ISIS, NATO has improved its awareness, capabilities, and engagement.

The decline in defence spending has been reversed, and the trends are in the right direction, even if some of the timetables are disappointing.

NATO acted swiftly to reassure those members who felt most at risk from Russia's belligerence, and since then, NATO has moved beyond reassurance and on to defence and deterrence. However, this must be seen as a continuing work in progress since Russia seems more intent upon testing, probing and challenging than in dialogue and cooperation; more interested in an arms race than in arms control.

For instance, Russia's persistent intransigence regarding its violation of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty rendered the Treaty meaningless, and left the United States with no option but to withdraw from the Treaty.

Our Alliance must also decide how to respond to Russia's efforts to develop several new nuclear delivery systems with destabilising characteristics.

But NATO's Secretary General, Jens Stoltenberg, will be talking about NATO later this morning, so let me focus on our Assembly's contribution.

We have a proud track record of speaking up for Georgia and Ukraine, and condemning the illegal occupation of their territory.

And it is not just words: we show our support and our solidarity unambiguously.

We did that in 2017 by holding our Spring Session in Tbilisi, and we will do so next year by holding our Spring Session in Kyiv.

This year, I have also made a point of visiting both Tbilisi and Kyiv to demonstrate my commitment to their Euro-Atlantic aspirations, and to learn at first hand how Georgia and Ukraine are coping with direct Russian aggression. Before our spring meeting next year, at the invitation of Ukraine's President Volodymyr Zelensky, I intend to visit Eastern Ukraine to see the security situation directly. And just two weeks ago, I visited the Administrative Boundary Line which Russia has set up around South Ossetia.

I know that many of you will have done the same thing during our session in Tbilisi in 2017, and I am sure you will therefore understand why I feel a moral obligation to take this opportunity to talk about what I saw, and what I felt.

Russia wants that line to become a defined border, entrenching the illegal division of Georgia. Georgia understandably does not want to legitimize the theft of its territory. Consequently, Russia periodically moves that line forward. It pays no attention to the lives and livelihoods of those whose families and properties are divided. I spoke to a farmer who is now effectively trapped behind the barbed wire, unable to see family members or work his land on the other side of the wire.

It was heart-rending, and I promised that I would speak up about this ongoing, callous disregard, not just of international law, but of fellow human beings, and human rights.

At this point, I must also mention that the United Kingdom has seen that same callousness used in assassinations using radioactive substances in one case, and a nerve agent in another.

And I will not begin to catalogue Russia's assaults on all our nations' free and democratic institutions, violations of arms control agreements, provocative rhetoric, and vicious propaganda campaigns.

All this is building new barriers of tension and mistrust between Russia and the European continent—and beyond—when Russia should instead be joining us in striving to overcome the legacy of the Cold War by continuing to build a united and peaceful Europe.

I have focused a lot on Europe and what I am comfortable describing as the problem of the Russian regime.

Unfortunately, we have to address other problems as well, and I must mention our highly constructive work in reaching out to our friends and colleagues from other states beyond our Alliance, notably from North Africa, the Middle East, and through into Central Asia.

We have many partners from those regions, and many of them are represented here. I will not name them all, but I would like to mention a few, for reasons which I am sure will become obvious.

Firstly, for the first time, we have among us a delegation from the Pan-African Parliament as a direct result of an Assembly meeting at the African Union's headquarters in Addis Ababa just two weeks ago, which I had the pleasure to attend.

During a bilateral meeting here with the representative from the Pan-African Parliament, I have discussed how we can build upon this new relationship.

I would also like to mention delegations from Afghanistan and Iraq, countries where NATO is making direct contributions to their quests for stability and security.

Our investments in the stability, security, and prosperity of Afghanistan and Iraq are investments in our own stability, security and economic well-being.

And I will also mention the Parliamentary Assembly of the Mediterranean whose Vice-President will speak to us later this morning. Here, too, we look towards the further development of relations between our two organizations.

Colleagues from so many NATO partner countries are a welcome, tangible reminder of the value of parliamentary diplomacy and the Assembly's continuing efforts to build ties of friendship and cooperation.

Let me make a few remarks about the evolution of our own organization.

There is a saying that you cannot cross the same river twice. The water under the bridge might look the same, but it is not the same water as the last time you crossed the bridge. So it is with our Assembly. Our meetings look the same, but the people change all the time. And it seems that they are changing faster than ever.

The International Secretariat and I have worked hard over the last year to help new Assembly members adapt to our unique community as rapidly as possible. We are also trying to ensure that those leaving us, do not lose contact with us. Our alumni network is truly remarkable, as many of us saw this February when we met Speaker of the House of Representatives, Nancy Pelosi, and EU High Representative Federica Mogherini, both of whom spoke warmly of their days in our Assembly.

And finally, I am actively pursuing efforts to engage our youth. We all know the importance of ensuring that the next generation learns about NATO and recognises that it is about their future, not just their past.

Here in London, at our Spring Session in Bratislava, and during visits to Ukraine and Georgia, we have held extremely productive meetings with the younger generation, from students to young professionals. All those meetings have been different, but all have revealed a clear desire to engage and to learn more about our Alliance and our Assembly. The demand is there. We have to step forward to fulfil that demand.

We must keep that mission at the forefront of our work, and I would urge each one of you to consider how you, as a national parliamentarian, can contribute.

Let me remind you that in less than two months, NATO will hold its Leaders' Meeting in London. London, as Richard Benyon pointed out in his welcome message, was NATO's first home. From 1949 to 1952, its headquarters were in Belgrave Square in a building which would comfortably sit in a small corner of the atrium in NATO's new headquarters.

Nothing could better illustrate NATO's ability to adapt to changing circumstances, and to demonstrate the confidence that its members have in its ability to endure for another 70 years and beyond.

Our Session here has been a great accomplishment. In bilateral meetings with new members and partners I have done my best to broaden and deepen our cooperation. Our Committees have strengthened the ties that bind us, and have finalised a host of reports which will soon be publically available on our website. Later this morning, we will adopt policy recommendations presenting our considered views on key issues facing NATO and the NATO community of nations.

I would like to thank each and every one of you for the contributions you have made and which you continue to make to this Assembly's success.

Address by H.E. Mr Jens Stoltenberg, Secretary General of NATO and Chairman of the North Atlantic Council, delivered at the plenary sitting on 14 October 2019

Dear friends, it is a great pleasure to see you again.

And let me start by expressing a special thanks to our hosts, the UK Government and the UK Parliamentary Delegation.

It is a particular honour to be here in London, in this important year of anniversaries. NATO not only celebrates our 70th anniversary, 70 years since the creation of our Alliance. But also 30 years since the fall of the Berlin Wall. An important milestone for the Alliance and for the new democracies who joined NATO after the Cold War.

So we may have real causes to celebrate, but we have no reason to become complacent. That is why I am delighted to have this opportunity to discuss with you today. Not only about what we have achieved. But more importantly, about where we are going.

NATO is the most successful Alliance in history. For over seven decades, it has created an area of unprecedented peace and prosperity. And prevented devastating conflict, which had marred so much of Europe's history for so long.

London itself witnessed the heavy cost of war. And the UK has always made a major contribution to European and transatlantic security. A bold, outward-looking and responsible global power. Which I know it will continue to be. This city is part of NATO's history. Our first home was less than a half hour walk from here, at 13 Belgrave Square. Lord Ismay, our first Secretary General, helped turn NATO into a political, as well as a military alliance. And in 1990, London hosted the meeting where NATO Leaders agreed to 'extend the hand of friendship' to the countries of Central and Eastern Europe.

The UK has always been a highly valued member of our alliance. It leads by example, spending two per cent of its GDP on defence, and by investing in new capabilities and innovation. Regardless of the UK's changing relationship with the European Union, the UK commitment to NATO remains unchanged. If anything, it will only become more important.

So we are delighted to be 'coming home' to London in December, and grateful to the UK for helping us to close this year of celebration.

As an Alliance, we face many challenges today. The balance of power is shifting. And our values are under pressure.

China is now the second largest economy. And the second largest defence spender in the world. The rise of China presents opportunities. But opportunities that also come with risks.

Russia is not the partner we once hoped for. It continues to threaten its neighbours, disregard international law, and interfere in our societies.

Instability in the Middle East and North Africa continues. Despite the enormous strides we have made against Da'esh in Iraq and Syria.

Increasingly, the lines between peace and war are being blurred. Our adversaries are using hybrid tactics to undermine our institutions, our values, and our democracies.

So the list is long. And I am ready to answer your questions on all of these challenges. But in my opening remarks I would like to focus on three of them:

- Afghanistan,
- arms control,
- and disruptive new technologies.

These are all challenges NATO Leaders will discuss when they meet in London at the end of this year.

First, Afghanistan. The day after 9/11, NATO invoked Article 5 of our founding treaty for the first and only time in our history. This was not just an attack against the United States. It was an attack against freedom and democracy everywhere in the world.

This is why NATO Allies and partners continue to stand shoulder-to-shoulder in Afghanistan. To make the Afghan security forces stronger, so that they can fight international terrorism, and create the conditions for lasting peace in Afghanistan.

I commend the Afghan forces, and the Afghan men and women for what they have achieved, and I commend the Afghan people who exercised their democratic right to vote in the recent presidential elections. NATO supported the peace talks. We would welcome the resumption of these peace talks, but then Taliban must show willingness to make real compromises at the negotiating table.

Unfortunately, what we see now is that the Taliban are escalating violence, not ending it. This demonstrates a lack of commitment to lasting peace, and it proves the need for firm and credible guarantees for any future peace deal. NATO remains committed to Afghanistan and to ensure the country never again becomes a safe haven for international terrorists.

Second, Russia's challenge to arms control. We have seen this most recently with the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. For years, the United States and NATO pressed for Russia to verifiably destroy its treaty-violating SSC-8 missiles, and to come back into full compliance.

But instead, Russia took a different path. It developed and deployed intermediate-range missiles in Europe for the first time in decades. Missiles that are nuclear capable, mobile, very hard to detect, and can reach European cities with little warning. All Allies supported the United States' decision to withdraw from the Treaty, because no treaty is effective if it is only respected by one side.

While we must respond to the presence of new Russian missiles in Europe, we will not mirror what Russia does. NATO has no intention to deploy land-based nuclear missiles in Europe. We do not want a new arms race. We remain open for constructive dialogue with Russia, and committed to effective arms control, disarmament and non-proliferation.

And at the same time, we will continue to maintain credible deterrence and defence. To keep our people safe. That is the core purpose of NATO.

The third challenge I will mention is innovation, and the rapid pace of technological change. Artificial intelligence, autonomous weapon systems, big data, and biotech. Extraordinary technologies that are changing our lives. That have the potential to revolutionise our societies, and to change the nature of warfare.

Throughout NATO's history, our deterrence and defence has depended on maintaining our technological edge. We achieved this by investing more in research and development than our rivals. But today, we can no longer take our technological edge for granted. China, for example, intends on becoming the world's leading power in artificial intelligence by 2030.

Our security depends on our ability to understand and adopt emerging technologies. And NATO plays a key role. It coordinates defence planning among nations, ensuring Allies are developing and investing in the best technologies for our defence. It creates common standards and procedures, ensuring we continue to work effectively together, including in this new domain.

And NATO can serve as a platform, as a forum for Allies and partners to consider the difficult practical, ethical and legal questions that will inevitably arise from these new technologies. For example, how to deal with the advent of entirely autonomous weapons systems that can locate, identify and kill with no human interaction? How do we ensure effective arms control when the challenge is not counting warheads, but measuring algorithms? Or how do we respond to the increasing use of off-the-shelf drones for surveillance, or to attack and disrupt civilian infrastructure?

So there are many challenges which are connected to how NATO is responding to the development of new and disruptive technologies. Ladies and gentlemen, Every one of these challenges depends on NATO maintaining strong deterrence and defence. And every one of these challenges requires your support as parliamentarians. Every single day.

I was, as I told you before, a parliamentarian for 20 years. So I know the difficult debates that must be had. Particularly when it comes to deciding budgets, and allocating resources for defence. When other domestic priorities, such as health or education, are more pressing. But our security is the foundation for everything else. We cannot take it for granted. Especially as our world becomes more unpredictable, and as our security challenges grow.

In recent years, NATO Allies have made progress. More Allies are meeting the two per cent guideline. Defence spending has increased across European Allies and Canada for five consecutive years. And by the end of next year, those Allies will have added one hundred billion extra dollars for defence spending. So we have really turned a corner. And I thank you whole-heartedly for that progress, for continuing to make a strong case for investing in our shared security.

Your experience and expertise is essential as we navigate the complexities of our modern world. Afghanistan, arms control, new technologies and many more challenges besides. They require the wisdom that only our democratically elected parliaments can offer. And perhaps even more important, is your role as the direct link between the almost one billion people we protect.

We must continue to demonstrate that working together is always better than going it alone. NATO is an Alliance of values. Of liberty, democracy and the rule of law. For 70 years, it has kept our people and our nations safe. And with your support it will keep us safe for many more years to come.

Before taking your questions let me just say a few words about the ongoing situation in Syria. The situation is of great concern. I met with President Erdoğan as well as Minister Çavuşoğlu and Minister Akar in Istanbul on Friday. I shared with them my serious concerns about the ongoing operation and the risk of further destabilising the region, escalating tensions, and even more human suffering.

Turkey has legitimate security concerns. No other Ally has suffered more terrorist attacks. No other Ally is more exposed to the instability, violence and turmoil from the Middle East. And no other Ally hosts so many refugees from Syria.

Nevertheless, I expect Turkey to act with restraint and in coordination with other Allies so that we can preserve the gains we have made against our common enemy – Da'esh.

A few years ago, Da'esh controlled significant territory in Iraq and Syria. Working together in the Global Coalition, we have liberated all this territory and millions of people. These gains must not be jeopardised.

An imminent concern is that captured terrorists must not be allowed to escape. The international community must find a coordinated and sustainable solution to deal with foreign fighters held in Syria.

Appendix D: Resolutions

Resolution 454: Reaffirming Commitment to NATO's Founding Principles and Values

Presented by the Committee on the Civil Dimension of Security and adopted by the Plenary Assembly on Monday 14 October 2019, London, United Kingdom.

The Assembly,

1. **Celebrating** the 70th anniversary of the transatlantic Alliance—a unique political-military community of like-minded nations and a bulwark of the free world;
2. **Convinced** that the enduring prominence of this Alliance as a major international actor not only stems from the military, economic, and technological strength of its members, but also from the commitment to the shared principles and values that underpin the transatlantic community;
3. **Recalling** that the North Atlantic Treaty, signed on 4 April 1949 in Washington, D.C., stipulates in its preamble the determination of the Allies “to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilisation of their peoples, founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and the rule of law”, and that, in Article 2, the Allies express their commitment to “strengthening their free institutions”;
4. **Noting** that, particularly after the fall of the Berlin Wall, NATO contributed significantly to the spread of democratic principles across the Euro-Atlantic area, and beyond, through political statements, the Open Door policy, and partnership mechanisms;
5. **Recalling** its own role as a forum to discuss the democratic credentials of NATO members during the Cold War and its activities in the post-Cold War era, supporting new democracies and helping them to develop mechanisms of parliamentary oversight of the defence and security sector;
6. **Stressing** that after the end of the Cold War, many nations broke free and were able to join NATO, and **lamenting** that some of them are still fighting for their freedom and their right to freely choose their foreign policy vector and to join the Alliance;
7. **Mindful** of the ongoing paradigm shifts in the global political and security landscape as a result of significant technological, economic, and demographic developments, and **aware** that these developments can empower autocrats and lead to a global erosion of democracy and human rights standards;
8. **Deeply concerned** that the Euro-Atlantic nations are not immune to phenomena such as decreasing popular confidence in political institutions, disenchantment with mainstream parties, and media and general democratic backsliding, which can jeopardise the trust among the Allies;
9. **Deploring** external interference, particularly by the Russian Federation, in the democratic processes in North America and Europe, the aggression against

Ukraine and Georgia, and attempts to undermine the Alliance's unity and deepen internal cleavages through cyber intrusions, social media manipulation, and other hybrid tactics;

10. **Emphasising**, nevertheless, that the founding principles and values of the Alliance remain valid and continue to define the Alliance's identity;
11. **URGES** member governments and parliaments of the North Atlantic Alliance to take a more proactive approach in promoting and protecting democratic values within the Euro-Atlantic community and beyond, and in particular:
 - a. to consider designating a structure within NATO institutions with a mandate and capacity to monitor and report –in a respectful and constructive manner –on the democratic credentials of member and candidate states, when there is reasonable ground for it, and to offer assistance to member states on election integrity and security, judicial independence, press freedom, and other aspects critical to maintaining a vibrant democracy;
 - b. to consider updating NATO's Strategic Concept to include stronger commitment to democratic values and to expand references to democracy, human rights, and the rule of law in NATO's external communication, including NATO Summit Communiqués;
 - c. to ensure adequate support to relevant Centres of Excellence, particularly the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence, the NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence, and the European Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats, in order to support democracy resilience programmes in member states;
 - d. to exchange best practices and innovative techniques and to develop further cooperation with the EU in enhancing the cyber literacy of citizens and in tackling disinformation, hate speech, and other hybrid threats;
 - e. to identify national electoral systems as strategic infrastructure and provide them with adequate protection and to raise awareness among officials and participants of electoral campaigns on how to detect and prevent hostile interference;
 - f. to support the NATO Public Diplomacy Division and relevant national actors, including parliamentarians, in their efforts to reach out to new generations of Europeans and North Americans and to spread awareness of NATO's core missions and values;
 - g. to reaffirm commitment to NATO's Open Door policy as a tool to spread the zone of stability and democratic standards in Europe, to support the Euro-Atlantic integration of Bosnia and Herzegovina, Georgia, and Ukraine, and to help strengthen their resilience against foreign interference;
 - h. to support multilateral efforts to sanction human rights abusers;
 - i. to foster the implementation of NATO's Women, Peace, and Security agenda and to mainstream gender through all NATO policies;
 - j. to redouble efforts on the national, regional, and international levels to tackle the root causes of public discontent, including migration and income inequality;

- k. to encourage authoritative figures in politics, culture, and science to help rebuild public support for democratic values and the rules-based global order;
 - l. to continue using the NATO Parliamentary Assembly as a venue for Allies to exchange their views on how to defend and promote NATO's core principles within the Alliance and beyond;
12. **URGES** international social media corporations to allocate sufficient resources to work with relevant international organisations, including NATO, its member states and partner nations as well as their civil societies, to identify and counter disinformation and social media manipulation efforts aimed at influencing the free electoral choices of member and partner nations.

Resolution 455: Supporting NATO's Post-INF Treaty Defence and Deterrence Posture

Presented by the Defence and Security Committee and adopted by the Plenary Assembly on Monday 14 October 2019, London, United Kingdom.

The Assembly,

1. **Recognising** that the Alliance's populations and territories, particularly its eastern territories, as well as neighbouring countries, already face significant and escalating conventional and hybrid threats;
2. **Alert** to efforts by states such as North Korea and Iran to develop new, powerful, and precise ballistic and cruise missile systems and, given these countries' disregard for international law and potential willingness to arm these weapons with nuclear warheads, **concerned** about the threat that this poses to international security;
3. **Aware** of China's renewed focus on its nuclear capabilities to enhance the size, robustness, precision, and mobility of its nuclear systems and **recognising** that China's efforts to modernise and expand its nuclear arsenal threaten to destabilise international peace and security;
4. **Concerned** about Russia's concerted efforts to modernise its existing strategic and tactical nuclear forces and **troubled** by its endeavours to develop new destabilising nuclear weapons with the goal of overwhelming any defences against them;
5. **Emphasising** the dangers associated with Russia's renewed focus on nuclear weapons development, as illustrated by recent incidents involving Russia's experimental nuclear weapons systems;
6. **Underscoring** that Russia's use of aggressive nuclear rhetoric, the combination of conventional and nuclear elements in its military exercising, and the continued ambiguity of its nuclear doctrine signal a potentially lower threshold for the use of nuclear weapons;
7. **Regretting** that these developments demonstrate Russia's determination to use nuclear weapons as a key means to assert its position as a global power;
8. **Underlining** that, despite the Budapest Memorandum, which guarantees the respect of Ukraine's existing borders, security and sovereignty, Russia's attack on Ukraine, its subsequent annexation of Crimea and occupation of certain territories of Donetsk and Luhansk regions has undermined global nuclear non-proliferation efforts;
9. **Reprehending** Russia's preparations for deployment of nuclear arms in Crimea;
10. **Condemning** Russian violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, which had been a pillar of stability in European security for over three decades, and **strongly supporting** the United States' decision to withdraw from the treaty after that country's extensive efforts to bring Russia back into compliance;

11. **Blaming** Russia's actions for the failure of the INF Treaty and diminished trust and stability within bilateral arms control frameworks, which may result in negative impacts on future efforts to limit the development and deployment of nuclear armaments;
12. **Underscoring** NATO's decision to respond to the end of the INF Treaty in a "measured and responsible way" with regard to the deployment of new land-based missiles in Europe;
13. **Strongly endorsing** the Alliance's announcement that it will both ensure that its nuclear deterrent remains safe, secure and effective and explore options to "work on issues" such as: exercises, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, air and missile defences, and conventional capabilities;
14. **Reiterating** NATO's longstanding commitment to arms control, as stated in the 2018 Brussels Summit Declaration, and its enduring support for the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT);
15. **Noting** the ongoing debate about the potential extension of the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (New START), now the only remaining strategic nuclear arms control agreement between the United States and Russia—which is due to expire in 2021, and **encouraging** its extension;
16. **Affirming** that, as long as they exist, nuclear weapons must remain a core component of the Alliance's defence and deterrence posture and that NATO's nuclear declaratory language must signal Allies' preparedness to take the steps necessary to defend themselves;
17. **Highlighting** that nuclear modernisation efforts by the United States, France, and the United Kingdom are necessary to ensure the safety and reliability of existing arsenals and to respond to the evolving nuclear environment, and that they do not contravene these countries' international treaty commitments and obligations;
18. **Underscoring** the necessity of maintaining the full complement of NATO's nuclear deterrence mission, including Allied support for US forward-deployed nuclear weapons and the systems necessary for their maintenance and potential deployment;
19. **URGES** member governments and parliaments of the North Atlantic Alliance:
 - a. to continue to support the Alliance's maintenance of a safe, secure, strong, capable, and survivable nuclear deterrent as a central pillar of its defence and deterrence policy in order to ensure the peace and security of Allied populations and territories and to mitigate against the dangers of an evolving international security environment characterised by the development and deployment of modern and destabilising nuclear weapons;
 - b. to continue the investments necessary to modernise existing nuclear systems and their supporting infrastructures across the full complement of NATO's nuclear mission, including the maintenance of US forward-deployed nuclear weapons;

- c. to stand behind and adequately resource new defence and deterrence measures taken by the Alliance in response to the evolving post-INF Treaty security environment, including increased exercises, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance, air and missile defences, and conventional capabilities;
- d. to educate their populations about the indispensable nature of the Alliance's nuclear capabilities within its broader defence and deterrence posture and, therefore, about the necessity of providing sufficient resources to maintain safe and reliable nuclear capabilities;
- e. to support NATO's efforts to maintain the NPT as the cornerstone of the global nuclear non-proliferation regime to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and to encourage other states to join international arms control, disarmament, and non-proliferation initiatives reflecting the nuclear weapons environment that Allies seek to mitigate for the sake of broader international peace and security.

Resolution 456: Recent Developments in Afghanistan

Presented by the Defence and Security Committee and adopted by the Plenary Assembly on Monday 14 October 2019, London, United Kingdom.

The Assembly,

1. **Recalling** that Afghanistan remains a high priority for NATO Allies and their international partners, whose principal mission is to actively support the stabilisation of Afghanistan and to contribute to the establishment of sustainable peace in this country, so that it will never again become a haven for international terrorism;
2. **Honouring** the more than 3,000 NATO and partner country forces who died as part of the effort to bring peace and stability to Afghanistan, and recognising the tens of billions of dollars contributed by those countries to rebuild and develop Afghanistan;
3. **Welcoming** the Alliance's decision at the 2018 Brussels Summit to maintain the Resolute Support Mission (RSM), which trains, advises, and assists the Afghanistan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) in their mission to protect the people and territory of Afghanistan;
4. **Concerned** by faltering progress in security sector reform in the country, which impedes ANDSF capacity and readiness and prolongs ANDSF dependence on external assistance;
5. **Worried** about increasing instability and a precipitous rise of civilian casualties due to the Taliban's intensified military efforts to seize more territory and maximise leverage at the negotiating table;
6. **Troubled** by the continued and escalating attacks by the international terrorist group, the ISILKP, also known as Daesh, in its effort to sow instability and jeopardise peace negotiations;
7. **Disappointed** the narcotics trade continues to flourish in the country, providing a key income source for the Taliban and other armed insurgent groups, fueling widespread institutional corruption, particularly in the security and justice sectors, and sustaining a nexus of destabilising criminal networks in the country, across the region, and globally;
8. **Encouraged** by the July 2019 Intra-Afghan Conference for Peace, which brought together a wide range of key stakeholders in Afghanistan and agreed on a formula for future inclusive negotiations;
9. **Urging** key parties to the ongoing conflict in Afghanistan to strive for constructive and inclusive Intra-Afghan peace negotiations, in order to facilitate a settlement reflecting a shared understanding of Afghanistan's future;
10. **Concerned** by the impact of factional disagreements inside the National Assembly of Afghanistan on the execution of its duties, resulting in its increasing marginalisation by the executive branch in the policy-making process;

11. **Underlining** that only an independent, effective, accountable, and transparent justice sector can ensure the establishment of the rule of law, increase trust in the country's institutions, and mitigate corruption;
12. **Recalling** progress made in key areas to rebuild and strengthen Afghanistan since the fall of the Taliban in 2001, including: improved access to running water, electricity, and medicine, increasing overall health indices; a stronger and more inclusive educational system; the incorporation of women into all sectors of society, particularly law enforcement and peace-building efforts; and a more diverse and growing economy;
13. **Encouraged** both by the significant advances made by Afghan women across all sectors of society and by the determination Afghan women have shown in seeking to preserve and safeguard those gains;
14. **Acknowledging**, however, that socioeconomic progress has been highly uneven across the country and that international financial support will remain vital to cover Afghanistan's continuing operational budgets and development programmes;
15. **Reaffirming** the commitment made by NATO member states to extend financial support for Afghan security forces through 2024 and **recognising** the vital role that this support and broader development assistance plays in developing the Afghan government and improving the lives of Afghans;
16. **URGES** member governments and parliaments of the North Atlantic Alliance and their partners contributing to international efforts in Afghanistan:
 - a. to continue to assist the ANDSF by enhancing the effectiveness of ongoing security assistance programmes to build a capable, self-sustaining, and professional military force working to create the conditions for enduring peace and stability in Afghanistan;
 - b. to maintain their security force assistance missions in Afghanistan until a peace agreement is reached to provide a necessary counterbalance to the ongoing efforts by insurgent groups to spoil a potential peace settlement, reconstruction efforts, and regional stability;
 - c. to fully support inclusive intra-Afghan peace negotiations and to help sustain a resulting peace agreement by providing long-term financial and technical assistance to major post-conflict challenges, such as the reintegration of former Taliban fighters into society, the promotion of economic growth, and the development of the Afghan National Police;
 - d. to support the Afghan parliament in its efforts to become an essential legislative body working for the broader good of the entire Afghan nation;
 - e. to do everything possible to ensure that Afghan women have seats at the table during peace negotiations and to support a final settlement that preserves the hard-won rights of Afghan women and girls;
17. **CALLS UPON** the government and National Assembly of Afghanistan:
 - a. to insist upon a peace settlement protecting the political, economic, and civil society achievements reached in Afghanistan since 2001, and to include

the significant and enduring participation of women across all sectors of society in that settlement;

- b. to stop factional infighting and respect the Afghan parliament's rightful role in the legislative process, and to accelerate broad-based institutional reforms to create the conditions necessary for legitimate and effective governance and the broad enforcement of the rule of law across the country.

Resolution 457: NATO @ 70: Celebrating 70 Years of Peace and Security Through Unity

Presented by the Political Committee and adopted by the Plenary Assembly on Monday 14 October 2019, London, United Kingdom.

The Assembly,

1. **Underlining** that NATO has advanced peace and security in the Euro-Atlantic area for more than 70 years and reaffirming that the Alliance remains the cornerstone of transatlantic security;
2. **Stressing** that its unique strength lies in Europe and North America's commitment to ensure each other's security, and reaffirming that all Allies are committed to the fundamental principle, enshrined in Article 5 of the Washington Treaty, that an attack against one Ally is considered as an attack against all Allies;
3. **Acknowledging** that threats such as extreme nationalism and polarised societies challenge the Alliance from within;
4. **Welcoming** the meeting of NATO Heads of State and Government in London in December 2019 to celebrate NATO's anniversary as an opportunity to ensure that the Alliance is prepared for future security challenges;
5. **Noting** that NATO continues to be the most successful security organisation because it has been credible and that that credibility is based on NATO's military capabilities and a common unity of purpose;
6. **Emphasising** that NATO's success is also due to its adherence to common values: a commitment to democracy, individual liberty, human rights, and the rule of law;
7. **Welcoming** the tangible progress on Allied defence spending and military equipment modernisation following the Defence Investment Pledge made at the 2014 Wales Summit, but also noting that the relative imbalance in defence spending and military capabilities within NATO remains to be addressed;
8. **Convinced** that the prospect of further enlargement and the spirit of cooperative security promote stability and security in the Euro-Atlantic region and reaffirming its commitment to, and support for, NATO's Open Door policy;
9. **Stressing** the crucial contribution of NATO partnerships, such as the Mediterranean Dialogue, to security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic area, the MENA region and beyond;
10. **Applauding** the important steps taken to strengthen NATO-EU cooperation, and recognising the strategic potential that could be realised by further exploiting their complementary capabilities;
11. **Recognising** that Russia's aggressive stance and actions and continued instability on NATO's southern flank challenge the security of NATO member and partner countries and pose new security threats, including in the cyber domain;

12. **Aware** that global trends such as shifts in economic and military power, demographics, and rapidly developing technologies require NATO to continuously revisit its strategic outlook;
13. **URGES** member governments and parliaments of the North Atlantic Alliance:
 - a. to update the Strategic Concept to reflect the new security environment, in particular with regard to cyber and hybrid threats, the aggressive behaviour of Russia, the growing prominence of China, the threats to the Alliance's southern flank due to the persistence of Islamist terrorist groups and the fragility of some state structures in that region;
 - b. to continue and reinforce efforts to implement the Defence Investment Pledge as fair sharing of the defence burden is crucial for Alliance cohesion and necessary to rebuild and maintain the military capabilities to deter and defend against potential adversaries;
 - c. to rededicate the Alliance to the shared democratic values that constitute its founding principles by developing democracy resiliency programmes in member states and by considering the creation of a Democratic Resiliency Coordination Centre (DRCC) within NATO's institutional structure in order to help NATO member states strengthen democratic institutions;
 - d. to ensure adequate support to relevant Centres of Excellence, particularly the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence, the NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence and the European Centre of Excellence for Countering Hybrid Threats, in order to support democracy resiliency programmes in member states;
 - e. to develop the NATO-EU relationship further, particularly in the fields of cyber defence and military mobility;
 - f. to continue supporting its partners in the East—Ukraine and Georgia in particular—against Russian interference, and to maintain, and if possible increase, assistance for their reform processes, especially for those countries aspiring to integrate into Euro-Atlantic structures (currently Bosnia-Herzegovina, Georgia and Ukraine);
 - g. to continue to develop political and practical cooperation with NATO partners, including the United Nations, the African Union, the Arab League, and the Gulf Cooperation Council;
 - h. to work towards opening up more partnerships with Latin American countries, following the example of Colombia, to strengthen the security and stability of the Euro-Atlantic area and to promote our shared commitment to democracy, the rule of law, human rights, and individual liberty.

Resolution 458: Tackling Security Challenges from Africa

Presented by the Political Committee and adopted by the Plenary Assembly on Monday 14 October 2019, London, United Kingdom.

The Assembly,

1. **Emphasising** that security on NATO's southern flank is closely intertwined with the stability of the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, which is itself heavily impacted by the volatility of the countries further south;
2. **Deeply concerned** about the deteriorating security situation in Libya caused by jihadists and the strengthening of Russian military support to Libyan militia leaders, which escalates insecurity and chaos and leads to further destabilisation;
3. **Recognising** that the interplay between corruption, weak institutions, radicalisation, terrorism, and illicit trafficking of arms, drugs, and people causes endemic insecurity in large parts of the continent;
4. **Recognising** that the expansion of militant Islamist groups beyond the Sahel region creates a belt of violent extremism in Africa;
5. **Welcoming** the decrease in irregular migration over the Mediterranean but **acknowledging** that the underlying causes driving migration have not yet been addressed;
6. **Noting** that NATO has recently been putting greater emphasis on challenges emanating from Africa and that the Framework for the South seeks to integrate and streamline NATO's approach to its southern neighbours;
7. **Applauding** the creation of the NATO Hub for the South in Naples, as it increases awareness of security not only in the MENA region but also in the areas south of it;
8. **Recognising** that NATO's approach to the South focuses on three pillars:
 - a) strengthening NATO's deterrence and defence against threats from the South,
 - b) contributing to international crisis management efforts in the region, and
 - c) helping regional partners build resilience against security threats such as terrorism;
9. **Underlining** the need for enhanced cooperation between NATO, the EU and the African Union (AU) to provide in-depth support to countries in Africa and the Middle East interested in comprehensive political and economic reform programmes;
10. **URGES** member governments and parliaments of the North Atlantic Alliance and NATO partners:
 - a. to improve situational awareness, by enhancing early-warning capabilities to monitor instability and security in Africa e.g. through improved intelligence sharing among Allies and partner countries at the Hub for the South and through greater coordination with the early-warning mechanism

within the EU, in order to create a new NATO-EU cooperation area thus enhancing NATO's capabilities to monitor potential threats;

- b. to engage in capacity-building efforts, dialogue and information exchange, and training of security forces in the Sahel region to prevent regional terrorist movements from merging with similar groups, thereby creating an immediate threat to the security of NATO Allies, some of which are already taking action to provide an adequate response, including when their links with the continent are more recent than those of the Allies with an established presence;
- c. to strengthen assistance to partner countries of the Mediterranean Dialogue (MD) in the development of adequate counterterrorism strategies that foster interethnic reconciliation and an inclusive political process;
- d. to explore the potential that member countries such as Portugal, Spain, Italy and Greece could offer for reinforcing security in Africa thanks to their privileged geographical position as a bridge between Europe and the African continent;
- e. to explore options for a shared EU-NATO approach on promoting stability in Africa and the MENA region so that both organisations can pursue common objectives, identify necessary means and mutually reinforce the respective efforts of each other;
- f. to further develop NATO's fledgling relationship with African actors, particularly the African Union;
- g. to further develop the Alliance's cooperation with the AU on security- and politics-related topics, such as the operationalisation of the African Standby Forces (ASF) and the promotion of good governance through the expansion of NATO's Building Integrity Programmes;
- h. to consider expanding NATO's Partnership for Peace (PfP) Programme to Sub-Saharan African states interested in formalising their cooperation with the Alliance on political and security-related issues in a manner which complements other missions engaged in stabilisation processes, including the Partnership for Security and Stability in the Sahel,

Resolution 459: Strengthening NATO Cyber Security, Defence, and Deterrence

Presented by the Science and Technology Committee and adopted by the Plenary Assembly on Monday 14 October 2019, London, United Kingdom.

The Assembly,

1. **Recognising** the increasingly complex international cyber threat landscape;
2. **Increasingly facing** persistent cyber campaigns falling below the threshold of armed conflict and **acknowledging** an important role for the Alliance in countering them;
3. **Remaining vigilant** regarding increasing cyber threats from terrorist and extremist groups;
4. **Underlining** that cyber attacks by states or their proxies present the biggest cyber threat to NATO;
5. **Stressing** that cyber attacks can threaten national and Euro-Atlantic prosperity, security, and stability and could, thus, lead to the invocation of the collective defence clause (Article 5) of the NATO's founding treaty;
6. **Underscoring** that Allies have an individual responsibility to maintain and develop both individual and collective capacity to resist cyber attacks, but **highlighting** NATO's crucial support role;
7. **Emphasising** NATO's defensive mandate, its continued adherence to international law, and the principle of strong political oversight of military operations;
8. **Recalling** the need to operate and defend in cyber space as effectively as in other military domains;
9. **Lauding** recent Allied and NATO progress on strengthening cyber security, defence, and deterrence;
10. **Recalling** the difficulty of attributing cyber attacks and **stressing** the danger of escalation and the need for states to decide on appropriate responses;
11. **URGES** member governments and parliaments of the North Atlantic Alliance:
 - a. to fulfil their national cyber commitments under the NATO Defence Planning Process and the NATO Cyber Defence Pledge;
 - b. to adopt a NATO cyber space doctrine by the end of 2019;

Cyber Security and Defence

- c. to redouble their efforts on:
 - i. i. cyber capability development;
 - ii. ii. cyber defence expenditures;
 - iii. iii. adaptation of Allied and NATO structures;
 - iv. iv. integration of cyber effects into military operations;
 - v. v. refinement of cyber strategies and policies at the national and NATO levels;

- vi. vi. cooperation and exchange of best practices;
- vii. vii. situational awareness, information sharing, and assessment;
- viii. viii. enhancement of skills and awareness across all national and NATO stakeholder communities;
- ix. ix. fostering education, training and exercises;
- x. x. strengthening effective cyber partnerships with industry, academia, partner nations, and other international organisations, especially the EU as part of the NATO-EU Strategic Partnership;
- d. to strongly consider making defensive and offensive cyber effects available for NATO operations on a voluntary basis, if not already committed to do so;

Cyber Deterrence

- e. to continue to signal their resolve and credibility to deter cyber attacks;
- f. to maintain a cyber deterrence policy of ambiguity concerning the threshold at which a cyber attack is considered an armed attack and possible collective responses if that threshold is crossed;
- g. to continue to seek to reduce escalatory risks through clear diplomatic messaging and engagement, a high level of transparency on cyber capabilities and policies, and support to norm-development and confidence-building measures in cyber space;

Persistent Cyber Campaigns

- h. to recognise the long-term strategic risk constituted by persistent cyber campaigns and intensify consultations within the Alliance and with partners with membership aspirations;
- i. to counter persistent cyber campaigns with the right mix of security, defence, and deterrence, including increased civil preparedness and resilience;
- j. to attribute malicious cyber operations, when feasible, in a timely and coordinated fashion while respecting the sovereignty of governments; and
- k. to continue to refine their strategies for countering hybrid threats.

Appendix E: Reports

Reports adopted by committees of the NATO Parliamentary Assembly are listed below. Reports can be accessed from: <http://nato-pa.int/documents>.

Committee on the Civil Dimension of Security

- NATO @ 70: Reaffirming the Alliance's Values
- Ukraine: Five Years After the Revolution of Dignity
- Border Security

Defence and Security Committee

- A New Era For Nuclear Deterrence? Modernisation, Arms Control, and Allied Nuclear Forces
- NATO Exercises – Evolution and Lessons Learned
- Evolving Security in the North Atlantic

Economics and Security Committee

- Economic Sanctions as a Tool of Foreign Policy
- North American and European Approaches to Digital Markets and Cyber Security
- The Republic of North Macedonia: Political Change, NATO Accession and Economic Transition

Political Committee

- Security and Stability in Africa – Challenges and Opportunities for NATO
- NATO-Russia Relations – A Snapshot
- NATO @ 70: Why the Alliance Remains Indispensable

Science and Technology Committee

- NATO in the Cyber Age: Strengthening Security and Defence, Stabilising Deterrence
- Artificial Intelligence: Implications for NATO's Armed Forces
- NATO Anti-Submarine Warfare: Rebuilding Capability, Preparing for the Future