



NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

**SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER
TRANSFORMATION**

SACT's REMARKS to

MCCS

Partnership Session

Brussels, 18th May 2016

V1_0

Général d'armée aérienne Denis MERCIER



NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER TRANSFORMATION

Thank you very much Petr.

As mentioned by Mark, enhancing our interoperability with Partners has become crucial as it is difficult to imagine any NATO Operation without their involvement.

And as we moved from the high operational tempo of ISAF, we realized that our partnerships toolbox was not meeting many of the needs of our partners, including enhancing interoperability.

To address this, we are working on a new Individually Tailored Roadmaps –ITRs- concept that is intended to simplify, optimize and synchronise NATO's partnership programmes.

It will help better meet the military objectives agreed with Partners— including enhancing their interoperability with NATO.

The Military Committee has asked the Strategic Commands to deliver a new Capstone Concept by January 2017, informed by three pilot projects.

While the overarching concept will look at our partnerships tool box in the broader NATO context, the three pilot projects will take a practical look of developing a common *planning model/framework* for all partners.

Finland, Georgia, and Jordan have each volunteered to work with one of the pilot projects.

Our interim report is not due to the Military Committee until July, but I would offer some early observations.

First, we need to be clear that ITRs will not be a panacea.



NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER TRANSFORMATION

They won't meet everyone's needs, but they will move us from a largely activities based planning model to a more objectives based *model/framework* at the military level.

Second, ITRs will introduce a longer planning horizon, which is much more conducive to objectives based planning, and thus to a building blocks approach in order to enhance interoperability and meet other objectives.

The alignment of longer term NATO and Partner planning horizons will be difficult, but we have already seen progress in this area.

Partner visibility on NATO Military Training and Exercise Program now extends out to five years, and the NAC recently approved NATO School course for two years.

With the right political will, this can be achieved.

Third, we listened to Partners' concerns that we would try to achieve a one-size-fits-all planning model.

This is not our intent. I expect we will see a modular planning *model/framework* flexible enough to meet the divergent needs of most partners.

Fourth, for ITRs to be successful, I believe that both NATO and our partners have to be prepared to commit the resources and planning.

Partners have to develop long-term defence plans if they want to benefit from a more objectives-based approach.



NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY ORGANIZATION

SUPREME ALLIED COMMANDER TRANSFORMATION

And the overall success of the Concept relies on a long-term commitment of resources by both NATO and Partners.

And finally, through the ITRs concept, we hope to also shed a light on other reforms, political and military, that may be necessary to maximize the effectiveness of our partnerships toolbox.

In closing, from my perspective, ITRs could offer much more than the improved synchronization of NATO's military activities to support our Partners.

They could also become a common planning framework with other International Organizations, like the European Union and the United Nations.

With such a framework approach, areas of duplication and opportunities for greater collaboration could be more readily identified.

Therefore, building synergy with other stakeholders is something we are considering as we develop the concept.

I thank you for your attention and stand ready to answer your questions.