The Shared Perspective of the World in 2030 and Beyond
Security Implications

Strategic Foresight Analysis Workshop #3
INITIAL FINDINGS REPORT

3 December 2012
Madison Hotel - Washington, DC

Organized by
Allied Command Transformation, Norfolk

In partnership with
Atlantic Council of the United States, Washington DC
Security and Defence Agenda, Brussels

Executive Summary

The third Strategic Foresight Analysis Workshop took place December 3rd, 2012 in Washington DC, United States. Workshop #3 elaborated on security implications from the 8 top drivers identified during the Workshop#2: Shift of Global Power, No Shared Threat Perception, Interconnected World, Technology as Accelerant, Demographic Shifts, Individual Detachment, Geopolitical Competition for Resources and Globalization of Financial Resources.

75 participants from 15 nations, NATO HQ (IS, IMS), ACO (CCOMC), ACT, think tanks, academia, MODs, Delegations to NATO, Industry and military representatives from IMS and COEs attended the event. Opening remarks and guidance set the stage for 4 breakout syndicate discussions. The afternoon consisted of cross functional analysis findings and cross discussion over various aspects of the findings.

The plenary discussion revealed that Security Implications, in a NATO context, include the challenges to and opportunities for attaining the level of ambition as outlined in the Strategic Concept and defined by the three core tasks, and in maintaining the viability of the Alliance as a political and security organization with particular emphasis on sustaining Article 5.

Analysis Report

INTRODUCTION

The maintenance of future readiness and planning future capabilities in a complex and constantly evolving security environment demands extending the current mid-term 2020 planning horizon toward 2030 and beyond, where a different future security environment, its security and military implications and new broad strategic operating requirements are anticipated. Workshop #3 built upon outcomes of the second Workshop to adopt an initial perception of a shared perspective of security implications that the future security and operating environments of 2030 and beyond will present to the Alliance. The next step in the foresight process intends to expound upon these initial findings to develop a comprehensive, inclusive and transparent document during the summer of 2013.

SECURITY IMPLICATIONS

Workshop #3 intended to develop the broad security implications of the drivers of change in the 2030 timeframe identified through a combination of meta-analysis and discussions over the course of two previous foresight workshops. These implications identified for each driver are presented below.

LIST OF SECURITY IMPLICATIONS

Shift of Global Power

- **NATO's relevance as a guarantor of security will be challenged.** The economic power shift away from the West will be followed by a natural shift of military power in the future. Simultaneously, non-state actors might become sources or suppliers of security while NATO might be perceived as an organization that is no longer tenable when the relevance of its traditional military orientation might be challenged.

- **A shift in economic power creates a shift of military power.** If a shift of political and economic power creates a shift of military power to a potentially unified economic competitor, a new power "bloc" may form. If such were to occur then NATO could lose the strategic advantage and strength cornerstone that differentiates it today. On the other hand NATO could captitalize on the change and serve as a model for any new political-military alliance.

- **The Alliance's common values consensus will be challenged.** New powers will assert a ''value challenge'' while the Alliance is in danger of experiencing an eroding common-value base. This situation could affect the cohesion of the Alliance. Therefore, the key question becomes how to build NATO as an anti-fragile organization and as an exporter of security in the possible new dynamic of a post-nation state world?

Interconnected world

- **NATO is challenged by both internal and external tensions caused by the rising relevance of non-state actors.** In the world of 2030, the Alliance may face more and more sources of competition between NATO members, or global conflicts in which the interests of NATO nations do not align.

- **Legitimacy of NATO decision-making process will be challenged by new forms of expression worldwide.** Political systems worldwide will face more elements of direct democracy and plebiscite. A more informed society will demand participation in national and international politics. This may change representative democracies in NATO nations dramatically.

Absence of a shared threat perspective

- **Maintenance of NATO's center of gravity (the 28 nations) requires enhanced leadership, continuous strategic dialogue and foresight talent.** The Leadership implication refers to the existence of those centrifugal internal dynamics that could fray and possibly tear NATO's fabric. Multiple and varied threat perceptions could pull NATO in the direction of too many national, regional and functional priorities ("28 rubber ducks in a tub"). This could leave NATO unprepared at the military operational level and ineffective at the political-military consultative level, justifying why a continuous strategic dialogue is essential among the 28 nations, and further underlining the NDPP's relevance.

- **Strategic reach will remain critical in the transatlantic region.** Reciprocal power projection remains a core capability for NATO forces located in North America and Europe. This means the capacity to flow forces bi-directionally reinforces the idea of a global NATO especially when members' shores touch all strategic regions. Strategic reach includes classical military projection along physical lines of communication (LOC) as well as virtual LOCs.

- **The existence of divergent perceptions on future threats within NATO may jeopardize the ability to defend NATO values.** A renewed emphasis and constant attention to securing trans-Atlantic values will continue to be essential as part of the core mission. Absence of a shared perspective presents an opportunity for NATO to explore future ways to become a more dynamic and flexible organization, able to provide regional solutions to conflicts. NATO could identify a group of clusters of "shared threats" to facilitate debate on how the Alliance should face selected strategic challenges.

Technology as an Accelerant

- **NATO will need to monitor disruptive technologies as one of its primary tasks.** NATO nations have achieved an advantage on technological development so far. In the future, disruptive technologies can be used for good (e.g., to solve major global challenges such as

energy and natural resource shortages) as well as for malevolent purposes. Some technologies may develop more rapidly than others; if so, the faster technological developments should be tracked closely.

- **NATO will need to broaden its range of approaches to go beyond traditional concepts of a political-military Alliance that provides security.** Modern technologies will influence the security environment in unexpected and non-traditional ways. NATO will need to exert its influence in different areas, probably acting beyond the traditional provision of military and security responses. Restructuring the Alliance to achieve such goals and remain relevant will be a future challenge.

- **Strategic foresight will be a permanent requirement for NATO in the future.** Technology amplifies security challenges, increasing the likelihood of "strategic surprise." Technology is expected to speed up the evolution of the security environment, which will require NATO to evolve the way it prepares for emerging challenges, in order to avoid being left behind. For this purpose, strategic foresight initiatives will be necessary to ensure the effectiveness of the Alliance.

- **More effective countermeasures will challenge NATO capabilities.** Improved adversary conventional, unconventional and cyber capabilities will challenge the nations' willingness to engage in conflicts. This may have three effects on NATO: reluctance or resistance to engage at times; reduced or limited effectiveness when it does engage; and difficulties in deciding when to disengage. This may constrain NATO's strategic reach.

- **Adaptability will be a necessity in future organizations.** As a large, multinational organization, NATO has difficulty adapting to change than will future adversaries such as non-state actors. Moreover, as a military organization the ability to confront rapid technological changes becomes a challenge. Persistent institutional rigidity and nearsightedness within NATO and some member Nations may impede reaching an agreement on what constitutes a shared perspective.

- **Return to "effects" as a planning output for the identification of future security requirements.** NATO should reconsider effects as planning outcome to identify and address future security requirements. The complexities inherent in an interconnected and globalized world introduce critical factors into the planning equation. A return to "effects" as an "end" could be considered a way to help develop future capabilities and focus on what NATO intends to achieve in a dynamic and challenging operational environment.

Individual Detachment

- **Emerging information technologies will continue to shake our societies' original foundations.** Because of interconnecting information technologies of a nation state's citizens may identify more with a group or an organization other than the state and its grounding in consensus and rule of law. Conflicting interests may undermine loyalty to the state and its ideals. Absent unity born of common experiences, traditions and rituals that build a values-based community, i.e. the state declines. If virtual communities and cyber affiliations supplant national identities, how do we ensure Alliance cohesion is preserved in future generations?

- **NATO will be challenged to maintain an effective strategic narrative to appeal to its citizens as well as to the global community.** NATO should reposition itself now and in the future as a relevant organization through effective internal as well as external strategic communication, so as to be able to further develop a cultural solidarity among societies of member states.

Globalization of Financial Resources

- **NATO increases its relevance only as a security-*broker*.** Most nations cannot afford full spectrum capabilities anymore. Nations have to work together and specialize in certain areas. The Alliance as a whole can provide the full range of capabilities as long as it can develop mechanisms in the next decade to ensure availability for all members upon need.

- **There will be a decoupling of strategic and capability cycles as the pace of technological innovation increases.** NATO's Strategic and Procurement cycles are too cumbersome to adequately adapt to change. However, the Alliance may function as the "homogenizer" of capability building among its members, when the NDPP is improved.

- **Defence Planning will be increasingly exposed to market forces. N**ations may not have the resources to adhere to previously planned defence spending, due to financial markets volatility.

- **NATO's defence industry's role of a technology booster will diminish**. The defence industry will look beyond NATO for lucrative civilian and military markets outside. Thus, NATO may be denied or have limited access to technological advances developed outside the Alliance by its former industry partners.

Demographic Shifts

- **Widespread but unequal aging of population across the globe will have a two-fold effect and create instability.** Increased fertility rates and the consequent youth bulge in the developing world along NATO's borders (such as Middle East and North Africa) will likely fuel instability. In the developed world aging's economic impact will likely force increased social spending form the expense of defence budgets. Reduced fertility rates coupled with aging will affect the pool of available personnel for military services.

- **Increased urbanization will prompt the rise of the mega-cities.** A greater percentage of global population will have moved to expanding urban areas in search of social services and opportunities. Resource shortages and income disparities will like result in dissatisfaction and unrest. Consequently, NATO will likely have to perform peace-support and combat operations in urban areas exposing its forces to asymmetric threats.

- **NATO must be prepared to respond to shifting migration patterns.** Migration caused by natural, economic and other man-made events will have positive and negative effects on the Alliance. On the one hand immigrants pursuing economic and other opportunities will revive western societies, helping them to maintain their workforce and skill base, and compensate for its declining indigenous populations. However, immigrants' inability or resistance to cultural assimilation may cause internal unrest and or reduced support for NATO and its mission.

Geopolitical Competition for Resources

- **Competition for resources will impact Alliance security.** As nations look to secure resources for their economies, likely friction and conflict will require a political-military response. Within the Alliance, energy security must be addressed to ensure continued cooperation and cohesion and a hedge against shortages and threats.

- **The need for alternative energy will be a significant security issue.** The long-term reality of hydrocarbon depletion, pollution and climate change is already being addressed by individual allies. Collectively, a more energy efficient Alliance will reduce its dependency on "external sources" located in unstable regions and avoid being held energy- hostage by anti-western groups or nations controlling access to critical resources.

CONCLUSION

The Alliance should anticipate an alternative future and strive to gain an early understanding of how to match requirements to new and emerging threats, challenges and opportunities. The goal of this third workshop, "to examine selected drivers of change and determine their Security Implications for NATO in 2030 and beyond," has been achieved, but these are only the initial findings, which will be studied in-depth to deduce the deeper military and political implications. This deepening of the study will be done in close collaboration with all stakeholders of the Alliance in a transparent process that will culminate in a final document during the summer of 2013. By then, Strategic Foresight Analysis will have established a shared perspective of the future that will inform the Future Framework for Alliance Operations, which will describe broad strategic requirements. Both of these products should be fully integrated into an enhanced NDPP as part of an enduring and continuous Alliance planning process.