

NORDIC COOPERATION ON FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICY

Proposals presented to the extraordinary meeting of Nordic foreign ministers
in Oslo on 9 February 2009


Thorvald Stoltenberg





CONTENTS

Introduction	5
Peacebuilding	7
Proposal 1. Nordic Stabilisation Task Force.....	7
Air surveillance	10
Proposal 2. Nordic cooperation on surveillance of Icelandic airspace.....	10
Maritime monitoring and arctic issues	12
Proposal 3. Nordic maritime monitoring system.....	12
Proposal 4. Maritime response force.....	15
Proposal 5. Satellite system for surveillance and communications.....	17
Proposal 6. Nordic cooperation on Arctic issues.....	19
Societal security	21
Proposal 7. Nordic resource network to protect against cyber attacks.....	21
Proposal 8. Disaster response unit.....	23
Proposal 9. War crimes investigation unit.....	25
Foreign services	26
Proposal 10. Cooperation between foreign services.....	26
Military cooperation	28
Proposal 11. Military cooperation on transport, medical services, education, materiel and exercise ranges.....	28
Proposal 12. Amphibious unit.....	32
Declaration of solidarity	34
Proposal 13. Nordic declaration of solidarity.....	34



INTRODUCTION

On 16 June 2008, I was asked by the Nordic foreign ministers to draw up proposals for closer foreign and security policy cooperation between the Nordic countries.

Each of the foreign ministers appointed two contact persons: Nanna Hvidt and Hans Hækkerup from Denmark, Ulla Maria Antilla and Tuomas Forsberg from Finland, Gudmundur Alfredsson and Krístrún Heimisdóttir from Iceland, Julie Christiansen and Henrik Thune from Norge and Urban Ahlin and Gøran Lennmarker from Sweden. They have provided me with useful input, but I have the sole responsibility for the 13 proposals that are presented here.

The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has provided a secretariat with a staff of two (Elin Marie Hellum and Sverre Jervell) to prepare the report.

My work on the report has involved several visits to the Nordic capitals and talks with a wide range of people, especially politicians from both government and opposition parties and a variety of experts.

Some of the main points that emerged from these talks are as follows:

- There is a widespread desire in all the Nordic countries to strengthen Nordic cooperation.
- There is a widely held perception that because of their geographical proximity, the Nordic countries have many foreign and security policy interests in common, despite their different forms of association with the EU and NATO.
- There is a widely held view that the Nordic region is becoming increasingly important in geopolitical and strategic terms. This is a result of the role of the Nordic seas as a production and transit area for gas for European markets and of the changes taking place in the Arctic.
- The EU and NATO are showing a growing interest in regional cooperation between member states and non-member states.
- All the Nordic countries are willing to cooperate with the UN. There is widespread interest in expanding the Nordic force contribution to UN operations on the basis of current needs and the comparative advantages of the Nordic countries.

- The Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish chiefs of defence have recently drawn up a report containing proposals for cooperation to ensure that their defence budgets are used as cost effectively as possible. Modern defence technology is becoming increasingly expensive, making it more difficult for individual countries to fund a modern defence system. This in itself creates a need for Nordic cooperation in the defence sector. I have found the report from the chiefs of defence valuable in my work.
- The Nordic countries are responsible for the management of large sea areas. Climate change and melting of the sea ice will open the way for considerable activity in these areas, including new shipping routes through Arctic waters to the Pacific Ocean. This means that Nordic cooperation in the northern seas and the Arctic is highly relevant.

On the basis of the above, I have drawn up 13 specific proposals for strengthening Nordic cooperation. They have been designed with a view to enabling all the Nordic countries to participate. Nevertheless, in several cases it will be most natural for two or more countries to initiate cooperation, and for the rest to join in as and when they wish.

Oslo, 9 February 2009



Thorvald Stoltenberg

PEACEBUILDING

Proposal 1. Nordic Stabilisation Task Force

A Nordic stabilisation task force should be established that can be deployed to states affected by major internal unrest or other critical situations where international assistance is desirable. It would be responsible for stabilising the situation and then creating an environment in which the state and political processes can function properly. It should include both civilian and military personnel.



PHOTO: UN PHOTO 178789

The task force should have four components: a military component, a humanitarian component, a statebuilding component (including police officers, judges, prison officers, election observers) and a development assistance component.

A Nordic stabilisation task force should be established to address some of the new security challenges facing the UN and the international community. Previously, security challenges were mainly related to strong states that were prepared to use force to promote their interests at the expense of weaker neighbouring countries. More recently, attention has turned to a new type of security challenge involving fragile states – states where there is great internal unrest or other critical internal problems. Examples include countries torn by civil war, countries where state structures have disintegrated, and countries where the political system no longer functions satisfactorily for other reasons. Situations such as these often cause significant suffering for the civilian population and can have serious consequences in the form of regional unrest and large flows of refugees.

In recent years, the international community has experienced how difficult it can be to deal with such situations. An integrated approach involving cooperation between military personnel and humanitarian organisations is generally needed, as in Afghanistan and Iraq. However, we have seen in these countries just how difficult it can be to achieve fruitful cooperation between

military forces and aid agencies. Another problem is poor coordination between the various countries involved in such efforts.

The military component of the proposed task force would primarily act as a rapid reaction force, to be deployed as needed to stabilise the situation in an area so that the humanitarian component can come into play. Military stabilisation should, as rapidly as possible, be followed up by coordinated efforts by the statebuilding component, including police officers, legal advisers, election observers and other civilian expertise needed by civil society. Subsequently, the development component should initiate and support more long-term development projects. One of the key objectives of the operation must be to enable local political processes and the state apparatus to function. This will also be a vital element of the exit strategy, making it politically and practically easier to conclude an operation.

This proposal has been discussed with various people in key UN bodies in New York, who see a great need for such a task force. They have pointed to the need for the task force to acquire basic expertise and for it to be able to make use of experience from previous and current operations. It would need to utilise local experts, who can advise on local conditions and help to ensure that the task force does not override the local community. It was also noted that the Nordic countries have demonstrated that they can handle the interactions between civilian and military components better than most other countries. Moreover, the Nordic countries have long experience of cooperation in international operations under the auspices of the UN, and should therefore be particularly well qualified to support the UN's stabilisation efforts in this way.

A Nordic stabilisation task force could contribute to large-scale UN-led operations as well as operations led by the EU, NATO, the AU or the OSCE that have a UN mandate. All or part of the task force could be deployed according to need.

The task force to be deployed should be adapted to the operation in question, and will thus not be a standing unit. The civilian components will be put together on the basis of a list of qualified personnel who can be deployed at short notice.

In order to ensure the necessary level of training and a rapid response capacity, the military component must be deployable at short notice and draw on military resources that are currently available for the Nordic Battle Group under the EU and the NATO Response Force.

The task force should have a permanent command and training staff. This staff will put together the various components for each operation, and ensure that the personnel have trained together as much as possible. In order to build confidence and ensure that expertise is shared across organisations and areas of expertise, regular staff exercises should be held. In addition, an analysis support network should be established to examine relevant crises and local conditions,



and determine whether there is any possibility of resolving conflicts through mediation. The network should be built up using resources in existing Nordic institutions.

The main challenge in connection with the development and deployment of a Nordic stabilisation task force will be to ensure satisfactory cooperation between the military and civilian components. This can to some extent be ensured through systematic training to improve cooperation and understanding of the operation as a whole. It will also be important to establish systems whereby experience from the field can be transferred rapidly to staff who are training task force personnel. There are already a number of institutions in the Nordic countries that have experience of this kind of training and that can make a valuable contribution in this respect.

AIR SURVEILLANCE



Danish fighter plane PHOTO: FORSVARETS MEDIESENTER

Proposal 2. Nordic cooperation on surveillance of Icelandic airspace

The Nordic countries should take on part of the responsibility for air surveillance and air patrolling over Iceland. Initially, the Nordic countries could deploy personnel to the Keflavik base and take part in the regular Northern

Viking exercises, which are organised by the Icelandic authorities. After this, they could take responsibility for some of the air patrols organised by NATO. Thus, Nordic cooperation on air patrolling could become an example of cooperation between NATO member states and partner countries that have signed Partnership for Peace (PfP) agreements. The Nordic cooperation could be developed in three phases as described below.

Iceland is located in an area that is likely to attract increasing attention. After the US withdrew its troops from the Keflavik base in 2006 after 55 years, a need for better surveillance of Icelandic airspace has arisen, both on Iceland and in the rest of the Nordic region. In addition, air surveillance is an area where the Nordic countries have an interest in cooperation more generally.

Since the US withdrawal, the Icelandic authorities (the Icelandic Defence Agency) have been responsible for operation of the installations at Keflavik and the radar chain for air surveillance. Iceland has received practical assistance from Denmark and Norway in training Icelandic personnel to operate the installations.

In addition, arrangements for regular air patrols over Iceland have been developed under the auspices of NATO, whereby aircraft from NATO member countries patrol Icelandic airspace normally for periods of three to four weeks, four times a year. In practice, a country that offers to cover a slot enters into an agreement with the Icelandic authorities on technical, financial and practical issues.



In 2009, Denmark, Spain and the US will be deploying fighter planes to Iceland. Germany and the US have confirmed that they will deploy aircrafts in 2010. Other countries that have shown an interest in taking part in air patrols include Canada, Italy and Poland. At the same time, there are plans to cut the number of periods when there is a fighter plane presence at Keflavik from four to three per year. The defence exercise Northern Viking, which is organised by Iceland, will probably be held in 2010.

In a joint report, the Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish chiefs of defence recently proposed that cooperation between the Nordic countries on air surveillance should be strengthened. In the short term, they recommend that Finland and Sweden should enter into an agreement on data exchange with NATO's air defence system. This process is already under way, and will make it possible for the Nordic countries to establish a common recognised air picture for Nordic airspace and to keep this updated. The defence chiefs also proposed that in the longer term, cooperation on joint infrastructure for air surveillance (air surveillance radar, command and control infrastructure, etc) should be initiated. As emphasised in the report, this could result in considerable savings by reducing the need for investments and cutting running costs.

In technical terms, Nordic cooperation on air surveillance does not pose problems, and could be implemented at short notice as soon as a political decision has been made. If the Nordic countries decide to take on some of the responsibility for surveillance of Icelandic airspace, this could become a practical example of cooperation under the Partnership for Peace programme.

The Nordic cooperation arrangements discussed above could be divided into three phases:

- In the first phase, joint air surveillance arrangements should be established, as proposed in the defence chiefs' report.
- In the second phase, Nordic personnel should be deployed to the Keflavik base, either in connection with the regular Northern Viking exercises or on a more permanent basis. Air surveillance is an important element of Northern Viking, and Nordic participation in these exercises would be a natural part of the cooperation arrangements that have been agreed between NATO members and Partnership countries.
- In the third phase (from 2010 onwards), the Nordic countries should take responsibility for one of the slots in the current air patrolling arrangements for Icelandic airspace.

Nordic cooperation on surveillance of Icelandic airspace under Icelandic authority could be an important step in the development of practical Nordic cooperation on surveillance and the exercise of jurisdiction in the Nordic areas more generally.

This proposal is closely linked to proposal 3 on maritime monitoring and proposal 5 on the development of a satellite system.

With these three proposals (2, 3 and 5), the Nordic countries could take an important step towards assuming responsibility for surveillance of Nordic airspace and sea areas.

MARITIME MONITORING AND ARCTIC ISSUES



BalticWatch/BarentsWatch ILLUSTRATION: SINTEF

Proposal 3. Nordic maritime monitoring system

A Nordic system should be established for monitoring and early warning in the Nordic sea areas. The system should in principle be civilian and be designed for tasks such as monitoring the marine environment and pollution and monitoring of civilian traffic. The existing military surveillance systems are not

particularly designed to carry out these tasks. A Nordic maritime monitoring system could have two pillars, one for the Baltic Sea (“BalticWatch”) and one for the North Atlantic, parts of the Arctic Ocean and the Barents Sea (“BarentsWatch”), under a common overall system.

The Nordic countries manage large sea areas. Climate change and the resulting melting of the sea ice will make these areas even more extensive. Climate change may also result in greater activity in the northern seas, particularly related to oil and gas production, and open up new shipping routes between Europe and the Pacific via Arctic waters.

Effective management of these areas requires an overview, preferably in real time, of what is happening in the sea and on the surface of the sea. This will require the development and coordination of different sector systems .

The current Nordic systems for monitoring and early warning at sea have clear limitations. The responsibility for maritime and environmental monitoring is divided between a number of national institutions, and it can be difficult to gain a complete overview of the situation when an incident occurs. This is both because practices for sharing data vary, and because of the practical limitations of computer systems at national level. In addition, there is a lack of information exchange and coordination between the Nordic countries, particularly in civilian contexts.

Modern computer technology makes it possible to develop integrated systems for maritime monitoring. Using such technology, it is possible to link up existing systems at both national and



multinational level. This means that in principle, it is possible for a person, wherever they may be, to access all relevant information to which they have authorised access at the same time.

Developing such integrated systems within a Nordic framework would give major benefits. It would make it easier to obtain an overall picture of the situation both in the Baltic Sea and in the North Atlantic. This in turn would make it possible to use the limited Nordic resources more effectively, and put the Nordic countries in a better position to develop new systems, such as an effective Nordic satellite system (see proposal 5).

A Nordic maritime monitoring system must be developed in a way that will make it easy to exchange information with other countries. There will be a need for a regular exchange of information with Russia on the Barents Sea and the Baltic Sea, with the other Baltic states on the Baltic Sea, and with Canada and the US on the North Atlantic. Russia, Norway and Iceland already have a system for exchanging information that ensures continual monitoring of oil tankers sailing from Murmansk to the US via Norwegian coastal waters and Icelandic waters. Information, particularly on search and rescue operations, is also exchanged via the North Atlantic Coast Guard Forum, where Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Norway and the US participate.

The defence forces play an important role in maritime monitoring in the Nordic countries. The national defence authorities have effective systems, but they are not particularly suited to deal with the new challenges that are arising in relation to management of the environment and natural resources. Nevertheless, the military systems collect a great deal of information that is relevant for civilian maritime monitoring, and an overall Nordic system will therefore only be truly effective if it is coordinated with and can exchange data with military systems.

The EU is seeking to promote integrated management of vulnerable sea areas. This is dependent on an overview of what is happening on and under the surface of the sea. The EU is also concerned to put in place arrangements that will make it possible to control the Schengen external borders in the northern sea areas.

In the EU, plans are being outlined for each country first to develop its own maritime monitoring systems, followed by the development of regional systems that can be linked to form a wider European system. Cross-sectoral, cross-border Nordic cooperation on maritime monitoring would fit with the EU's long-term visions in this field, and an integrated Nordic system could be a pioneering project in Europe and the world as a whole. This could also open up possibilities for European-level funding.

In the military field, Finland and Sweden have had a joint system for surveillance of the Baltic Sea and exchange of situation data since 2006. There are plans to expand this cooperation and develop a military surveillance system for the whole of the Baltic Sea, with the participation of the Baltic states, Poland and Germany. Denmark and Norway have also been invited to take

part. Finland and Sweden together have developed an advanced system for traffic surveillance in the Baltic Sea. The question of developing an integrated surveillance system that also covers the environment and natural resources has been discussed on several occasions, but no decision has been taken on this yet.

Denmark, Iceland and Norway also have an effective military maritime surveillance system that produces common situation data. In 2008, it was decided to develop this further to provide a new, more effective system. This work is now in progress, and may be of importance to the development of a Nordic maritime monitoring system.

A major project is under way to develop an integrated civilian system for monitoring of the Norwegian parts of the Barents Sea and Norwegian Sea. The report of the project (“i-Nord”) was submitted to the Norwegian Government on 5 February and contains proposals for how the various Norwegian sectoral systems can be linked together. The system (“BarentsWatch”), which is envisaged as being developed in the period 2009–2016, will be designed in such a way that it can be integrated with systems in the other Nordic countries and so that relevant information can be exchanged with Canada, Russia and the US.

It is important that a decision in principle to establish a civilian Nordic system for maritime monitoring is taken before the respective Nordic countries establish their own integrated system. This will make it possible for countries to ensure interoperability between national systems and broader Nordic solutions. If such a decision is taken, it would be appropriate for the Norwegian authorities to invite Denmark and Iceland to be partners in “BarentsWatch” as early as spring 2009. Danish and Icelandic interests and concerns could then be incorporated as the system is further developed. The relevant Danish, Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish authorities should also maintain close contact with each other, so that an integrated maritime monitoring system for the Baltic (“BalticWatch”) can be developed using the same system as BarentsWatch.

This proposal should be considered together with the proposals for a Nordic maritime response force (proposal 4), a Nordic satellite system (proposal 5) and a Nordic amphibious unit (proposal 12).



Proposal 4. Maritime response force

Once a Nordic maritime monitoring system is in place, a Nordic maritime response force should be established, consisting of elements from the Nordic countries' coast guards and rescue services. It should patrol regularly in the Nordic seas, and one of its main responsibilities should be search and rescue.

* * * *

The establishment of a joint maritime monitoring system would make it possible to set up a joint rescue coordination centre that could draw on resources from several Nordic countries. A logical next step is to propose the establishment of a Nordic maritime response force that can be deployed both in the Baltic Sea and in the northern seas.

The Nordic countries, particularly Denmark/Greenland, Iceland and Norway, are responsible for the monitoring and management of huge sea areas. There are currently too few vessels that can be used for surveillance and deployed when needed. This problem will be intensified as new shipping routes open up between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans via the Arctic Ocean. Traffic through Arctic waters, particularly during the polar night, will pose major challenges in the years ahead. The search and rescue systems in these areas are highly inadequate, and there may be a growing need for assistance in the event of accidents or if ships freeze into the ice.

A joint rescue coordination centre should therefore be established for the Nordic coast guards and search and rescue services. This could lead joint Nordic operations in the Baltic Sea or the Barents Sea by coordinating and giving instructions to units that are in the relevant area.

A Nordic maritime response force should have expertise on Arctic conditions and resources that are suitable for these conditions. Operations in Arctic areas will often require icebreaker capacity, for example because ships may freeze into the ice. The Nordic countries should therefore join forces to develop icebreaker capacity for Arctic waters. Canada, Russia and the US already have such capacity available, but none of the Nordic countries do. Finland and Sweden have icebreaker capacity in the Baltic Sea.

It is costly to develop icebreaker capacity for Arctic conditions. It would therefore seem appropriate to consider designing a Nordic icebreaker that can also be used as a research vessel, tugboat, etc. Until a multi-purpose vessel of this kind can be built, Nordic emergency preparedness arrangements in the Arctic should be based on agreements to use Finnish, Russian and Swedish icebreaker capacity.

To ensure that they can operate effectively together, the relevant coast guard and search and rescue resources should hold regular joint exercises. This could for example be organised in the form of joint patrols in the Baltic Sea or Barents Sea.



Proposal 5. Satellite system for surveillance and communications

By 2020, a Nordic polar orbit satellite system should be established in connection with the development of a Nordic maritime monitoring system. Such a satellite system could provide frequently updated real-time images of the situation at sea, which is essential for effective maritime monitoring and crisis management.

* * * *

Satellite communication and observation services are indispensable in any effective, modern maritime monitoring system. Satellite image data are essential to ensure continuous maritime monitoring, and satellites equipped with radars can provide information from the sea surface irrespective of weather and light conditions. A satellite system could be an important tool for communication between the various actors and components of a Nordic maritime monitoring system.

A satellite system is the only solution that can provide round-the-clock communications in all Nordic sea areas. In emergency situations, satellite services will be needed for voice and video communication and data transfer. Round-the-clock availability is essential for effective and reliable crisis management in these areas.

A satellite system that both provides observations and ensures communications in the north could fulfil an important function in the management of ecosystems and fisheries in these sea areas. It would also be important for monitoring maritime traffic in these areas, including future traffic across the Arctic Ocean. For the offshore oil industry, a satellite system would be useful mainly as a means of communication.

To meet their need for satellite services, the Nordic countries can choose between purchasing services from foreign suppliers and developing their own national or Nordic satellite systems.

At present, the Nordic countries purchase the satellite services they need in connection with maritime monitoring. These include both communication services and services based on image data. The images are used for example to register ships, oil spills and algal blooms and ice conditions, and to gather information on oceanographic and meteorological conditions. These

services are purchased from US and European suppliers, including the European Maritime Safety Agency and the European Space Agency.

There are a number of arguments for why the Nordic countries should develop their own solutions for satellite services. At present, the communication services purchased by the Nordic countries are mainly provided by satellites in geostationary orbit above the equator. These satellites do not provide satisfactory coverage north of 71°N. This problem will become even greater with the start of commercial maritime traffic across the Arctic Ocean.

There are also economic arguments for why the Nordic countries should develop their own satellite systems. Today, a number of Nordic institutions purchase the same image data services from one supplier. As the use of satellite services increases, a point will be reached where it will become advantageous for the Nordic countries to develop their own services. The Nordic defence forces' need for surveillance and communication data should make a Nordic satellite project even more attractive, both politically and economically.

A Nordic satellite system with for example three satellites in a highly elliptical orbit would need to cover the area from Denmark (about 52°N) to the North Pole (90°N). This would be an expensive system, and it is unlikely to be realised much before 2020. However, if we are to establish a Nordic satellite system in the future, it is important to agree on a political declaration of intent to establish such a system before the individual Nordic countries have made too much progress in developing national solutions.



Proposal 6.

Nordic cooperation on Arctic issues

The Nordic countries, which are all members of the Arctic Council, should develop cooperation on Arctic issues focusing on more practical matters. The environment, climate change, maritime safety and search and rescue services are appropriate areas for such cooperation.

* * * *

The Arctic region is an indicator of global climate change. The melting of the sea ice will have major impacts on activities in Arctic areas. Natural resources, especially energy resources, are becoming more accessible, and this may have consequences for the vulnerable marine environment in the High North. Changes in sea temperature can result in fish stocks changing their migration patterns. In addition, these changes are having major impacts on the traditional livelihoods of parts of the Arctic population.

Moreover, ice melt is opening up new transport routes between the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans: the Northern Sea Route, the Northwest Passage, and in the longer term, a route straight across the Arctic Ocean. It is expected that the first merchant vessels will be able to make use of Arctic sea routes as soon as 2009 or 2010. This will pose a number of new challenges relating to search and rescue services, safety and the environment, particularly during the winter season.

The closer focus on the Arctic may have geopolitical consequences as the northern seas hold the potential to become an important source of energy for Europe. The seas in the Nordic region may therefore become important as a transit area for oil and gas transported by ship and through pipelines.

These developments involve responsibilities for the Nordic countries, and thus create a need for Nordic cooperation on Arctic issues. This applies not only to the Arctic coastal states, but to all five Nordic countries as members of the Arctic Council.

¹ Proposal 6 is somewhat different from the other proposals in this report. This is because a number of elements that will be relevant to Nordic cooperation on the Arctic are set out separately in other proposals. These are air surveillance (proposal 2), maritime monitoring (proposal 3), a satellite system (proposal 5), and proposals for new instruments to facilitate operations in the Arctic: a Nordic maritime response force (proposal 4) and a Nordic amphibious unit (proposal 12).

To pursue an active Arctic policy, we must have a good overview of what is happening in the region. A Nordic maritime monitoring system will be one important instrument in this context. A Nordic satellite system and Nordic cooperation on air surveillance over Iceland can also be included to ensure a satisfactory overview and improve communications.

A Nordic maritime response force with search and rescue expertise and icebreaker capacity (proposal 4) would be an important tool for dealing with incidents in the region. A Nordic amphibious unit (proposal 12) would also be important in this connection, provided that it develops expertise on Arctic conditions.

The Nordic countries, together with Canada, Russia and the US, are members of the Arctic Council. The Nordic countries can play an important role in this forum as regards climate change issues generally and the links between the use of natural resources and the environment more specifically. The Nordic countries can also develop specific cooperation measures to follow up the Arctic Council's recommendation to improve search and rescue capabilities in the Arctic. These cooperation measures could be expanded to include Canada, Russia and the US.

NORDIC RESOURCE NETWORK

Proposal 7. Nordic resource network to protect against cyber attacks

A Nordic resource network should be established to defend the Nordic countries against cyber attacks. Its main task would be to facilitate exchange of experience and coordinate national efforts to prevent and protect against such attacks and provide advice to Nordic countries that are in the process of building capacity in this area. In the longer term, the resource network could develop and coordinate systems for identifying cyber threats against the Nordic countries.



Norwegian National Security Authority PHOTO: MARIT SYLSTAD

As society becomes increasingly dependent on information technology, it becomes more vulnerable to hostile actors' attempts to paralyse vital services and functions. Cyber attacks can involve spreading viruses, overloading websites or taking control of computers. Attacks can result in the disruption or malfunctioning of Internet services. Communication systems, ranging from mobile telephone networks to broadcasting, may collapse. Electricity supply may be disrupted, and air and rail traffic come to a halt. Cyber attacks may also disrupt commercial and banking services, and websites with information for the general public may become inaccessible. Digital attacks can also be used to gain access to sensitive information or for financial gain.

From a societal point of view, data security is therefore about preparing for, detecting and dealing with attacks that can disrupt critical infrastructure and vital sectors such as defence, air and rail traffic, energy supply, and telephone and financial services.

The current threat picture in the field of information and communication technology is complex and unpredictable. It is difficult to predict who might pose a threat, which methods might be employed, and what goals perpetrators might be attempting to achieve. Attacks could be launched by foreign states, terrorist organisations, organised criminal groups or individuals.

There have been several examples of cyber attacks on countries. In 2007, civil infrastructure in Estonia was the object of an extensive attack, and in 2008 "cyber weapons" were used in

connection with the conflict in Georgia. Several countries are currently developing their ability to launch cyber attacks against other countries.

A country's modern defence capability should include systems to protect against cyber attacks. The Nordic countries are therefore establishing bodies that will be responsible for detecting and preventing hostile activities targeting vital data networks. The ability of the various countries to analyse and counter serious cyber threats varies, and there is no systematic Nordic cooperation in this field.

Furthermore, there is no secure Nordic communication system, and this makes rapid exchange of sensitive information between the Nordic countries difficult. Cyber attacks can escalate and spread quickly, and the time factor is therefore important. If they are to be able to respond to a future cyber threat in a coordinated and effective manner, the Nordic countries must in advance have developed a secure Nordic system for information sharing and communication.

In their efforts to build national systems to protect against cyber attacks and respond to cyber threats, the Nordic countries could benefit greatly from sharing their experience, exchanging information and cooperating on analysis across national borders. This could involve cooperating on the assessment of technical solutions and exchange of cyber threat assessments, analyses of attack techniques, information regarding the vulnerability of critical infrastructure and information about emergency preparedness measures.

Defensive measures against cyber attacks require knowledge of offensive measures. Cooperation on cyber defence is therefore a sensitive issue, and it may take time to get used to thinking along these lines. Nonetheless, it may be expedient to begin cooperating in a number of areas now, for example the exchange of information and cooperation between existing institutions on defensive measures.

International cooperation on cyber security is beginning to take form. The establishment of the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence in Estonia is an example of this. In addition to enhancing the Nordic countries' emergency planning and crisis management capability, a Nordic resource network would strengthen their contribution to existing international cooperation schemes and their ability to assist other countries with crisis management.

Proposal 8. Disaster response unit

A Nordic disaster response unit should be established for dealing with large-scale disasters and accidents in the Nordic region and in other countries. The unit's main task would be to coordinate Nordic efforts as needed. It would maintain an overview of available equipment and personnel and establish a network made up of the many public and private organisations working in this field.

The unit would set up Nordic groups/teams to meet specific needs, for example in the field of advanced search and rescue.

* * * *

The Nordic countries have well developed national systems for dealing with disasters and accidents, involving both public agencies and NGOs. In the case of large-scale disasters, however, there is a limit to how much the individual countries' authorities can deal with, and in certain areas national resources are limited. Moreover, equipment can be extremely expensive, particularly when it is purchased by a country on its own.

Therefore, a Nordic disaster response unit should be established to strengthen and complement existing national emergency preparedness systems. There is no need to establish a new institution for this purpose. The unit should have its basis in existing institutions and serve as a coordinating body.

The unit would maintain an overview of available equipment and personnel and establish a network made up of public and private actors. It would also consider the purchase/rental of common emergency preparedness equipment and the need for joint exercises and training. This should enable it to put together and deploy a large-scale regional response team in the event of accidents and disasters, both in the Nordic region and in other countries.

The unit would have to base its activities on existing bilateral and international agreements, such as the framework agreement on Nordic cooperation on rescue services, NORDRED.

The unit should also consider measures to improve preparedness and response capability in a number of areas, such as natural disasters, maritime rescue services, search and rescue, and chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear (CBRN) response.

There may also be a need to set up specialised Nordic groups/teams that can assist the Nordic authorities in large-scale, complex operations, or that can meet special needs that the individual countries are unable to deal with on their own. For example, using existing resources, Nordic search and rescue teams could be put together for deployment in the event of major incidents where people are missing or have to be rescued from buildings or means of transportation. The teams would have to possess special expertise, for example on avalanches, and have access to technological resources such as specialised cameras and sonar and navigation equipment, and search dogs.

In addition to assisting the authorities in the Nordic countries, such search and rescue teams would often be useful in an international context. Thus, the teams could be part of a Nordic contribution to civil crisis management under the auspices of the UN, the EU or NATO.

Proposal 9.

War crimes investigation unit

A joint investigation unit should be established to coordinate the Nordic countries' investigation of genocide, crimes against humanity and war crimes committed by persons residing in the Nordic countries.

* * * *

All of the Nordic countries are facing challenges related to the fact that persons suspected of war crimes are residing within their borders. Norway has had its first criminal case related to the conflict in the former Yugoslavia. Denmark has carried out extensive investigation of a man suspected of complicity in the genocide in Rwanda in 1994, and has also prosecuted cases related to crimes committed in Afghanistan, the former Yugoslavia and the Middle East. There is no reason to believe that the number of such cases will decrease in the years to come.

Investigating such cases is a difficult task. Typically, the events have taken place several years back in time, the geographical distances are great, and the examination of witnesses can be hampered by language problems, cultural differences and witnesses' fear of reprisals. Separately, the respective Nordic countries have limited experience of such cases, and the investigation of these cases necessarily requires extensive international cooperation involving many countries.

In 2002, Denmark set up its Special International Crimes Office, and Norway and Sweden have since established similar units. In Finland, a public prosecutor has been given special responsibility for this field. The Nordic countries cooperate on individual cases, but no formalised cooperation has been established.

Recently, a Nordic working group presented a report on closer cooperation between the Nordic prosecuting authorities to the Nordic ministers of justice. The group pointed to the need for closer contact between the prosecuting authorities, but also to the fact there is a certain reluctance to transfer national authority in this field. This is a problem that does not arise in connection with cooperation on investigation.

The advantages of cooperation on such complex and resource-intensive cases as those involving war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide are obvious. These cases pose new challenges for the Nordic countries, and require a more concerted effort. Exchange of resources and expertise will therefore be of benefit both in the investigation of such cases and in the development of expertise in international humanitarian and criminal law.

FOREIGN SERVICES



The Nordic embassy complex in Berlin PHOTO: RÜDIGER ALMS

Proposal 10. Cooperation between foreign services

In countries and areas where no Nordic country has an embassy or consulate general, the countries could establish and run joint diplomatic and consular missions.

The Nordic countries have interests in countries and areas where none of them currently has an embassy or consulate general. Central Asia is an example of an important area where all the Nordic countries are underrepresented. Any unrest or security policy problems in Central Asia may have consequences for the Nordic countries as well, and they therefore need to be in a position to follow developments closely and maintain regular contact with the authorities, the business sector and others. It is also expensive to set up and run embassies and consulates. Moreover, today's requirements relating to personnel safety have resulted in a considerable rise in costs in many places. Nevertheless, cooperation would enable the Nordic countries to be represented in more countries than is the case today.

So far, the Nordic embassy complex in Berlin is the only example of co-location of all five Nordic embassies, where they share the premises and cooperate on building management and running technical services. There are several other countries where two or more Nordic embassies are co-located, and other cases where this is being considered.

The Nordic countries should be able to continue this cooperation with a view to establishing diplomatic or consular missions for some or all of the countries. In countries where one or more Nordic countries are already represented, provision should be made to allow representatives of the other Nordic countries to be posted there as well. If none of the Nordic countries is represented, new diplomatic and consular missions can be set up and run jointly, with personnel from those countries that are interested. The authority to issue instructions on policy matters must always lie with the country from which an employee is posted. Administrative matters



must be agreed on in advance, for example in annual budget meetings, and the day-to-day responsibility for such matters must lie with the head of mission.

The establishment of joint Nordic diplomatic and consular missions could also open the way for more cooperation on courses and training for foreign service personnel, which could enhance the quality of the service.

The EU has also discussed the possibility of establishing joint embassies. The draft Lisbon Treaty included a clause on joint representation in third countries, with personnel from the member states, the General Secretariat of the Council of the European Union and the European Commission. So far, EU ambassadors have only represented the Commission. If EU embassies that represent all the member states are established, it would become more difficult to establish joint Nordic diplomatic and consular missions.

MILITARY COOPERATION



The Finnish-Swedish amphibious cooperation
PHOTO: FÖRSVARSMAKTEN/FINNISH DEFENCE FORCES

Proposal 11. Military cooperation on transport, medical services, education, materiel and exercise ranges

The Nordic countries should strengthen their defence cooperation on medical services, education, materiel and exercise ranges. Several of these areas are also discussed in the report presented by the Finnish, Norwegian and Swedish Chiefs of Defence.

The background to the following proposals is the large and steadily increasing costs associated with the procurement of modern defence technology. As a result of this situation, the size of certain units may fall below a critical limit, and in such a situation it is natural that small countries should consider cooperating on for example procurement, maintenance, exercises and education.

The alternative to cooperation could be a situation where small and medium-sized countries lose their ability to maintain a credible defence. The result could be a Europe where only countries like France, Russia, the UK and Germany have their own modern defence forces. Looking 15 to 20 years down the road, none of the Nordic countries will be able to maintain their armed forces at their current size and quality without closer Nordic cooperation.

The establishment of Nordic transport and lift capability

The Nordic countries should coordinate their transport and lift capability, including their use of transport aircraft, helicopters and maritime transport resources, both in the Nordic region and in other countries. The goal should be to establish a combined command unit, to which the Nordic countries would make available elements that would form part of a Nordic transport unit.

Nordic cooperation on transport would lead to cost savings and more efficient use of available resources. It would also pave the way for joint procurement and joint negotiations for the purchase of transport capacity. When they operate separately in the civilian market, the Nordic countries are small purchasers with little bargaining power. If they purchase transport services together, they will be able to negotiate better terms.

At present, there is only limited Nordic cooperation on the use of transport resources, namely that under the Nordic Coordinated Arrangement for Military Peace Support (NORDCAPS). Finland, Norway and Sweden are, however, involved in the establishment of a joint NATO/PfP base for strategic transport aircraft in Hungary. These aircraft will be used by the participating countries according to a specified allocation formula. Coordination among the Nordic countries would be useful here, as it would be in connection with NATO's scheme for leasing Russian and Ukrainian Antonov aircraft, in which Norway and Sweden are participating.

Coordination among the Nordic countries as regards the development and use of their transport capability is important in connection with the proposals to establish a stabilisation task force, a disaster response unit and an amphibious unit (proposals 1, 8 and 12).

The establishment of a Nordic medical unit

Today the Nordic countries are finding it difficult to provide sufficient numbers of medical personnel for international operations. Medical services, including field hospitals for stabilisation surgery, and evacuation capability are therefore an area where the Nordic countries should cooperate more closely.

A joint medical unit should be established to enhance the Nordic countries' ability to make sustainable medical contributions to international operations. The unit could either be based on a rotation system, where the countries take turns staffing relevant field hospitals or other hospitals, or on a joint staffing system.

The Nordic countries' medical personnel should also take part in joint training and exercises in connection with large-scale exercises. This would not only lay the foundations for effective cooperation in international operations, but also help to maintain and further develop medical expertise in the individual Nordic countries.

The establishment of a Nordic medical unit is important in connection with the proposals to establish a Nordic stabilisation task force and a disaster response unit (proposals 1 and 8).

Nordic cooperation on military education

At present, the individual Nordic countries have their own programmes for educating officers, NCOs and experts at many levels in a number of highly specialised areas. The number of persons being educated is often small, and the education programmes are both expensive and demanding in terms of the expertise required. This is particularly the case for programmes that require expensive educational equipment, such as simulators.

Higher quality is the main argument for setting up joint education programmes. In several areas, there are only a small number of national experts, and it can be difficult to develop and maintain the necessary teaching expertise in all areas. Joint courses and education programmes would

lead to greater capacity and more resources in each individual area, and would also help to ensure continuity, research and development.

Joint education, particularly of officers and NCOs, would promote a common military understanding and thinking in the Nordic countries. Current military thinking in the individual Nordic countries is, as would be expected, shaped by their different histories.

In addition to joint military education programmes, the Nordic countries should develop joint courses on civil-military cooperation. This is highly relevant for the proposal to establish a Nordic stabilisation task force (proposal 1).

The Nordic countries should also develop a joint senior management training course, where about half the participants would be military officers and the rest civilians. By building on this course and extending its duration, the Nordic countries could also develop an education programme at defence/war college level, which none of them offer at present.

Nordic cooperation on military education is relevant in connection with the proposals to establish a Nordic stabilisation task force and an amphibious unit (proposals 1 and 12).

Joint procurement, maintenance and upgrading of materiel

Procurement, maintenance and upgrading of materiel are major expenses in any country's defence budget. This speaks in favour of Nordic cooperation.

As early as 1994 the Nordic countries concluded an agreement on cooperation on the development and procurement of military materiel and promotion of defence-industrial cooperation. Under the Nordic Armaments Cooperation (NORDAC), the Nordic countries have cooperated on purchasing helicopters, armoured infantry combat vehicles, artillery locating radars and armoured wheeled vehicles. There is, however, potential for far more extensive cooperation.

As regards army materiel there is great potential because Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden use the same materiel. For example, they all use versions of the German Leopard 2 battle tank, the Swedish CV-90 combat vehicle and the Finnish Sisu Pasi armoured personnel carrier.

Closer cooperation on the maintenance and upgrading of this materiel would lead to economies of scale for all involved parties. The same holds true for procurement of new materiel, since together the Nordic countries would have more bargaining power in negotiations with producers.

Joint firing and exercise ranges

Over the past few decades, all of the Nordic countries have reduced – in some cases radically – the number of firing and exercise ranges. Nevertheless, the size of their armed forces has decreased ever more rapidly. As a result, the cost of maintaining the remaining ranges has increased in relation to the size of the Nordic countries' defence forces. In addition, the need for advanced simulators and other expensive equipment designed to make training more realistic has made the upgrading of firing and exercise ranges very expensive.

The Nordic countries therefore need to cooperate on the operation and use of firing and exercise ranges. By maintaining for example one firing and exercise range of a certain type, rather than four, we could make far more efficient use of expensive, but necessary, technology and of the personnel resources that are required to operate the range.

Proposal 12. Amphibious unit²

A Nordic amphibious unit should be established based on existing units and the current cooperation between Sweden and Finland. The unit could be employed in international operations. In the longer term, the unit should develop its own Arctic expertise.

The Nordic countries have for a long time shared the ambition of making joint contributions to international military operations and multinational response forces. In 1997, the Nordic ministers of defence established the Nordic Coordinated Arrangement for Military Peace Support (NORDCAPS) to coordinate their contributions to peacekeeping operations. In 2008 Finland, Norway and Sweden (together with Estonia and Ireland) made forces available to the EU battle groups via the Nordic Battle Group. In addition, all the Nordic countries are participating in NATO-led operations, mainly in the ISAF forces in Afghanistan. Cooperation among the Nordic countries in ISAF has been useful, but it could be further developed with a view to making better use of the limited Nordic resources.

The Nordic countries should cooperate on international military operations by making joint contributions in areas where there is a demand for this, and where the Nordic countries have particular expertise. Military forces that are specialised in operating in confined waters near to the coast are one example of a resource that is in demand abroad and that the Nordic countries can provide.

So far, most international military operations under UN auspices have been conducted in inland areas. However, a large proportion of the world's population lives near the coast, and this means that an amphibious unit could be a valuable contribution to various kinds of international operations in the future. Moreover, many countries are concerned about the vulnerability of maritime transport, particularly of energy. Here protection is needed, including in connection with pirate activity in important shipping lanes.

²The term "amphibious unit" here denotes a military unit that can carry out intelligence, reconnaissance and protective missions in the coastal zone. In military terminology the term denotes a unit with sea-going capability based on a large mother ship carrying high-speed boats in an internal dock and equipped with heavy weapons.

In the past decade, Finland and Sweden have engaged in cooperation on amphibious forces by establishing cooperation between the 1st Amphibious Regiment in Sweden and the Nyland Brigade in Finland. A Nordic amphibious unit would build on this cooperation and on other existing units and weapon systems.

A Nordic amphibious unit would be useful with a view both to meeting the Nordic countries' own needs and to making them more attractive as cooperation partners in international operations.

In order to have Arctic capability, the unit would need logistic support adapted to Arctic conditions. This support could be provided by one logistic support vessel, which could function as command platform, transport and supply vessel and amphibious landing platform. These functions could also be provided by a combination of various types of vessels.

The establishment of a Nordic amphibious unit is also relevant to the proposals for the establishment of a maritime response force and for Nordic cooperation on Arctic issues (proposals 4 and 6).

DECLARATION OF SOLIDARITY



PHOTO: SCANPIX

Proposal 13. Nordic declaration of solidarity

The Nordic governments should issue a mutual declaration of solidarity in which they commit themselves to clarifying how they would respond if a Nordic country were subject to external attack or undue pressure.

In this report, I have outlined a number of specific proposals that primarily involve civil cooperation. I have also put forward proposals under which two or more Nordic countries can cooperate on joint defence arrangements.

As Nordic defence cooperation develops, we could reach a point where some or all Nordic countries specialise in certain tasks, and fulfil different, but complementary roles. The combined defence capability of the countries as a group would be greater than the sum of their individual contributions. But taken in isolation, the individual country's defence capability might be reduced.

Such a development would make it necessary to base the cooperation on a formal security policy guarantee. If the Nordic countries are to be dependent on each other militarily, they must also be able to rely on having access to the military means they require to defend themselves, should the need arise.

To achieve this, the Nordic governments could issue a mutually binding declaration containing a security policy guarantee. In such a declaration, the countries could clarify in binding terms how they would respond if a Nordic country were subject to external attack or undue pressure.



A joint declaration of this kind issued by the Nordic governments would make it possible to engage in far closer military cooperation than is the case today. Here I am assuming that the declaration would have to be made in a form that would ensure that it did not come in conflict with the Nordic countries' existing UN, EU and NATO obligations. On the contrary, by facilitating close military cooperation, the declaration would help to strengthen the Nordic countries' ability to fulfil their obligations and make resources available to these organisations.

Cooperation of this kind would complement, not replace, the Nordic countries' existing foreign and security policy allegiances.

This report can be downloaded from www.regjeringen.no/ud
or from the websites of the Finnish, Icelandic and Swedish Ministries of Foreign Affairs.
A video recording of the press conference is available on the same websites.