**Introduction**

This is our fifth edition of the NATO Legal Electronic Gazette written by Legal Advisors who are assigned to NATO or are involved in NATO issues. Anyone reading this Gazette who is addressing a legal issue that is of common interest is encouraged and requested to write a short, informal article for future editions and provide it to the ACT SEE Legal Office: either Sherrod.bumgardner@shape.nato.int or Dominique.palmer@shape.nato.int

**NATO LEGAL CONFERENCE**

Joint Warfare Centre

Since our last issue, 53 NATO legal advisors and legal personnel gathered at the Joint Warfare Centre in Stavanger, Norway, to share information, gain knowledge, and discuss solutions for the current legal challenges faced by our Alliance. As may be suspected, we were not a gathering of the silent. From the frequently lively discussions, a number of goals and deliverables were identified for action. These results will be provided in the Conference after-action report that will be forthcoming shortly!

**June and July Legal Courses**

We are now less than two weeks from the NATO Legal Advisors Course and about six weeks from the first NATO Operational Law Course. If you are considering attending either the “NATO Legal Advisors’ Course,” Course P5-34 from 4 - 8 June 2007 or the “Advanced NATO Operational Law (OPLAW) Course”, Course N5-68, 9-13 July, 2007, you should contact the NATO School via its website: www.natoschool.nato.int under the pull-down menu “Academics.” Please be aware the “NATO Legal Advisors’ Course,” Course P5-34 will be offered again from 15 to 19 October 2007.
NATO’s Standards of Conduct

Mr. Matt Galas - NCSA

Although NATO currently lacks a recognized definition for the term, “standards of conduct” is generally understood to mean rules of ethical behavior designed to ensure the honesty and accountability of public employees, as well as to promote fairness and transparency in public administration.

Historically, NATO has taken a piecemeal and fragmentary approach to standards of conduct rules. In part, this approach is a reflection of NATO’s fragmented structure, which resembles a loose confederation of civil and military bodies rather than a single, monolithic entity. However, this approach is also the natural result of the difficulty in reaching consensus on a subject that touches on cultural values and norms. Because of this, past attempts to draft a single, NATO-wide standards of conduct policy have fallen flat.

The closest NATO has come to implementing organization-wide ethics rules are the NATO Civilian Personnel Regulations, which contain provisions on conflicts of interest (Art. 12.2.2), safeguarding inside information (Art. 12.1.3), restrictions on outside activities that conflict with NATO business (Art. 12.2.1), and other subjects. While these rules are drafted broadly enough to cover a multitude of sins, their vagueness also serves as a loophole for employees charged with acts of misconduct. Likewise, their lack of specificity provides no guidance to honest employees who are simply trying to do the right thing. And while these rules have NATO-wide applicability, their restriction to NATO civilians not only creates a double standard, but limits their usefulness as a benchmark for the organization as a whole. One recent attempt to create a NATO-wide standard of conduct policy was a draft document produced in January 2006 at NATO Headquarters by the Advisory Group of Financial Counselors. This document, circulated for comment as AGFC-N(2006)0005, employed a prescriptive, rules-based approach to standards of conduct. As an American attorney, the draft AGFC rules seemed very familiar to me, and it was apparent that the drafter had looked to the US Department of Defense’s Joint Ethics Regulation for inspiration. However, a number of provisions - notably the requirement for disclosure of certain financial interests - ultimately proved so controversial that the AGFC draft rules were quietly withdrawn from consideration.

The consequence of such failures has been a stop-gap approach adopted by NATO civil and military bodies, largely in response to particular issues. The most obvious potential for conflicts of interest and corruption is in the field of contracting, so it is no surprise that the bulk of NATO’s current ethics rules focus on the procurement arena. For example, ACO Directive 40-7 and ACT Directive 40-3 both deal with relationships with contractors. In a similar vein, acceptance of gifts from outside sources is an easily recognized problem, leading to regulations such as ACO Directive 60-54 on acceptance of gratuities.

The disadvantage of the current focus on procurement is the lack of attention to other areas ripe for corruption and conflicts of interest, such as the recruitment of civilian personnel. The focus on contracting also means that the field of ethics has traditionally been governed by the financial community within NATO, with a relative lack of involvement by the legal community.

Recently, NATO Headquarters has made another attempt to draft a NATO-wide standards of conduct policy.

Martin Solc
Kocían Solc Balášťik
Chair, Public and Professional Interest Division
International Bar Association

The legal profession does not and cannot concern itself exclusively with questions of substantive law, since its existence is inextricably linked with many other issues. Some are closely connected with professional practice, for example, regulatory frameworks for practitioners, rules of ethical conduct, continuing education or practice management. Lawyers, however, cannot just be mere technical specialists or limit their vision to aspects of the “legal business”.

A lawyer’s role is to partake in the evolution of legal culture, to promote the rule of law, to advocate the upholding of human rights and to fight against corruption. It may not always be obvious just how relevant these issues are to the day-to-day business of a lawyer and yet it is here that the fundamentals of a progressive and healthy legal culture lie.
Entitled the "NATO Ethics Framework and Policy," this document was drafted by the Office of the Assistant Secretary General for Executive Management. The draft was circulated for comment in November 2006 as AGFC-N(2006)0030. In contrast to earlier attempts, this initiative abandons a rule-based approach, opting instead for a broad statement of ethical principles. Once this ethics framework is in place, the policy envisions that NATO bodies will use it as a foundation upon which to build individualized ethics codes adapted to their particular circumstances and needs. The policy also advocates the creation of a NATO Office of Ethics, led by a Director answering to the North Atlantic Council. That office would exercise training, audit, and oversight functions for the ethics programs implemented by the various NATO bodies. This initiative is currently being revised after the initial round of coordination; it remains to be seen if this less ambitious approach is any more successful than the attempts of the past.

In conclusion, interest in some sort of global NATO approach to ethics appears to be growing. However, controversial rules (such as financial disclosure) are likely to remain a significant barrier to consensus. Likewise, any policy that creates a double standard for military and civilian personnel is unlikely to gain buy-in from the NATO workforce. Given the difficulties associated with a "top-down" approach, and the uncertain fate of the NATO Ethics Framework, one possible solution could be the creation of a Bi-SC Directive on standards of conduct. In other areas, the publication of Bi-SC directives has exercised a strong normative effect across NATO. Such a "ground-up" approach would not only have a similar effect on other NATO bodies, but might well generate the impetus needed to achieve consensus in Brussels on a NATO-wide ethics policy.

For insight into how other international organizations have dealt with the standards of conduct issue, see the following links:

http://www.ibanet.org/publicprofinterest/Professional_Ethics.cfm

http://www.ibanet.org/barassociations/Core_Values.cfm#Resources

Mr. Matt Galas - NCSA
NCN: 254-6880
Comm. +32-65-446880
Stanley.Galas@shape.nato.int
Vetting of Defence Officials in Bosnia-Herzegovina

One of the more unusual security sector reform tasks which a NATO Headquarters could perform is the vetting of defence officials in Bosnia and Herzegovina. UNSCR 1722 (November 2006) reaffirmed that NATO Headquarters – Sarajevo (NHQSa) and the European Union Force (EUFOR) are legal successors to IFOR and SFOR in achieving their missions to implement the General Framework Agreement for Peace (GFAP), its Annexes and Appendices, and relevant UN Security Council Resolutions.

Under his GFAP authority to do all that he judged necessary to enforce compliance with the Military Aspects of the GFAP, the IFOR Commander began issuing “Instructions to the Parties” [i.e., the Parties to the GFAP] which told them how he intended to implement certain GFAP military provisions. There were originally 18 chapters, and these included instructions on inspections of entity military sites, movement control, airspace control, demining, control of the electromagnetic spectrum, etc.

Chapter 14 covered the process of developing professionalism in the entity armed forces, and now is titled Armed Forces of BiH (AFBiH) in a Democratic Society:

Ethics, Development and Cooperation. Chapter 14’s goal is to develop confidence by the citizens in “the personal integrity, constitutional loyalty, and military competence of the Armed Forces of Bosnia and Herzegovina in general, and specifically, the General Officer corps.” In that regard, the Commanders of EUFOR and NHQSa apply their GFAP powers to do all they judge necessary to ensure the military in BiH is professional, politically neutral and supportive of the peace process.

Through this particular instruction, the Commanders have stated they will prevent political purges of the professional members of the military. Similarly, they have also stated they believe that “past or current actions which cast doubt on the professionalism, character or competence of a member of the AFBiH and any member of the Ministry of Defence, may be a precursor to instability in the AFBiH and MOD, and can constitute a current threat to the peace process in BiH. This is especially true of senior leaders and commanders.”

Chapter 14 clearly states its desired professional ethical standards, including integrity, leadership, loyalty and selfless service. Absolute standards include a ban on service by individuals indicted or under mere investigation by the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia, or lower level courts and prosecutors, for war crimes or crimes against humanity. Similarly, no service is allowed for those convicted or actually indicted (but not merely under investigation for) other serious criminal offenses and violations of domestic law, international humanitarian law, the law of armed conflict, and domestic or international human rights law. Investigations for such offenses require suspension from duties until the case is resolved. Confirmation requires that the individual be removed from his position, or not allowed to take the new position.

Persons “removed” under these provisions cannot work elsewhere within the Ministry of Defence or the Bosnian armed forces.

Chapter 14 required the Bosnian government to establish the position of Inspector General in its armed forces, which was accomplished. In conjunction with the NHQSa Inspector General, the AFBiH Inspector General assemble evidence regarding any persons who may be affected by the above provisions. We call this process “vetting.”
Vetting of Defence Officials in Bosnia-Herzegovina

The IFOR Commander and his successors at SFOR, NHQSa and EUFOR retained a right to approve all officers and officials nominated to the rank of general officer, or those assigned to general officer positions, brigade and regimental commanders, assistant ministers of defence, military advisors to the many senior politicians in Bosnia, and of course all officers assigned to the Inspector General.

In addition to information provided by the AFBiH Inspector General’s, the NHQSa Inspector General queries various international agencies and other governments for background information on the officials being vetted. The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) has a huge database of evidence on numerous war crimes and other events stemming from the 1991-1995 wars, and this has served as a useful cross-check of locally-provided information. While the primary goal is ending the service of individuals who committed war crimes or similar violations, a related goal is removing those who have corruption issues or are involved in organized crime.

The Legal Advisor at NHQSa serves as the advisor to the NHQSa Inspector General during the vetting process and then reviews the evidence assembled for legal sufficiency. Vetting is sometimes a labor-intensive process, and also frustratingly inexact. Many officials have connections to alleged war crimes because they were in a unit during a period the unit was alleged to have committed war crimes. Very few have direct evidence against them that they personally participated in a war crime - if so, they probably would have already been indicted by the ICTY or the Court of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Instead, the Commanders are often presented a series of unconnected allegations and have to decide whether to exercise their GFAP-authorized discretion in allowing the official to serve.

The GFAP makes all decisions of the Commander(s) as final and binding on the Parties, so there is no appeal from these decisions. The Republic of BiH ratified the European Convention on Human Rights, and recently some removed officials have challenged the lack of an appeal process as violative of human rights provided for under the Convention.

However, the entire process is protective of their rights and the evidence must be substantial and convincing to take action against them.

LtCol Barry Stephens - NHQSa
Comm. +387-33-49-5210
Barry.Stephens@nhqsa.nato.int
Industry Involvement in NATO Acquisition – A Legal Perspective

Mrs. Simona Rocchi – NC3A

NATO’s evolutionary path in meeting the new security challenges of the 21st century requires a revisit of NATO Acquisition in order to be able to produce quicker and more effective solutions to these security challenges. Up-to-date knowledge of the latest developments and, moreover, of the latest standardization trends in industries is of particular relevance for the Alliance’s efforts to shorten the time required to take a viable concept and turn it into an operational and interoperable capability.

Earlier industry involvement in the NATO acquisition cycle could allow NATO to more effectively respond to these security challenges. On the other hand, the importance and the benefits to NATO of fair competition in NATO acquisition cannot be under evaluated --- thus the need for NATO to establish rules which allow earlier industry involvement in the acquisition phase, while preserving an open and fair environment for all the players.

As one of the most significant players in NATO acquisition, the role of NC3A\(^1\) is to facilitate interactions with industry, while preserving full autonomy for NATO and for NATO Nations to set priorities in the establishment of capabilities and in the development of global C3 interoperability. The NC3A has identified a four-phased approach to industry involvement, as indicated in figure 1 below.

---

\(^1\) NATO Consultation, Command and Control Agency, a NATO Agency established under the Ottawa Agreement
Industry Involvement in NATO Acquisition –
A Legal Perspective

This article will focus on the first two phases: the non-competitive and the pre-competitive environment phases.

In the first phase, the non-competitive environment, NATO should aim at reaching the largest possible number of industries interested in participating in specific information sharing activities. In the non-competitive/non-commercial environment, NATO maintains a close relationship with industry through various mechanisms, such as informal information exchange visits, conferences, exhibitions, active involvement in the activities of the Research and Technology Organisation (RTO), etc. There is also close contact with the NATO Industrial Advisory Group (NIAG) through regular liaison meetings in order to increase information exchange and coordination of activities. This has proven to be very effective, in particular in the area of Defence Against Terrorism (DAT) and industrial battle lab integration.

NATO is also involved with industrial consortia, including the Object Management Group (OMG) and the Network Centric Operations Industry Consortium (NCOIC). As the NCOIC comprises a large number of companies, it also provides NATO with an industry forum in an unbiased and more general way. The main effort of NCOIC, however, is to develop open standards (e.g. for NNEC), while other areas of interest are not within their scope. NATO’s interest in participating in these activities is to gain first hand information on up-to-date technology in order to be able to make more informed decisions for future acquisition of NATO capabilities. It is, however, in NATO’s interest to ensure that participation in these activities will not prejudice any future competition. It is important to ensure that certain conditions are met, i.e. that the process is open to all NATO industries interested in participating, that information can circulate freely within the association of industries, that in the spirit of information sharing, the parties to the association shall jointly own whatever has been created under the association and that there are no license fees for the use of intellectual properties made available by the parties. Export control restrictions should also be kept to a minimum. Another important aspect to consider is releasability. Releasability of such information to NATO (defined in the broadest term, i.e. including agencies, military commands and possibly, NATO Nations) is of paramount importance to allow NATO to make informative decisions for the potential follow on competitive phase.

The interactions with industry outlined above do not, however, allow a more in-depth dialogue with individual companies. Within the pre-competitive environment, NATO may have an interest in acquiring a better understanding of new industry capabilities. Those interactions are important because they allow NATO to gain a more in-depth knowledge of R&Ds. This knowledge though cannot be shared freely and appropriate protective agreements have to be put in place. It is crucial that NATO ensures the choice of industries for such agreements do not create perception of favouritism, or lack of transparency within the NATO environment.
Industry Involvement in NATO Acquisition – A Legal Perspective

Information exchange agreements, on a non-exclusive, fully-compartmented and non-commercial basis can be a valid tool for improving customer-supplier cooperation and mutual understanding, as long as the information provided by NATO to the companies through such agreements would be available and does not constitute an undue advantage over other companies for future contracts with NATO. In these information exchange agreements, the parties agree to exchange information based on NATO interest. By defining these agreements to be non-commercial, together with potential non-disclosure agreements, both sides are able to share confidential information. Such Agreements offer an open and transparent way to exchange information that does not prejudice the integrity of the Organisation. Appropriate transparency measures shall ensure that this information cannot constitute an undue advantage over other companies for future contracts with NATO.

In the majority of these agreements, the level of information exchanged is commercial in-confidence; object code and sometimes source code are disclosed under these agreements, and so the confidentiality of such information is very important for both parties. There are generally no joint activities under these Non Disclosure Agreements, each party retains its own IP. Releasability is also an issue of concern; it is generally confined to the parties signing the agreement, sometimes even disclosed only to named employees of the parties. Generally, we do not accept such limitations since these evaluations are often conducted for NATO partners such as the Military Commands. Therefore, we often require, as a minimum, releasability to other entities within NATO as well.

Mrs. Simona Rocchi – NC3A
NCN: 255-8229
Comm. +32-2-7078229
Simona.Rocchi@nc3a.nato.int

NON SENSITIVE INFORMATION RELEASABLE TO THE PUBLIC
Seminar on International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Issues

Mr. Lewis Bumgardner – ACT/SEE

From 1891 to 1896 the Swedish-born scientist, inventor and philanthropist Alfred Nobel spent his last years in San Remo, Italy. In his final will signed in 1895, he directed his estate to fund five annual awards for persons whose work greatly benefited mankind. Since 1901 at ceremonies in Stockholm, the King of Sweden delivers Nobel Prizes for outstanding achievement in physics, chemistry, medicine, and literature. For the fifth prize, however, Nobel requested a committee chosen by the Norwegian Parliament to annually make the politically freighted choice of the person who has done the most to promote peace. Following this procedure, 91 times in the past 105 years on 10 December, the date Alfred Nobel died, the Nobel Peace Prize has been awarded in Oslo. http://nobelpeaceprize.org/eng_com_nor.html

In 1970 the independent Institute of International Humanitarian Law (IIHL) was founded in San Remo and during its early years Alfred Nobel’s Villa served as the seat of the Institute. To highlight the relationship between Oslo and San Remo fostered by Alfred Nobel and capitalize on the international attention for the past four years, the IIHL has conducted an Alumni and Friends of the IIHL Meeting on the Occasion of the Nobel Peace Prize Celebrations in Oslo. http://web.iihl.org/iihl/Album/News%2022.pdf

In December 2006, I attended the 3rd Seminar on Current International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Issue. Organized by the IIHL in cooperation with the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, the conference had 39 international participants from 13 countries who were government officials, academics, NGO workers, law instructors, and political representatives from Iraq. Other attendees were Norwegian law students and persons interested in events in Iraq.

As a 1995 alumni of the IIHL Military Course, the aim of my attendance was to re-establish a working relationship with IIHL concerning their teaching of international humanitarian law and meet other legal professionals or government officials responsible for teaching and implementing the law of armed conflict. It also gave me the opportunity of hearing a discussion of the current issues concerning international humanitarian law and learning from representatives from the Shia, Sunni, and Kurdish populations describing the conditions in Iraq.

In keeping with its role as a forum “favouring reflection, discussion, exchanges of views and experiences”, intensely interactive IIHL activities began with a group dinner upon arrival on Saturday, December. Discussion items were rich and varied. A Vice President of the Romania ICRC spoke about IHL training in NATO exercises; representatives of the Kurdish population of Iraq talked about the possible future of their region; the Executive Director of an Egypt-based NGO described the dramatic increase in refugees from Somalia and Sudan in Cairo. On Sunday our group watched the Nobel Peace Prize Award Ceremonies, participated as part of the audience for an hour long internationally televised interview of the 2006 Nobel Laureate, Dr. Mohammed Yunus in the City Hall of Oslo, walked in and watched a torchlight parade by the children of Oslo honoring Dr. Yunus, and then enjoyed another group dinner.

On Monday the IIHL seminar began with an overview of its teaching and training activities on international humanitarian law and human rights law by the Secretary-General of the IIHL, Ms. Stefania Baldini. General Salvatore Lato, AF Italy, (and the former SHAPE J-6) provided an overview of the topics of the international law of armed conflict with specific comments on Rules of Engagement in military operations, humanitarian considerations, and military necessity.
Seminar on International Humanitarian Law and Human Rights Issues

Professor Yoram Dinstein lectured on the three major problem areas for the application of International Humanitarian Law:

1) the dramatic increase of non-international armed conflict;
2) problems with the protections of civilians in the context of suicide attacks and the use of human shield; and
3) circumstances where the protection of civilians in an armed conflict is lost.

Following Professor Dinstein’s remarks, we received the newly published Manual on the Law of Non-International Armed Conflict with Commentary commissioned by the San Remo Institute that Professor Dinstein co-authored with Michael Schmitt, and Charles Garaway. http://www.michaelschmitt.org/images/Manual [1].Final.Brief.pdf

Our afternoon session started with a presentation by Dr. Muthar Al Fadhal, a member of the Iraqi National Assembly, concerning the definition of federalism in the new Constitution of Iraq. http://www.krg.org/pdf/Success_%20Failure_foundation_iraq_%20MuntherAlFadhal.pdf. He was followed by Dr. Kemal Kerkuki, Vice-President of Kurdistan Regional Parliament, who spoke about the human rights suffering of the Kurdish people and the necessity of their protection by the U.S. and international community. Dr. Christianna Nichols Leahy, Professor of Political Science and International Studies, McDaniel College, USA, provided the final presentation of the conference concerning Human Rights in Iraq from an NGO perspective. Following this content-full day, our Norwegian hosts led us to the Nobel Concert where 14 international musical stars celebrated the Peace Prize and the work of Dr. Mohammed Yunus until the late hours of an extremely enjoyable evening.

Anyone interested in the activities of the IHL, the Nobel Peace Prize, the company of other international law professionals, and the pleasure of visiting Oslo should consider participating in this annual seminar. The challenge, however, is that 72 hours may not be enough for all the activities!

Resources
IDr. Mohammed Yunus, 2006 Nobel Peace Prize Winner: http://www.grameenfoundation.org/who_we_are/our_people/board_members/muhammad_yunus/
Nobel Peace Prize: http://nobelpeaceprize.org/eng_com_nor.html
Nobel Concert: http://nobelpeaceprize.org/concert/history/index.php
Will of Alfred Nobel: http://nobelprize.org/alfred_nobel/will/short_testament.html

Mr. Lewis Bumgardner – ACT/SEE
NCO: 254-5499
Comm. +32-65-445499
Sherrod.Bumgardner@ahape.nato.int
Spotlight

Mr. Oliver Aretz,

Senior Legal Assistant

NATO E3A Component in Geilenkirchen, Germany

Name: Oliver Aretz

Rank/Service/Nationality: Civilian (German).

Job title: Legal Assistant, NATO E-3A Component, Geilenkirchen, Germany.

Primary legal focus of effort: Being with NATO only since January, my personal focus is still on learning how NATO works. The main tasks here at the legal office are solving problems with the host nation, as well as working on directives and giving advise to our component personnel.

Likes: Working in a multinational environment, traveling, dining

Dislikes: Keeping to the speed limit

When in Geilenkirchen, everyone should: Make use of the tri-border community and enjoy the local specialties of Germany, Belgium and the Netherlands – after you stopped by the Legal Office for coffee and restaurant critics, of course.

Best NATO experience: This year’s legal conference in Stavanger, Norway.

My one recommendation for the NATO Legal Community: Actually I have two: the first recommendation would be to visit the E-3A Component for its 25 year anniversary celebration on 17 – 18 June 2007. The second would be to keep improving to use the joint resources within the NATO Legal community; it should make everybody’s work just a little bit easier.

Oliver.Aretz@e3a.nato.int
Hail

JWC: Colonel Geir Fagerheim (NOR AF) joined on May 7th, 2007

NHQSa: Major Kari Fletcher (USA AF) joined on May 16th, 2007

Farewell

HQ SACT: Ms. Dana Stone, Legal Assistant, has accepted a management position at a private law firm in South Carolina, USA, and will be departing the Organisation on 15 June ‘07. Dana originally arrived at the Headquarters in 2001 as a US Navy Yeoman serving as the leading petty officer at the HQ Secretariat/Registry until she was discharged from the US Navy in 2003 and joined the Legal Affairs office. Since that time, Dana has assisted hundreds of HQ personnel on a variety of legal assistance issues, and also has been an incredible asset to the entire NATO Legal Community serving as an integral part of the current development of the NATO Legal Community web site and other on-going NATO-wide information sharing initiatives.

Dana’s vibrant personality along with her helpful and giving nature will be missed greatly by all HQ staff, but especially by the Legal Affairs staff.

A vacancy notice for this position (C-0276, “Legal Assistant”) is posted. If you are aware of any qualified candidates who may be interested in this post, please direct their attention to the following link: http://www.act.nato.int/employment/vacancies.htm
GENERAL INTEREST

Electronic Resources:

http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/0,1518,481740,00.html
Interview given by General John Craddock to der Spiegel on May 8 – “Peacekeeping is a Very Ambiguous Term”

http://jwc.nato.int/files/SEP_06.pdf?bcsi_scan_81D5FEFB6D3BD525=0&bcsi_scan_filename=SEP_06.pdf
Issue 6 of the Three Swords Magazine in which you will find the article “Effects Based Approved to Operations and its implications for ACT” written by Colonel Jody Prescott (US A) - JWC

Issue 8 of the Three Sword Magazine – look on page 8 for an article on the NATO Legal Conference and on page 25 for the article “Training EBAC and Humanitarian Considerations in Operations – Blue Force Looks Within” by Colonel Jody Prescott (USA) – JWC

http://www.nato.int/cv/chod/cv-chod.htm
List and pictures of NATO Chiefs of Staff

Fact Sheet on NATO-Russia Military Cooperation

On May 23, the Russian State Duma has ratified the Partnership for Peace Status of Forces Agreement. This agreement will greatly enhance the ability of Russia and the member states of NATO to engage in joint military training and exercises, develop the interoperability of our armed forces, and pursue concrete forms of practical cooperation that enhance our common security.

Articles/Inserts for next newsletter can be addressed to Lewis Bumgardner (Sherrod.Bumgardner@shape.nato.int) with a copy to Dominique Palmer-De Greve (Dominique.Degreve@shape.nato.int) and Kathy Bair (bair@act.nato.int)
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