

NATO

Chairs: Nikolas Schäfer, Daniela Hobel, Timo Goldinger

LAKE
MUN
2019

1

Topic A: The future of transatlantic cooperation regarding the defense against cyber-attacks

Topic B: The future of the INF-Treaty

North-Atlantic-Treaty-Organization (NATO)

Table of Contents

Topic A: The future of transatlantic cooperation regarding the defense against cyber-attacks.....	1
Topic B: The future of the INF-Treaty	1
<i>North-Atlantic-Treaty-Organization (NATO)</i>	1
A Note from the Chairs.....	3
I. Introduction	4
A. Introduction of topic A (The future of transatlantic cooperation regarding the defense against cyber-attacks)	5
B. Definition of Key Terms	6
C. History of the Conflict/the Issue.....	6
D. Current Situation	7
E. Important Actors.....	9
F. Relevant NATO Documents	10
G. Questions to Consider	10
II. Introduction of Topic B (The future of the INF-Treaty)	11
A. Definition of Key Terms	12
B. History of the Conflict/the Issue.....	12
C. Current Situation	13
D. Important Actors.....	14
E. Relevant NATO Documents	15
F. Questions to Consider	15
III. Bibliography and further reading	17

A Note from the Chairs

Dear delegates,

We warmly welcome you all to LakeMUN 2019 and to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization - NATO! We cannot stress enough how much of an honor it is for us to be your committee chairs. We are all students at Zeppelin University and friends. But you can be sure to not hear a single word in German from our side.

Our hope is that every single delegate feels comfortable and has lots of fun during the sessions. You probably already know how amazing lake Constance is. With the undoubtedly pleasant socials the conference has the safe potential to be an unforgettable time for everybody.

As important as having a good time is, a MUN conference is of course work, too. Nevertheless, being able to pass a resolution after a long process of negotiations is a worthy reward. The two chosen topics are exciting and complex. We hope the following guide gives you all the necessary input to prepare for a fruitful and heated debate.

We look very much forward to get to know you all! If you have any questions, do not hesitate to contact us.

See you all soon!

Kindest regards,

Timo, Daniela and Nikolas

I. Introduction

You may ask: What has NATO done for me lately?

“My answer is one word: Freedom. The NATO Alliance is defined not by the threats we face, but by the values we share, and by our shared vision of the future we desire.”

- Anders Rasmussen (fmr. Secretary General of NATO)

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization was founded in the wake of the Second World War when the new Soviet threat to Europe became apparent. Since the beginning the Alliance has been committed to defend its members against any threat, be it fascist, communist or otherwise. Initially comprised of the major liberal democracies of the Northern Atlantic, NATO membership was subsequently expanded according to strategic needs as part of the Containment strategy against Communism. Through several rounds of expansion during the Cold War, maintaining the absolute commitment to each other's defense remained the declared mission of NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2019).

Since the end of the Cold War, however, the continued necessity of its mandate has been repeatedly called into question by an apparent lack of substantial threats to the integrity of most Member States. In the absence of a monolithic geostrategic threat, NATO has undergone a transformation, the result of which is still unclear. Some have seen its future role as that of a world police, carrying out military interventions according to UNSC resolutions. Others have called it a dangerous anachronism. After the 9/11 attacks of 2001, the US invoked Article V, the mutual defence section of the North Atlantic Treaty, for the first time. Ever since, NATO forces have been aiding the global ‘War on Terror’ (such as in the ISAF mission to Afghanistan), but the alliance has shown signs of fracture (e.g. the hesitant stance of certain members to the Iraq War). Its most important function remained the coordination of strategic positions and tactical contingency plans of its member states.

NATO, due to its size, history and scope is very different from the general committees simulated at MUN conferences and may need some adjustment on your part. The NATO committee at LakeMUN simulates the weekly meetings of the North Atlantic Council (NAC), the principal policy-shaping institution of the alliance which is based at the NATO

headquarters in Brussels. The powers of the NAC are to produce consensual communiqués which are, while usually careful in their wording, binding for all Member States. The NAC's main purpose is to ensure strategic coordination between NATO members in response to security issues and challenges. NATO as an alliance is only as strong as the consensus between its sovereign signatories, and their resolve to carry it out in tactical cooperation.

As a simulation of the North Atlantic Council is not *technically* a part of a Model *United Nations*, there are some important differences as to this committee's rules of procedure of which you should take careful note:

- The delegates in attendance will be the permanent representatives of their respective countries at the NAC, they may therefore refer to themselves in the 1st Person singular.
- The preliminary agenda is intentionally broad and open to development into different directions at the delegates' discretion with both topics being addressed within the final communiqué.
- Resolutions (*Communiqués*) in the NATO can only be passed unanimously. Establishing consensus will therefore be your main objective, rather than forming the more powerful bloc. There is no official voting procedure.

A. Introduction of topic A (The future of transatlantic cooperation regarding the defense against cyber-attacks)

“It takes just one click to send a cyber virus spreading across the globe, but it takes a global effort to stop it from wreaking havoc – and NATO is playing its part.”

-Jens Stoltenberg (Secretary General of NATO, 2019)

This quote taken directly from the first paragraph of an article written and published by current NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg in August of 2019 directly shows how seriously the alliance is taking the threat of Cyber criminality and warfare. In today's world the means and ways of waging war are changing more frequently and profoundly than at possibly any other time in modern history. One of the key areas major countries and their security policy focus on nowadays is Cyber defense. Cyber threats to the security of NATO are changing at a pace where it is becoming ever more difficult for the members of the alliance

to adapt to the ever-developing global landscape. Thusly Stoltenberg proclaims in his article that a more in-depth strategic cooperation on the matter is the only way for NATO to stay ahead of the ever-developing threats (Stoltenberg, Jens 2019a).

But defense against Cyber-attacks is not just a security risk and financial concern on its own it also plays a key role in many of the conflicts NATO has been involved in since almost its inception. A resilient Cyber defense is an extremely important aspect of several of the Alliance's core tasks, mainly collective defense, crisis management and cooperative security against threats coming from old enemies like the Russian Federation and China. Cyberthreats to the security of the alliance are becoming more frequent, complex and destructive, come from state and non-state actors from anywhere in the world. To continue to ensure the integrity of the infrastructures and networks of its Member States, minimizing the threat of damaging Cyber-attacks from state and non-state actors should be a key priority for the alliance moving forward. No single country alone can secure cyberspace and NATO must leverage their unique network of allies, partner countries and organizations to stay ahead of the curve and stay competitive in the digital age (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2019a).

B. Definition of Key Terms

Cyber Warfare - Cyber warfare involves the actions by a nation-state or international organization to attack and attempt to damage another nation's computers or information networks through, for example, computer viruses or denial-of-service attacks.

NATO Industry Cyber Partnership (NICP) – Cooperation agreement established at the 2014 NATO summit in Wales where the members of the Alliance declared their intention to cooperate more closely with technological innovators and experts from the private sector.

C. History of the Conflict/the Issue

While Cyber warfare is still a comparatively new threat the last couple of years have already seen a number of devastating attacks against several Members of the Alliance. Two years ago for example the United Kingdom was attacked by the so-called WannaCry Virus, which crippled computers in hospitals across the country, cancelling thousands of scheduled operations and costing the National Health Service millions of pounds. But a strong and resilient Cyber warfare division has not just been extremely important in protecting the

Chairs: Nikolas Schäfer, Daniela Hobel, Timo Goldinger

alliance against attacks such as an attempted invasion by the Russian Federation on the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons which was foiled with the help of NATO experts (Stoltenberg, Jens 2019a).

Protecting their communications and information systems was first put on the Alliance's agenda at the 2002 Prague Summit. Six years later, following the first major Cyber-attack against an ally, NATO approved its first Policy on Cyber Defense in January of 2008. In the same year the conflict between Russia and Georgia demonstrated that Cyber attacks have the potential to become a major component of conventional warfare. Throughout the next few years Cyber security was moved more and more into the focus of the Alliance, which concluded in Cyber defense being introduced into the NATO defense planning process.

In just 2016 cyberspace was finally recognized as a domain of operations in which NATO must defend itself as effectively as it does in the air, on land and at sea with protecting its own networks and enhancing resilience across the Alliance being the main focus. At the same time NATO also affirmed that international law applies in cyberspace and Member States signed a Cyber Defense Pledge, stating that enhancing their Cyber defenses was a matter of utmost priority. In December of the same year NATO and the EU agreed on a series of more than 40 measures to advance how the two organizations work together in the domain of Cyber defense through joint exercises, research, training and information-sharing (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2019a).

D. Current Situation

In late August of 2019 NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg stated that “*a serious cyberattack could trigger Article 5, where an attack against one ally is treated as an attack against all,*” which had only been invoked once in NATO's history, after the terrorist attacks in the US on 11 September 2001. Cyber attacks like the ones unearthed throughout the investigation into Russian interference into the US Presidential Election in 2016 show the range of effects such an attack can have on a country and its democracy. This amongst others is a key reason why NATO members have continued deepening their commitment to ensuring that their Cyber defense capabilities stay ahead of the curve (Stoltenberg, Jens 2019a).

Chairs: Nikolas Schäfer, Daniela Hobel, Timo Goldinger

A restructured and updated action plan was proposed and endorsed by members of the Alliance in 2017, establishing Cyber Defense as a focal point of NATO's collective defense which among other things also continued strengthening their cooperation with leading actors in the industry. The top priority of this new action plan remains the protection of the communications systems owned and operated by the Alliance, reflecting collective decisions on issues such as efficient Cyber defense governance, procedures for assistance to member countries, and the incorporation of cyber defense into operational planning. In addition, the policy also defined means to take forward awareness, education, training and exercise activities, and encourages further progress in various cooperative initiatives, including those with partners and international organizations. It also forecasts and boosts NATO's cooperation with industry, including information-sharing and the exchange of best state practices. At the 2018 NATO summit in Brussels Member States agreed to set up a new Cyberspace Operations Center which will provide better situational awareness and coordination of NATO operational activity within Cyberspace. The summit's communiqué also stated that NATO will from now on draw on national cyber capabilities for its missions.

At this point NATO is also helping its Allies by sharing information and best practices, and by conducting Cyber defense exercises to help develop national expertise. Cyber defense is now also a part of NATO's Smart Defense Initiatives which enables countries to work together to develop and maintain capabilities they could not afford to develop or procure alone, and to free resources for developing other capabilities. Because Cyber defense is as much about the people as the technology NATO continues to improve its training capabilities and holds amongst others yearly Crisis Management Exercises and continually expands its education and training, especially at the NATO Cyber Range, which is based at a facility in Estonia, the NATO Communications and Information Systems School in Italy and the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence, also in Estonia. Amongst others NATO works closely on the topic with other Organizations like the European Union, the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE). Through the NATO Industry Cyber Partnership established at the NATO summit in Wales the Alliance hopes to move closer to achieve the Enhanced Cyber Defense Policy's objectives. By sharing information on threats and vulnerabilities with pioneers from the private sector NATO hopes to gain an advantage in reinforcing the protection of its own networks. This cooperation of

course is governed closely by well-defined rules and regulations and is described by NATO as open, transparent and inclusive (North Atlantic Treaty Organization 2019a).

The NATO Policy on Cyber Defense is implemented by NATO's political, military and technical authorities, as well as by individual Allies. The NAC provides political oversight on all aspects of its implementation and is responsible for cyber defense-related crisis management. A 2018 report published by the NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence assessed the biggest weaknesses and vulnerabilities of the Alliance in the realm of Cyber defense. One specific area singled out in the Paper were the Space-based assets, as satellites for example are not only potentially vulnerable to attacks but are also the key to the provision of data and services for each of the Alliance's main areas in the air, on land, in the cyber and maritime domains. This heavy reliance on space has resulted in new cyber risks that disproportionately affect mission assurance.

E. Important Actors

NAC (North Atlantic Council) – Principal political decision-making body of NATO consisting of Permanent Representatives from its member countries. Only NATO-body that derives its authority explicitly from the North Atlantic Treaty. It also exercises principal authority in Cyber defense-related crisis management.

Cyber Defense Committee: Committee subordinate to the NAC is the lead committee for political governance and cyber defense policy in general.

NATO Cooperative Cyber Defense Center of Excellence (CCDCOE): NATO-accredited cyber defense hub supporting members of NATO and its Allies with cyber defense expertise.

NATO Consultation and Command Board: Main committee for consultation on technical and implementation aspects of cyber defense.

Cyberspace Operations Center – New NATO military command center in Mons (Belgium) set up at Brussels Summit 2018 to deter computer hackers and strengthen the Alliance's command structure.

NATO Computer Incident Response Capability (NCIRC) – NATO agency responsible for planning and executing all life cycle management activities for cyber security.

NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) – Intergovernmental Military Alliance between 29 North American and European Countries founded with the implementation of the North Atlantic Treaty that was signed on 4 April 1949.

F. Relevant NATO Documents

North Atlantic Treaty - Constituting Treaty of NATO. Article 5, the most important article, invokes Collective Defense which states that an attack against one or more Member States is viewed as an attack against all Member States.

Brussels Summit Final Declaration – Final Declaration Issued by the Heads of State and Government participating in the meeting of the North Atlantic Council in Brussels 11-12 July 2018. (Article 2, 6, 20, 29 relevant for Cyber)

G. Questions to Consider

- In what way could and should NATO members extend their existing cooperation not only with each other but also with other international organizations like the European Union, the OECD and the private sector?
- How can the Alliance continue staying ahead of their rivals and thwart potentially more and more sophisticated Cyber attacks from countries like Russia or China?
- How much of their cyber defense do members of the Alliance want to surrender to NATO, the NAC or the Cyber Defense Committee?
- How much are Member States willing to invest into research, development and training of not only their own but also their shared Cyber-security?

II. Introduction of Topic B (The future of the INF-Treaty)

In 1987 the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) was signed by Michail Gorbatschow and Ronald Reagan. Ever since the INF Treaty ensured that no short and intermediate-range missiles were deployed nor built by the USA and Russia. By the deadline of the 1st June 1991 the two contract parties had destroyed a total of 2,692 short- and intermediate-range missiles.

But in the last couple of years Russia did not abide by the contract and constructed the new short and intermediate- range missile called “9M729/ SSC-8”. That kind of missile is easily transported and hidden. Additionally, the reaction time of any NATO counter measures is shortened by this new missile. With the 9M729 Russia could easily reach all European capitals. Missiles like 9M729 are similar to the Russian SS-20 and the American Pershing II, which were assembled with nuclear warheads in the 70th and 80th and spread fear all over the world.

"no international agreement is effective if it is only respected by one side. Russia bears the sole responsibility for the demise of the Treaty". Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg (02.08.2019)

At the peak of the cold war around 70.000 nuclear warheads were deployed worldwide. After years of disarmament, the amount of nuclear weapons declined to a total of 14.000. With dismay the international community is watching the trend to an accrual of the nuclear stocks.

In recent years the American and Russian government have changed their tactics towards arming their navy and air force with nuclear weapons. The reason for this being, that the INF contract solely prohibits the use of nuclear warheads on land but ignores the use on vehicles such as aircraft and ships.

On August 2, 2019, the INF, one of the most important treaties for disarmament, expired as the US and Russia both refused to resume their compliance to the treaty. The nuclear threat is back and it is unclear whether we've just entered the beginning of a second arms race between two global major military powers.

A. Definition of Key Terms

SSC-8/9M729 missile system: New missile system developed by the Russian Federation capable of carrying nuclear warheads, which according to all NATO allies violated the INF Treaty and directly led to its demise.

B. History of the Conflict/the Issue

Of course the conflict resulting in the termination of the INF Treaty did not just start with Russia's new missile system but has roots that go all the way back to the end of the cold war, the fall of the Soviet Union and the ongoing expansion of NATO into what was once the domain of the Warsaw Pact. Nevertheless, relations between the western Alliance and its once sworn enemy started improving throughout the 1990s, with Russia joining the North Atlantic Cooperation Council in 1991 and joining in on NATO peacekeeping efforts in the Western Balkans in the late 1990s. Things continued to improve in the early 2000s with the establishment of the NATO-Russia Council (NRC) in 2002 but their deepening cooperation saw its first major setback during Russia's military intervention in Georgia in late 2008 when the NRC was suspended for half a year for the first time.

Similarly, to the general relationship between NATO and their Eastern neighbor, the INF-Treaty was viewed as a success for the first few decades after its signature. After having held up since its 1987 inception the otherwise fairly positively viewed INF-Treaty started showing cracks for the first time in May of 2013, when the United States started raising concerns about Russia's newly developed SSC-8/9M729 missile system and its possible violation of the conditions of the Treaty. The following year at the 2014 NATO summit held in Wales the entire Alliance for the first time officially called on Russia to terminate the missile program and preserve the viability of the Treaty, which they believed to be violated by the missile program whose existence the Russian Federation continued denying. That year the general relationship between Russia and the West of course also reached another low point when NATO suspended all practical civilian and military cooperation with Russia under the NRC as a response to the country's military intervention in Ukraine in the Spring of 2014.

Throughout the next few years NATO's concerns regarding the missile system continued to grow. At the 2016 NATO summit in Warsaw, the Alliance once again called on Russia to

Chairs: Nikolas Schäfer, Daniela Hobel, Timo Goldinger

finally answer the charges leveled at them by the US, which they believed to be the only way to save the agreement. It took until December of 2017 for Russia to finally admit to the existence of the SSC-8/9M729 but maintained that it was in compliance with the conditions of the Treaty. At their 2018 summit in Brussels, NATO for the first time officially declared their belief that Russia was indeed violating the agreement. A few months later in October of 2018 US President Donald Trump declared his intention to withdraw from the Treaty if Russia continued to refuse admitting their breach of its conditions. A last-ditch effort to salvage the agreement at the NAC-meeting in January of 2019 did not yield positive results and on February 1st, 2019 the US officially declared to suspend compliance of the INF-Treaty and withdraw from the agreement on August 2nd, six months later. This decision while lamented many times was fully supported by all members of NATO who in a joint-statement put the whole blame for the failure of the Treaty on the Russian Federation's refusal to comply to the conditions they had been upholding since the Treaty's signature in 1987.

C. Current Situation

After the United States' formal exit from the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty with Russia NATO stands before the difficult task of avoiding a new arms race and guaranteeing the security of its members, especially in the east of Europe. With more than 13,000 nuclear warheads in the world today, the threat of a nuclear conflict is as looming as always (SIPRI, 2019).

According to NATO member states Russia is solely responsible for the collapse of the treaty, citing that "*Russia has shown no willingness and taken no demonstrable steps to return to compliance with its international obligations.*" (Stoltenberg, 02.08.2019) On the other hand the question is being raised if the United States did enough to save the treaty, the buildup of American missile defense systems in Poland and Rumania was perceived as an aggression by Russia, and was used by its diplomats and military personnel to accuse the United States of breaking the INF-Treaty. No matter who violated the treaty and who did not is secondary, the main question is what will be the result of the collapse.

According to arms control advocates, the end of the INF-Treaty increases the risk of a nuclear military buildup, especially along Russia's border with Eastern Europe. (Kimball, Bogus,

Chairs: Nikolas Schäfer, Daniela Hobel, Timo Goldinger

2019) A proponent of nuclear arms control, U.N. Secretary-General António Guterres, said: *“When [the INF Treaty] expires tomorrow, the world will lose an invaluable brake on nuclear war. This will likely heighten, not reduce, the threat posed by ballistic missiles.”* (Antonio Guterres, 2019)

On the other side voices are being raised saying there’s no point in abiding to a treaty only half its members respect. Additionally, newly developed nuclear weapons like the Russian plans for hypersonic cruise missiles which could, according to Russian President Vladimir Putin, render the whole American missile defense system useless, are not prohibited by the INF or similar treaties. (Jamieson, 2018)

Furthermore, is the fact that with the rise of China, one of the great world powers is currently not bound to any bilateral nuclear arms control treaty. A 2018 report by the Pentagon showed that Beijing has vastly improved its cruise-missile arsenal, which would likely make it harder for the US military to succeed in case of a conflict.

US President Donald Trump already said in October of last year that: *“We’ll have to develop those weapons, unless Russia comes to us and China comes to us and they all come to us and say, ‘Let’s really get smart, and let’s none of us develop those weapons.’”* (Donald Trump 21.10.2018)

US President Donald Trump already discarded the idea of a new bilateral nuclear pact between the US and Russia. Stating that a new pact needs to include China, finally overhauling the binary Cold War-era arms control system.

D. Important Actors

Russian Federation: After years of denying the existence of the illegal 9M729/SSC-8 missile system the Russian Federation finally confirmed its existence in 2018 but in the eyes of NATO continued refusing to provide necessary transparency or explanation. As this was regarded as part of a pattern of non-compliance NATO allies stated that they believed Russia to be in violation of the Treaty.

United States: As a result of Russia’s non-compliance with the Treaty, the US announced they would suspend their obligations under Article XV of the INF Treaty, which meant they could terminate the agreement within the next six months. This one-sided termination of the

Chairs: Nikolas Schäfer, Daniela Hobel, Timo Goldinger

Treaty, which both the US and NATO blamed fully on Russia's non-compliance, took effect on August 2nd 2019. As stated before, the US is only willing to once again entertain negotiations for a new disarmament agreement if not just Russia but also China was a part of it.

NATO Russia Council (NRC): the NATO Russia Council is the premier vehicle for negotiations, consultations, joint-decision making and cooperation between the Alliance and the Russian Federation. Consultations were suspended following Russia's military intervention in Ukraine in 2014 but has since again taken place on a number of occasions. All 29 individual Allies and Russia are equal partners in the NRC, which makes it the most sensible mechanism for potential future negotiations between the parties.

Nuclear Planning Group (NPG): The senior body of NATO on nuclear matters and discusses specific policy issues associated with nuclear forces. It acts as a forum in which all NATO member countries can participate in the development of nuclear policies.

Concerning the NEW-Start Treaty, signed by the then presidents of the US and Russia, Barack Obama und Dmitry Medvedev, Donald Trump has not explicitly said one way or the other whether he will allow New START to continue.

E. Relevant NATO Documents

Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF): Bilateral agreement between the United States and the then Soviet Union to eliminate and permanently forswear all of their nuclear and conventional ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges of 500 to 5,500 kilometers.

New START: Bilateral agreement between the United States and Russia, signed in 2010 with the aim to reduce both sides' nuclear arsenals by a third. It limits all kinds of nuclear weapons, not only intermediate range missiles. The treaty is set to expire in 2021 unless both sides agree to extend it.

F. Questions to Consider

- Are members of NATO currently interested in once again entering negotiations with the Russian Federation on a new nuclear disarmament deal, or is a new deal only possible

if it includes other nuclear powers like the People's Republic of China, India or Pakistan?

- What would NATO expect from its partners in a new nuclear disarmament deal?
- How can the interest of NATO in Europe in general, and eastern Europe in particular, be secured during a lack of disarmament deals?
- What consequences will NATO draw from the collapse of the INF Treaty for other nuclear disarmament deals still in place today?
- Have the US and Russia really done enough to still salvage the Treaty before it expired?

III. Bibliography and further reading

Guterres, Antonio (2019), <https://www.un.org/sg/en/content/sg/speeches/2019-08-01/remarks-press-encounter-un-headquarters>.

Jamieson, Alastair, (2018), “Putin unveils new Russian nuclear missile, says it renders defenses ‘useless’” <https://www.nbcnews.com/news/world/vladimir-putin-set-state-union-speech-election-looms-n852211>

Kimball, Daryl G., Bugos, Shannon (2019), “The Post-INF Treaty Crisis: Background and Next Steps”, Arms Control Association, <https://www.armscontrol.org/issue-briefs/2019-08/post-inf-treaty-crisis-background-next-steps>

Lété Bruno; Chase, Peter (2018): Shaping Responsible State Behavior in Cyberspace. Retrieved, September 9th 2019, from <https://nato-engages.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Shaping-Responsible-State-Behavior-in-Cyberspace.pdf>.

North Atlantic Council (2018): Brussels Summit Declaration. Retrieved September 9th 2019 from, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/official_texts_156624.htm.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (1949): The North Atlantic Treaty – Washington D.C. – 4th April 1949. Retrieved September 9th 2019 from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/official_texts_17120.htm.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2019a): Cyber defence, Retrieved September 9th 2019, from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_78170.htm.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2019): NATO and the INF Treaty, Retrieved September 9th 2019, from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_166100.htm.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2019): NATO-Russia Council, Retrieved September 10th 2019, from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/topics_50091.htm.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (2019): Relations with Russia, Retrieved September 10th 2019, from https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/topics_50090.htm.

Chairs: Nikolas Schäfer, Daniela Hobel, Timo Goldinger

NATO Communications and Information Agency (2019): NATO Industry Cyber Partnership. Retrieved, September 9th 2019, from <https://www.ncia.nato.int/Industry/Pages/NATO-Industry-Cyber-Partnership.aspx>.

SIPRI Yearbook, (2019): S. 11 <https://www.sipri.org/yearbook/2019>

Stoltenberg, Jens (2019a): NATO will defend itself, Retrieved September 6th 2019, from, https://www.nato.int/cps/en/natohq/news_168435.htm?selectedLocale=en.

Stoltenberg, Jens (2019b): Statement by the North Atlantic Council on the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty. Retrieved September 9th 2019, from <https://bit.ly/2kDNIII>.

Unal, Beyza Dr. (2019): Research Paper – Cybersecurity of NATO’s Space based Strategic Assets. Retrieved September 9th 2019, from, <https://reader.chathamhouse.org/cybersecurity-nato-s-space-based-strategic-assets#>.