

Input / Output Metrics – National Fact Sheet – DENMARK
Years: 2014 & 2015

Metric	Selected Indicator	Absolute Value		Contribution (%)		NATO Guideline (%)	Rank	
		2014	2015	2014	2015		2014	2015
1. Defence Expenditure as a share of Gross Domestic Product (GDP)	Defence Expenditures (constant 2010 prices, mln national currency)	22,769	22,633	1.16	1.14	2	Middle	Middle
2A. Major Equipment and Associated Research and Development Expenditure as a share of Defence Expenditure	Major Equipment Expenditures (constant 2010 prices, mln national currency)	2,502	2,602	10.99	11.50	20	Middle	Bottom
2B. Defence Expenditures Categories	Personnel Expenditures	11,673	11,771	51.27	52.01	-	Middle	Middle
	Major Equipment Expenditures	2,502	2,602	10.99	11.50	20	Middle	Bottom
	Operations & Maintenance and Other Expenditures	8,374	8,012	36.78	35.40	-	Top	Top
	Infrastructure Expenditures	220	247	0.97	1.09	-	Bottom	Bottom
3A. Implementation of quantitative national targets ^{1,2,3,4,5,6}		-	-	99.71	97.62	100	Top	Middle
3B. Implementation of qualitative national targets ^{7,8,9}		-	-	72.67	71.02	100	Bottom	Middle
4A. Share of Land Forces Personnel which are deployable	Deployable Land Forces Personnel and % of total	5,961	5,879	68.60	67.45	50	Top	Top
4B. Share of Airframes which are deployable	Deployable Airframes and % of total	48	48	72.73	85.71	40	Top	Top
4C. Share of Vessels which are deployable	Deployable Vessels and % of total	13	17	86.67	89.47	80	Middle	Middle
5A. Share of Land Forces Personnel which are sustainable	Sustainable Land Forces Personnel and % of total	1,050	960	12.08	11.01	10	Top	Middle
5B. Share of Airframes which are sustainable	Sustainable Airframes and % of total	7	7	10.61	12.50	8	Top	Middle
5C. Share of Vessels which are sustainable	Sustainable Vessels and % of total	7	7	46.67	36.84	28	Top	Top
6A. Share of Deployable Land Forces Personnel deployed on NATO Operations and Missions Abroad	Personnel and % of total deployable	320	160	5.37	2.72	-	Middle	Middle
6B. Share of Deployable Land Forces Personnel deployed on non-NATO Operations and Missions Abroad	Personnel and % of total deployable	100	210	1.68	3.57	-	Middle	Top
6C. Share of Deployable Land Forces Personnel deployed specifically for supporting Assurance Measures (depicted as person-days)	Within National Boundaries	0	0	-	-	-	Top	Top
	Abroad	158	2,250	-	-	-	Middle	Top
7A. Share of Deployable Airframes deployed on NATO Operations and Missions Abroad	Airframes and % of total deployable	3.30	0.16	6.88	0.34	-	Top	Top
7B. Share of Deployable Airframes deployed on non-NATO Operations and Missions Abroad	Airframes and % of total deployable	2.27	5.24	4.73	10.91	-	Top	Top
7C. Share of Deployable Airframes employed specifically for supporting Assurance Measures (depicted as airframe-days)	Within National Boundaries	0	0	-	-	-	Top	Top
	Abroad	738	489	-	-	-	Top	Top
8A. Share of Deployable Vessels deployed on NATO Operations and Missions Abroad	Vessels and % of total deployable	0.63	0.77	4.83	4.53	-	Top	Top
8B. Share of Deployable Vessels deployed on non-NATO Operations and Missions Abroad	Vessels and % of total deployable	1.08	0.00	8.31	0.00	-	Top	Middle
8C. Share of Vessels (regardless of displacement) deployed specifically for supporting Assurance Measures (depicted as vessel-days)	Within National Boundaries	0	0	-	-	-	Top	Top
	Abroad	152	281	-	-	-	Middle	Middle
9. Fulfilment of NATO Command Structure (NCS) positions	National NCS Positions	95	95	92.63	96.84	100	Middle	Middle
	NCS Positions Filled	88	92					
10. Fulfilment of NATO Force Structure Headquarters Positions (NFSHP)	Number of Allocated Positions	44	68	100.00	98.53	100	Top	Middle
	Actually Filled Positions	44	67					
11. Fulfilment of Immediate Response Force (IRF) of the NATO Response Force (NRF)		-	-	143.36	143.36	100	Top	Top

1 Base year: 2014 and 2016.
2 Reference: DPCS 2015 as of May 2016.
3 Contributions two years later than requested: adjusted at 80%.
4 Limited adjustments to address capability shortfalls of the contributed forces; would require more information from nations to get a more precise assessment.
5 Transformation and modernisation of forces addressed in metric measuring implementation of capability targets.
6 Does not address readiness discrepancies unless significant (Ex: contribution requested at readiness 4 and provided at readiness 9).
7 Measures degree of implementation of force goals (which seek to address qualitative shortfalls of forces and defence transformation and modernisation) within the required timeframes.
8 Can only be considered as a very rough measurement of the transformation and modernisation effort.
9 Measurement imprecise especially for capability targets with multiple requirements and capability targets with a very long implementation time