

Session VIII: Research Agenda for the Cornwallis Group

Paul Chouinard, Ph.D., Louise Cox,
Barbara Smith, and Eugene P. Visco

Dr. Paul Chouinard, a member of the Cornwallis Group's Program Committee, is an analyst on the staff of the Consultation, Command, and Control Agency, a NATO organization located at The Hague, The Netherlands.

Louise Cox is Chief, Study Programs Office in the Office of the Deputy Under Secretary of the [U.S.] Army, located in the Pentagon, Washington, DC.

Barbara Smith is with the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees and is stationed in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Eugene P. Visco is a retired military operations analyst, a member of the Cornwallis Group's planning committee, and an independent researcher.

BACKGROUND

At Cornwallis IV, 29 March through 1 April 1999, Alex Morrison, President, Pearson Centre, presented a paper at the opening session. Within that paper, not as the key topic but with considerable emphasis, Alex presented a challenge to the Cornwallisians [Cornwallites?]. The challenge was to find ways to assist the Centre by conducting or participating in research tasks to respond to important questions about peacekeeping and peacekeeping training. Left to consideration by the Cornwallis Group was how such contributions could be made—organizationally and temporally.

As a first step to answering the question: How?, Dave Davis proposed developing a research agenda out of the discussions of Cornwallis IV. In response to that direction, topics and ideas were presented during the brief-out of the seminar sessions conducted 31 March (Wednesday). In preparing the proceedings of Cornwallis IV, Jim Narel compiled a provisional set of topics comprising the first cut at a research agenda. That agenda was categorized and vetted by Dave and placed in the proceedings, *The Cornwallis Group IV: Analysis of Civil-Military Interactions*, edited by Alexander Woodcock and David Davis, published by the Centre, 1999, within the concluding commentary by Dave and Ted (Alexander) on pp. 387-390.

In preparation for Cornwallis V and in support of the Centre, Gene Visco spent about a week at the Centre in November 1999. One task carried out during that visit was to review and revise the Emergent Research Agenda by examining the Centre's research program and in consultation with Centre staff. The result of that review is presented below and was submitted to the participants of Cornwallis V for their consideration and contributions.

STEPS IN REVISING THE AGENDA

A set of functional or 'objective' (in the sense of targets) categories have been provided to pick up the topics originally put under 'solution approaches' categories. Also, it is important to begin to answer two questions about research topics. The first is: What would you do if you had an answer to the problem? And the second is: How amenable is the problem to a reasonable expenditure of intellectual effort to solve it? That is, value added related to energy expended. For some topics, parenthetical comments or questions are included, representing Visco's confusion.

INFORMATION, INCLUDING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY, INFORMATION MANAGEMENT, AND COMMUNICATIONS

1. Identify information technology differences among organizations.
2. Determine information needs [Whose needs?].
3. Identify ways to improve coordination of information [to some extent, related to the results of the two preceding items].
4. Determine the effectiveness of the coordinated communications among civilian organizations during UNOSOM I and UNITAF.
5. Identify the important civil-military links [communication? other links?] and establish a process to ensure their timely connection.

PLANNING

1. How to conduct planning at great distances from headquarters [This topic needs further clarification; the problem is unclear].

ORGANIZATION, ORGANIZATIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL BEHAVIOR, ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS

1. Model civilian [organizations?] behavior under crises conditions [To help anticipate likely real behaviors? The value of this effort is unclear].
2. Determine elements on civil-military decision making [This topic needs further clarification; implies 'combined' decision making. True?].
3. Compare the effectiveness of UN HOC over three phases: UNISOM I, UNITAF, and UNISOM II.

4. Determine how to improve a civil-military operations center [Is there evidence that it needs improving?].
5. Identify the circumstances where the greatest problems between military and civilian agencies occur and develop ways to reduce or eliminate the problems.
6. Define standards for NGOs and DARTs to help measure performance [Will the independent organizations stand still for external sources defining standards for them?]
7. Study 'role changes' in the military forces, i.e., when a commander is required to use consensual techniques in cooperative environments. [Why? How would the answers to this topic be used?]
8. Determine if NG experiences in disaster relief operations, particularly, is of use to active units.
9. Identify the extent to which those involved in peace operations have the authority to effectuate the actions seen as needed to achieve the objectives of the intervention.

CRISIS MANAGEMENT

1. Identify cultural elements and factional interests that must be understood to effectuate successful interventions.
2. Define criteria for intervention decisions.
3. Identify factors influencing public order and civil police effectiveness when military forces are withdrawn.
4. Identify indicators which can assist in determining when to release military forces. [This is related to the immediately preceding topic].
5. Identify factors that may result in an intervention and ways that may resolve the crisis calling for the intervention. [Is this the same as topic 3, above?].
6. Design a procedure for identifying resources, including time, to accomplish the objectives of an intervention [This seems to be a major undertaking; isn't this the ultimate objective of all 'operations other than war' analyses?].
7. Develop doctrine for intervention, covering civilian and military organizations; include: measures of effectiveness; ways to maintain legitimacy, accountability and governance; balanced provision of near and long-term aid; and ways to determine when the intervention has met its goals. [This also appears to be a major effort. One might say: Wow!]

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

1. Determine the requisite education and training for military and civilian participants in interventions, including special training needed for specific deployments [How to generalize over such a wide range of possible interventions?]

LEADERSHIP

1. Identify attributes particularly important to the leaders of interventions and ensure that only leaders with those attributes are deployed. [Is this even doable? And, again, how would the results be applied, if the research was successful? How can the assignment procedures be controlled?].
2. Analyze the challenge of maintaining national commitment for interventions.

LOGISTICS

1. Identify and organize resources in an intervention to ensure needs of all are met expeditiously.
2. Identify resources for each military and civilian organizations involved in the intervention.

DATA COLLECTION, LESSONS LEARNED [SIC]

1. Determine accuracy [?] and usefulness of HAST and OFDA surveys. [How is usefulness defined?]
2. Define (determine, understand, clarify) the interaction between the civil-military and the media in Somalia (during the intervention).

MISCELLANEOUS, UNDEFINED

1. Determine difference in motivation among participants [Why is this useful? How would the results be used?].
2. Identify small issues that tend to have big consequences.
3. Define or develop a process to link the main actors and agendas. [This proposed task needs further definition].
4. Determine how such a process [from the above] for actors and agendas can be applied to local population.

5. Determine whether an OA team supporting a commander could help in interventions.
6. Apply military doctrine of unity of effort to all participants [This also appears as difficult to do as herd cats].

REVIEW AT CORNWALLIS V

The agenda, as above, was distributed to the participants early in the course of the program. The schedule called for the agenda to be discussed *en masse* at 15.30, 19 April 2000. Visco chaired the session; Louise Cox, Barbara Smith, and Paul Chouinard kept track of and recorded the open discussion. For the discussion, Cornwallis V was joined by David Gairdner, Director of Programs, Pearson Centre, and Dr. Walter Dorn, member of the Centre's external faculty, from Cornell University.

While reviewing the list of items on the agenda, the group was introduced to three questions to apply to each item:

1. Is the topic already well understood and solved or already the subject of inquiry by someone; if so, who was working the problem?
2. If it is not being worked on or solved, is it soluble (or solvable)?
3. If the problem were solved, is it clear what the solution provides to peace operations; that is, to what purpose would the answer be placed?

During the course of the open discussion, which, incidentally, resulted in contributions, questions, clarifications, and comments from essentially the entire group of Cornwallis participants attending, David Gairdner presented a perspective of the Pearson Centre view of research. An early objective is to determine what sort of relationship between the Centre and the Cornwallis Group was appropriate. Alex Morrison had opened a door but further elaboration and definition is needed to clarify the nature of the relationship.

Two considerations help frame the Centre's development of a research program. The first is the mandate from the Centre's principal sponsors, the Foreign and Defense Ministries, that the Centre's work must recognize the needs of Canada in peace operations and second, the role of the Centre in the international peacekeeping partnership must be maintained. Initially, the Centre will bring on two people to form the nucleus of the research group; in addition, the Centre will maintain its ongoing relationship with the external faculty and seek out new relationships, such as a possible link with the Cornwallis Group.

Among the research themes supported by the Centre's business plan are: civil-military relations in operational contexts, security sector reform, human security, transitional justice (e.g., how does one deal with crimes of the past such as war crimes), small arms control, disarmament, and economic dimensions of conflict. Beyond that short list, David Gairdner also expressed interest in essentially all the topics of the Cornwallis research agenda.

Walter Dorn commented more directly on the broad topics outlining the research agenda. Among other observations, Dorn referred to information as ‘power,’ that one can use information as both a carrot and a stick. So far as planning is concerned, much can be learned from the US military forces. With respect to the behavior and efficiency of organizations, it might be interesting to see how institutions have changed over time after participation in many peacekeeping operations.

Crisis management is really about intervention, that is, intervention occurs as a result of a political determination and other criteria are probably needed to drive the decisions to intervene, beyond the political one. Some thought might be given to pre-deployment training; the Centre has toyed with the idea of such training. Leadership topics can be considered in a manner similar to crisis management, that is, political factors dominate and that other dimensions ought to play a role in how leadership of peace operations is determined. Finally, logistics falls in with planning in that the US is considerable ahead of the UN.

The open forum process started by dealing with each individual topic within each of the broad categories of research areas. While the application of the three questions posed to the assembly served to open the discussion well, the participants often were troubled by the brevity of the topics. It became quickly apparent that without further elaboration, contributors were able to interpret each topic in terms of their own experiences and knowledge. The comments and suggestions were thus detailed but in accordance with specific experiences.

The results of the open discussion is therefore best expressed in terms of the broad functional categories, omitting the final two categories as somewhat fuzzier, more open-ended and less finely expressed (i.e., data collection including lessons learned and miscellaneous). Also, because the briefly stated research topics engendered so much effort, and consumed so much time, at clarification and interpretation, the latter functional categories received less detailed attention than the first three. However, it is probably fair to assume that the general comments devoted to the first three also will pertain to the subsequent four.

Information, including information technology, information management, and communications was acknowledged to be a serious topic for additional research but only after careful weeding of what is already known and reasonably accepted. The group agreed that much work has already been done in the area, citing, for example, publications of the US National Defence University and a variety of experiments and simulations. There was general agreement that there are specific topics needing further research but that they are believed to be soluble, although not yet well defined, and that getting on with the subject was important.

Planning was seen in a similar light although only one specific topic was included in the agenda under planning. What did become clear from the discussion was that there were many more dimensions to the planning area than represented by the one topic emerging from Cornwallis IV. Much experience is available to draw on but there seemed to be consensus that planning, particularly by civil agencies and institutions, was poorly done. The conclusion of the group was the same as that for the information category: further definition of specific topics, the area is ripe for further work, the problems are not insurmountable, and the results are needed and will be applied.

Organization, organizational and individual behavior, organizational effectiveness engendered as much fire and heat as any of the topics. Much of the discussion was devoted to

clarification and the bringing forth of implications about the subject. Measures of effectiveness also were discussed, at least in a general way without specification of particular measures of interest. There was support for the use of models in carrying out research of this area; there was a minority view that case studies would be more valuable. Again, the overall conclusion was the area should be pursued and further definition was needed. A number of the topics were specifically identified as of interest to the Pearson Centre and its emerging program.

CRISIS MANAGEMENT

With respect to crisis management, considerable discussion focussed on doctrine. Various forms of doctrine have apparently been written and are in the process of being published. Perhaps one contribution that the Cornwallis Group can make is the compilation and publication of the sources of doctrinal material. In any event, before specific research tasks are developed, a survey of existing material should be completed so that gaps can be identified and targeted.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Education and training was the last area which received full attention from the group, in the interest of time and staying on schedule with the balance of the program. The training of the Pearson Centre as well as pre-deployment training by nations entered into the discussion. As previously noted, the Centre has given some thought to the provision of pre-deployment training, although the difficulties of meshing with deployment schedules and other preparatory activities of deploying elements and people may preclude such programs or at least make them very difficult to carry out. Possibly mobile training teams might be an answer. Again, the area is important and work needs to be done.

Very short shrift was done to the last topics on the original agenda (leadership and logistics). Many of the comments for the preceding topics hold for these topics as well. The comments of Dr. Dorn are particularly useful for these two topics.

CONCLUSION

It is clear that much more work needs to be done before one can conclude that a research agenda supporting peace operations can be announced to the world. Not the least of the problems is the matter of establishing priorities and paying some attention to the resources needed to carry out research. Further definition by the Pearson Centre, as the world's leading institution for peace operations training, of its research needs would help refine the Cornwallis efforts as an agenda for the community. The notes taken of the open and candid discussion at Cornwallis V should be used to help expand and clarify a set of doable research tasks. Much more work remains to be done.