Civil-Military Cooperation Centre of Excellence
The Hague

Analysis Makes the Difference Workshop
First Impression Report

Introduction:

The Workshop "Analysis Makes the Difference" from 16 - 18 October 2018, was organized together with partners by the Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC) Centre of Excellence (CCOE). At the workshop 118 experts from the military and civilian sectors participated. The participants came from 31 countries and 65 military and civilian organizations.

The overall aim of the workshop was to strengthen cooperation between military and civilian spheres by enhancing mutual trust and confidence between NATO, its partners, and other international and local actors. The workshop overall topics were:

1. **Military and Civilian approaches to Analysis of the Civil Environment- including Conflict Analysis;**

2. **Discussions on Collective Defence, Resilience Building, Stability Operations with illustrative cases from Mali, Syria and North Eastern Europe Areas;**

3. **Enhancing the CIMIC Lessons Learned Community/Mindset; and**

4. **Improvement of concepts, and architectures for Civil-Military (CIV-MIL) Information Sharing.**

WWW.CIMIC-COE.ORG

The Workshop had a broad focus on the purpose of identifying areas that in all four topics could be investigated more by organizing further deep-dive workshops, conferences etc.

This paper is the first impression report and gives an overall idea about the findings from the workshop. The workshop was divided into three syndicates and the overall impressions were as follows:

Syndicate 1: Comprehensive Analysis. To get a holistic picture of the environment, it is more about asking the right questions and not so much the analysis technique used.

Syndicate 2: CIV-MIL Lessons Learned. It is important not only to strengthen the military CIMIC LL community but also to involve the civilian LL community.

Syndicate 3: CIV-MIL Information Sharing. We don't need to develop a new Information Management platform or systems but we need to change the mindset.

For all three syndicates is was stated that it is important that the military and the non-military organizations meet, exchange knowledge and build relationships so that over time all stakeholders have a common understanding of each other and that a strengthened cooperation is necessary for the future. The workshop has shown that the CCOE is an appropriate independent networking hub to discuss topics of mutual interest for the military and civil sphere.

The final workshop report will provide a more in-depth view into the findings and outcomes of the workshop and is expected to be finalized in the first quarter of 2019.

Picture: Analysis Makes the Difference Workshop/ syndicate work

Syndicate 1 – Comprehensive Analysis:

Syndicate One, Comprehensive Analysis, focused on how to achieve a comprehensive approach to analysis, one which takes into account the knowledge, expertise, and methodologies of civil and military actors through the sharing of analysis and information. The syndicate aimed to raise awareness on analysis approaches and the impact on decision making across the strategic, operational and tactical/programmatic spheres.

The expected outcome was to:

1. **provide a report identifying solutions for the development of a platform to link analysis and decision-makers from different stakeholders;**

2. **foster a common understanding on comprehensive analysis; and**

3. **identify areas of cooperation that will allow the development of a standardized conflict analysis/information systems across all sectors in the future.**

"The goal was to leave with concrete advice on how to proceed, rather than have another stand-alone event without sustainability".

Colonel Wolfgang Paulik, Director CCOE

In the context of hybrid warfare and intrastate, protracted conflict, crises have become more complex, with civilians and civilian organizations playing an increasing role within conflict settings, and militaries focusing on the protection of civilians and societal resilience to help fulfill their mission. An actors perspective influences the analysis. One may focus on the scope and extent of humanitarian needs within a crisis, whilst another may focus on the crisis itself. As a collective community, mutual benefit could be gained by sharing these analytical perspectives. In this context, there is an urgency to have the best possible analysis; the problem must be correctly identified in order to develop the correct solutions. However, identification is not enough; analysis must be a dynamic process whereby decision makers are involved throughout, providing clear direction to analysts to ensure the product of analysis is of good quality, relevant and timely.

Picture: Colonel Wolfgang Paulik during his opening speech

The issue is not a dearth of tools and methodologies; rather, it is a lack of joined-up analysis and sharing of perspectives and information. To explore how this can be amended, Syndicate One heard from civil and military experts and decision makers regarding their experience, where they see challenges, and how the issue is currently being tackled. This dialogue demonstrated the value of cross-sector collaboration as participants were exposed not only to new methodologies but viewpoints and perceptions of the issues at hand. To make this more tangible, participants broke into three sub-syndicates to apply an analysis method to a region or current crisis.

The syndicate discussions were broad, looking jointly at strategic, operational and tactical levels. Going forward, narrower and more focused workshops and meetings will identify concrete solutions to enable comprehensive analysis, and refine that which exists, but is yet to be mainstreamed. More actors and stakeholders are needed at the table. Humanitarian, development, academic and political representatives are required to share analysis from their perspectives, ensuring essential viewpoints and understandings are not missed and become an accepted essential element in the decision making process across all levels. Representatives of these sectors and the military are encouraged to meet and sustain the current momentum toward comprehensive analysis. CCOE is willing to support this initiative in cooperation with partners.

Sub-syndicate 1: Analysis Method for Humanitarian and Stabilization Operations

The first sub-syndicate introduced the fundamentals of the analysis process as can be applied across audiences that span programmatic Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), stabilization actors, diplomats, UN directors, and the donor community. Specific tools used by different organizations should not be confused with the fundamentals of the analysis process. A representative from iMMAP provided examples of their Syria work highlighting that methodologies and approaches must be flexible enough to support and guide decision making across the strategic, operational, and programmatic levels (the final report will provide an expanded explanation of the analysis process and its components).

The first step in the process is to identify the information gap that requires analytical efforts. Second, the analysis team must think of ways to obtain this information by developing an analysis plan. This plan is critical to first concretely define the outcomes desired from the analysis and then to work backward to identify the information and resources needed to achieve these outcomes. Once the information needs are identified, they are sub-divided by collection methodology—quantitative versus qualitative—which are collected, cleaned and triangulated according to stringent methodological requirements. The fourth step is to then analyze and synthesize the findings of the validated information/data. Lastly, the presentation of the analysis must be tailored to the needs of the audience, which can be done in the form of a report, infographics or map.

Participants were asked to apply this process to the case-study of Syria, specifically on broad strategic questions around borders and governance structures. The aim of this exercise was to anticipate or predict the situation in these two issue areas for 2019 by identifying current information gaps and brainstorming ways to retrieve this information. This process provides value as it does not pre-determine targets or indicators and can thus be used by varying sectors. The methodology is also focused on strategic-level decision-makers, as the final product is tailored to their needs and provides forward-looking analysis that enables them to influence future issues.

This exercise primarily focused on the first and second steps of the analysis process in order to emphasize the importance pre-planning in order to ensure analysts, programmers, and decision makers are asking the right questions needed to make the right decisions. This led to questions which could not be answered in the workshop itself but raised important questions around our current procedures, methodologies, and structures with regard to conflict analysis in Syria.

The problem of a conflict needs to be identified appropriately and accurately, without analyzing topics based upon preconceived biases and assumptions. Are we asking the right questions and are we prepared for the honest answer? It is necessary to utilize analysts to develop and drive the identification of problem sets that require analysis based upon their tactical and operational experience and insight.

> *"In a way, it's not so much what's the most important analysis; it's what's the most important question that we need to answer"*

> Natascha Hryckow, Independent Advisor

This process is time-consuming and occurs in dynamic and evolving situations requiring continual review, especially for strategic questions. To maintain a resource which is able to answer those kinds of questions it requires adequately funded structures that are appropriately networked with clear lines of communication and staffed by a diverse range of qualified and competent expertise. The current environment lacks a mechanism for objectively analyzing the context across the strategic to programmatic spectrum. This mechanism would work best as a consortium or network of organizations and analysts that receive sustained funding to conduct in-depth and long-term research and analysis in support of decision makers and programmers.

Picture: Natascha Hryckow, Independent Advisor

In order to analyze the context of the Syrian conflict objectively, it is necessary to overcome the perceived biases of a civil and military actor divide. Furthermore it is not sufficient to engage only with actors that respective organizations are accustomed to cooperating with; for example, Operation Inherent Resolve (OIR) coalition, western and allied militaries, International Organizations (IOs), Non-Government Organizations (NGOs), and Government Organizations (GOs). Comprehensive analysis requires quality networks and communique for the purpose of meaningful coordination with all stakeholders in this conflict, including representation from Russia, SAA, Iran, China, and Hezbollah in order to continue operational activities.

Sub-syndicate 2: NATO Analysis Method – Seven Baseline Requirements for Resilience

For NATO, resilience is the ability to resist and recover easily and quickly from shocks and stresses, combining civilian, economic, commercial and military factors and resources. This is achieved by enhancing civil preparedness within public and private sectors, supported by military capability and capacity. In order to do this, NATO collects information on seven baseline requirements for resilience. These include the resilience of government, energy supplies, uncontrolled movement of people, food and water supplies, communications and transport and the ability to deal with mass casualties. The presentation provided on resilience referred to an unofficial eighth factor looking at the resilience of the individual in the society. For NATO, this is not an official baseline requirement, however considered one of four levels of society at which resilience can be observed – societal, state and regional resilience being the others.

Sub-syndicate participants discussed what is missing from this tool and took part in a simulation based on the Eastern European context in which the tool was applied. The aim of this activity was not to cover the vast and complex topic of resilience, rather identify how early and comprehensive analysis of resilience indicators can benefit actors and decision makers in taking preventative action. In measuring resilience through analysis the Syndicate discussed factors that could prevent conflict or mitigate its effects are amplified, simultaneous conflicts and crises assessed and broader analysis possible through layering with other tools, such as PMESII (Political, Military, Economic, Social, Infrastructure, Information). It was also agreed the tool is missing some important aspects. It is quite technical and human factors must be added to each technical aspect. Additionally, societal level tensions, such as the integration of ethnolinguistic minorities, culture, the popular perception of NATO, and legal institutions were highlighted as missing. Additionally, the tool focuses on the state level and relies on member states to provide data, which may affect reliability due to sensitivities around information sharing.

In future work, it requires the development of specific indicators for each resilience requirement which will guide the assessment. The implementation of resilience requires further recognition of responders in case of events which affect the resilience of a state and also propose mechanisms for cooperative work to raise resilience.

Sub-syndicate 3: ACAPS Analysis Method – Qualitative Methodology and Global Crisis Severity Index

The second sub-syndicate introduced the Assessment Capacities Project (ACAPS) quantitative methodology for their Global Emergency Overview, a weekly update that provides a snapshot of current humanitarian priorities and recent events, and for their new Global Crisis Severity Index.

This index attempts to rank the severity of crises in order to provide evidence to inform the needs-based global allocation of resources, strengthen global level risk-based planning and allow organizations to combine their own data with global level security and risk data. It focuses on three main pillars: the geographical and human impact of the crisis, the humanitarian conditions, and the complexity of the emergency. These are further divided into 19 core indicators and 9 access indicators. Along with the presentation of the methodology, the sub-syndicate identified different types of biases (selection, social and process bias) and problems with the reliability of data that can limit the accuracy, and therefore the usefulness of the analysis.

Mali provided a good case study for the methodology as the crisis has many intertwining factors that affect stability. Monitoring the dozens of factors that can adversely affect the conflict situation, such as food insecurity and internal displacement, is critical to provide a comprehensive approach. Through a role-playing activity divided into different types of emergencies (floods, food insecurity and drought), participants were tasked with drafting an analysis from the information provided from the ACAPS methodology.

Positively, the methodology is transparent and attentive to bias and the application can be used in the field by various actors. The multi-sectoral analysis enables crisis responders to better understand and address the affected population. However, the analysis is mainly aggregated at the state level and must be supplemented with other data for local-level use. The retrospective approach of gathering information and mapping it using proxy indicators does not provide forward-looking analysis to assess tendencies in the near future.

The discussion during the workshop showed, that ways of work do not differ significantly; however, scope and level of analysis differ between different stakeholders. Therefore it is important to develop a common understanding of what analysis is and how it is used.

The discussion also made clear that all analysts face similar challenges during their analysis, no matter which organization they are working for. One of the major challenges in this context is the difficulty of data sharing between different stakeholders. More details on this subject can be found in the syndicate findings from Syndicate III.

Outcome and Findings

1. Existing conventions

The above methodologies each have advantages and disadvantages as well as similarities and differences. Approaches by different sectors often share common issues and topics of interest, areas of operation, general methodological flow and at times operational or programmatic end goals. These commonalities can act as points of entry for collaboration. On the other hand, specific tools, implementation of analysis, methods of information collection, resources available (notably between humanitarian and military), the lens of analysis used and the level of analysis often differ.

2. Shared vision

A key finding is that despite these different tools and techniques, there are more similarities in the fundamental analytical process than differences between civil and military actors. The lens used to decide priorities for respective organizations may vary, however, the complex and interactive environment requires an appreciation of all lenses. There is a greater challenge in understanding the requirements or outputs across the strategic to the tactical sphere rather than between civil and military actors.

3. Mutual benefit

No one methodology, whether due to a flaw, limited scope or the perspective from which it comes, can capture the entirety of a complex crisis. As such, cooperation between analysts from different sectors who use different methodologies is imperative to take advantage of potential synergies and fill information and methodological gaps. The role of both the analytical community and leadership in posing the right questions requires we work ever more closely together if we are to achieve a more holistic picture.

Moving Forward

The workshop identified current analysis conventions and highlighted challenges to comprehensive analysis. Participants predominately agreed that a collaborative approach to analysis across sectors and between the strategic, operational and tactical levels will add value to the holistic picture of complex environments. To achieve a solution for enabling comprehensive analysis, further targeted development work is recommended. This should occur in the near future to leverage the interest and momentum that has been generated.

There is a cross-sector Conflict Analyst Network (CAN) in Syria that is demonstrating possibilities for the future. OCHA is continuing this work forward at the Humanitarian Networks and Partnerships Week in February. The CCOE, as demonstrated by this workshop, is bringing civilian and military actors together. This meeting of different sectors is an essential step forward for comprehensive analysis as organizational and cultural differences, and lack of trust between civilian and military sectors, whether real or perceived, hinders information sharing and collaboration.

Syndicate 2 – CIMIC Lessons Learned:

Syndicate two, CIMIC Lessons Learned, had two main objectives. Firstly, it was to conduct a tailor-made training for CIMIC Lessons Learned (LL) personnel and interested civilians. Secondly, it was to conduct a kick-off event to strengthen the CIMIC Lessons Learned Community, with a special focus on the structures, tools, processes, and training.

Training

During the workshop, a three-day Lessons Learned Training was executed by the Joint Analysis and Lessons Learned Center (JALLC) Mobile Training Team (MTT). The idea of this training was to improve the skills and knowledge of the responsible persons for Lessons Learned in different units and organizations. In that sense, it had the following learning objectives:

1. Understand the management and execution of the various phases and steps of the NATO Lessons Learned process into the daily cycle of command, staff, and unit activities with the intent to improve current and future learning performance. NATO Mission Partners will have a better understanding of how to exchange lessons with NATO.

2. Know the key elements of the NATO Lessons Learned Capability, recognize and consider gaps in this context, and influence the direction of requirements to achieve improvement, especially in relation and support of the overall Lessons Learned process.

3. Analyze observations by applying various structured analysis techniques with the goal of discovering the root cause, suggesting conclusions, and supporting decision making.

4. Describe and identify the handling of lessons in NATO exercises and operations in reference to given direction and guidance of the NATO policy, when operating as a partner with NATO forces.

5. Understand the purpose of the NATO Lessons Learned Portal and it's handling in support of the Lessons Identified, Lessons Learnt and Best Practice data management and Lessons Learned sharing.

CIMIC Lessons Learned Community Kick-off

The aim of this subject was to enhance the CIMIC Lessons Learned collection and sharing tools, procedures and structures. This should be achieved in a first step by investigating which structures, tools, processes and training are in place throughout Organizations and Nations to collect and share CIMIC Lessons Learned. This intends to develop better how CIMIC Lessons Learned can be collected and shared and more effectively among organizations and partners. Furthermore this subject offered the chance to discuss the possible role of the CCOE within the CIMIC specific LL process.

Therefore the workshop participants were asked to identify which structures, processes, tools and trainings are supporting the development of a CIMIC Lessons Learned Community and which role this implies for the CCOE.

Outcome and findings

The outcomes and findings are describing the role of the CCOE, according to the feedback of the workshop participants.

1. *Structure:*

    a. Strengthen the military CIMIC Lessons Learned and involve the civilian Lessons Learned sphere in order to build a common CIMIC Lessons Learned Community.

    b. Identify the responsible persons for Lessons Learned in the CIMIC Community. Traditionally, the Lessons Learned role is, in most units and civilian organizations, an auxiliary function. The CCOE is in the lead to gather the players from the different units and organizations together.

    c. Use the already existing structure within NATO and the different organization's contacts to promote CIMIC Lessons Learned and change the mindset of the leadership/key leaders. This can, for example, be done at conferences and courses.

2. *Process:*

    Coordinate the collection plan for the CIMIC Lessons Learned Community.

3. *Tools:*

    a. Be responsible for the CIMIC Lessons Learned contacts network list and update on a regular basis.

    b. Include the Lessons Learned process in the new, 5th edition of the CCOE CIMIC handbook.

    c. The CIMIC Lessons Learned Community should only use the existing portal, chatroom etc. provided by JALLC. The portal should also be accessible for civilian actors.

4. *Training:*

    a. In cooperation with the JALLC, develop and provide Lessons Learned training for the Point of Contacts in the CIMIC Community and for interested civilian organizations.

    b. Focus on training of Key Leaders/Leadership, that can be done for example with a lesson in our Higher Command Course.

    c. Develop and provide a session that can be used to train the trainer in different CIMIC units or civilian organizations.

Moving forward

The Lessons Learned and Analysis Branch of the CCOE will take the outcomes as a starting point for building and developing the CIMIC Lessons Learned Community and include also an integral part of CCOE's Lessons Learned and Analysis (LL&A) Branch program of work for 2019.

Syndicate 3 – CIV MIL Information Sharing:

Syndicate 3 focused on improving the capabilities of military organizations to share information with civilians, and to manage and use information regarding the civil environment effectively, efficiently and appropriately. It was led by the Federated Mission Networking and Mission Partner Environment (FMN/MPE), Civilian-Military Information Sharing (CMIS) project team. This project aims to provide capabilities which support civilian-military (CIV-MIL) information sharing where this is critical to mission accomplishment, within the framework of the Federated Mission Networking construct. It is a project under the Multinational Capability Development Campaign (MCDC) of which NATO is a member.

The three-day discussion was conducted through a combination of briefings, reviews, and discussions in a working group format. Presentations from Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX), Protection of Civilians (PAX), and Netherlands Organization for Applied Scientific Research (TNO), and Marine Civil Information Management System (MARCIMS) enriched the discussions by contributing to deepen the knowledge on how information sharing from the civil side is performed and to identify the latest developments on the military side.

The main subjects discussed were the following:

1. The current CIV-MIL information sharing (CMIS) solution products are transferred to an organized community of practice.

    a. Revision of the (FMN/MPE) current products by the participants;

    b. Discussion of ways to introduce concepts and practices;

    c. Recognizing the unique role of CCOE as CIMIC doctrinal custodian for NATO and as a hub for collaboration by the CIV-MIL community;

    d. Identification of ways to sustain momentum and build a community of practice; and

    e. Proposal for a Civilian Information Management (CIM) project to complement FMCM/CMIS.

2. The lessons learned from the Federated Mission Networking and Mission Partner Environment (FMN/MPE) CMIS project are to be applied by the Community of Interest to the challenge of CIM.

    a. Reviewed current efforts which offer opportunities transition and sustainment;

    b. Reviewed challenges in maintaining multinational and Civil-Military cooperation; and

    c. Developed a concept for a near-term CIV-MIL Information project concepts for consideration by participants through the:

        i.   Identification of problems and gaps in information collection, data management, and data sharing (i.e. MARCIMS and KOBOTOOLBOX).

        ii. From this determine a list of requirements based on user needs.

        iii. Engage with civilian and military-technical specialists to develop a common way ahead.

        iv. Using limited objective exercises conduct a series of test and evaluation events to refine the solution and to validate and verify the tool with end users.

Outcome and findings

The community of interest and practice left the workshop with a shared vision and a common approach to solving common CIV-MIL information capability challenges in a collaborative way.

The participants agreed that the following events are an adequate approach to build a community of practices:

a.   Conferences

   i.   UNOCHA Regional Consultative Group on Humanitarian Civil-Military Coordination.

   ii.   Humanitarian Networks Partnerships Week (HNPW).

b.   Potential Exercises

   i.   Joint Cooperation.

   ii.   Trident Juncture.

   iii.   Viking Exercise (2021).

   iv.   RIMPAC – Humanitarian Response Phase (2020, 2022).

   v.   Cobra Gold (annual).

Moving forward

CCOE will take the steps identified in the community of practice by:

1.   Introducing the findings in the information sharing lectures delivered in the CCOE training landscape;

2.   Submitting the findings in the CIV-MIL Information Sharing chapter of the CCOE in the 5th Edition CIMIC Handbook and in the CIMIC Doctrine;

3.   Studying the viability of a CIV-MIL Information Sharing Workshop, in 2019; and

4.   Supporting a CIM project and serving as an information hub for sharing of best practices and lessons learned across the community.

Workshop Feedback:

Workshop Focus

The focus of the workshop was broad, especially in regards to the topic of comprehensive analysis. This was in order to understand the topic as a whole and not to preclude an aspect or stakeholder. The next step must be a more focused effort, in topic and audience. Therefore it will be necessary to identify key stakeholders to define the thematic priority for future work and the appropriate audience to engage in the next phase of development. This will be driven by the CCOE in consultation with subject-matter experts from the civilian and military sectors, with a first proposal to be provided in the final workshop report.

Time Management

The duration of the workshop was well received as it offered a good balance between work and travel time. On the other hand, it caused a tight agenda which didn't provide enough room for discussion and cross-linking the different syndicates. This has been acknowledged and will be taken into account for future events in general. As the next step will be more focused on topic and audience, it will be designed to provide more room for open discussions and working sessions.

CCOE's Role

The discussions during the workshop and feedback from the participants has shown that the CCOE is an appropriate independent networking hub to discuss topics of mutual interest for the military and civil sphere. Therefore the CCOE will remain engaged in all three topics of the workshop throughout the upcoming year in order to foster further development in a common comprehensive analysis approach.

Final Report:

The final workshop report will provide a more in-depth view into the findings and outcomes of the workshop and outline a proposal for future work to support CIV-MIL cooperation in comprehensive analysis. The CCOE will seek to incorporate relevant findings from the workshop in the 2019 Program of Work and CCOE Vision to 2025. The final report is expected to be finalized in the first quarter of 2019.

CCOE
CIVIL-MILITARY COOPERATION
CENTRE OF EXCELLENCE

Visiting Address:
Brasserskade 227A
2497 NX The Hague
The Netherlands

Reception: +31 (0) 15 2844702
Registry: +31 (0) 15 2844241
Email: info@cimic-coe.org
Web: www.cimic-coe.org

WWW.CIMIC-COE.ORG