

The PfP Consortium as a Change Management and Integration Tool: Ten Years of Experience

Velizar Shalamanov *

Introduction: Development of the Consortium in the Spirit of PfP

The PfP Consortium was born in 1999 at NATO's Fiftieth Anniversary at the Washington Summit, although the idea of the Consortium was first tested in 1998 at ISF in Zurich.¹ Bulgaria had the privilege of hosting the Second PfP Consortium Annual Conference in Sofia—the first gathering dedicated to the new initiative to define the roadmap for the future “troika council” that had been established to provide continuity between the annual conferences.

The objectives defined in Washington were “fostering greater academic and educational opportunities within the defense and security community; encouraging high standards for professional military education; promoting cost-effective education through collaborative distance learning and distributed training; expanding dialogue, understanding, and cooperation through security-related research in EAPC countries; and, exploring complementary relationships with institutions such as the NATO Defense College.” About ten years later it is time to see how these goals were pursued, and to assess to what extent they have been achieved in EAPC area.

The *Statement of the Principles* of the Consortium and the *Statement of Operation and Administration* were approved at the conference in Sofia. This marked the formal start of the new initiative, which was prepared by a team led by Dr. Kennedy and Dr. Winkler at the George C. Marshall European Center for Security Studies in Garmisch-Partenkirchen, Germany.² The following year, in 2000, Dr. Winkler took over the Geneva Centre for Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), an organization that played a key role in moving the Consortium forward.

From the very beginning, the Consortium—having been established in the spirit of PfP—was an effective change management instrument that provided the opportunity for defense academies to work with civilian universities and security studies institutes, many of them NGOs from PfP countries. The development of the Consortium was facilitated by annual conferences, and through its relationships with other forums such as the International Security Forum (ISF), the George Marshall Center Alumni Association, the NATO Defense College Alumni Association, and the Conference of the

* Dr. Velizar Shalamanov was Deputy Minister of Defense in Bulgaria from November 1998 to July 2001. He was responsible for defense policy, planning, and integration in NATO, and in this role he worked on preparing the Second PfP Consortium Annual Conference in Sofia as well as defining Bulgaria's participation strategy in the Consortium.

¹ Victor E. Stamey, “The Way Ahead,” *Connections: Athena Papers* (1998); available at <https://consortium.pims.org/events/1st-annual-conference-jan-2006>.

² “The Partnership for Peace Second Annual Conference, Sofia, Bulgaria, December 8-10 1999,” *Connections: Athena Papers* (1999); available at <https://consortium.pims.org/events/2nd-annual-conference-jan-2006>.

Commandants of the Defense Staff Colleges activities.

Now, a decade later, I propose to look at the Consortium's work and assess its role in the research and education community at large, and in every country and region. This endeavor could help shape the future of this initiative that is dedicated to supporting the formation of a stronger Euro-Atlantic community of security experts. This paper aims to analyze the development of the Consortium from a practitioner's perspective; it identifies problems, looks at different levels of community integration, and examines the Consortium's use as a change management tool. In my view, after ten successful years the future of the Consortium lies in facilitating an international and multidisciplinary operational analysis process by providing research infrastructure support (mostly computer assisted technologies) for study teams. The Consortium could become the base for the integration of the efforts of many research programs in the security area, programs supported by NATO, the EU and other organizations or individual countries for the common benefit of the strategic community established by the Consortium.

The Consortium Viewed from Different Angles

As a former deputy defense minister in Bulgaria, I had first-hand experience with the Washington Summit and the second annual Consortium conference in Sofia, as well the next two conferences in Tallinn (2000) and Moscow (2001). As a chairman of the George C. Marshall Association, a think tank in Bulgaria, I also took part in the annual PfP conferences in Paris (2002), Berlin (2003), and Bucharest (2004). Later I was able to evaluate the PfP Consortium through experiences gained from roles I held in a variety of settings: at the NATO Science Committee Human and Societal Dynamics of Security (HSD) Advisory Panel, at DCAF, and as a practitioner organizing security-related research projects in Bulgaria as well as security-related educational courses in various universities. Currently, as a participant in ESRIF, I have had the opportunity to experience the EU perspective on the PfP Consortium's areas of activity.

My work in preparation for the second annual conference in Sofia paved the way for my participation in DCAF (representing Bulgaria as a co-founder in 2000), the NATO Science Committee Advisory Panel on HSD (2004), and ESRIF (2007). My personal experience has shown that one of the key accomplishments of the Consortium is bringing people together and facilitating the development of a strategic community in the area of security-related research and education.

The agenda of the Consortium is an excellent example of the capacity to identify key security problems and to organize a focused approach to study them in a multinational environment. In practical terms, the framework of the Consortium was effectively used to internally define research topics for study, or to test and promote topics coming from different research organizations participating in the forum. For the first several years an important task of the Consortium was to develop its research and educational agenda and to explore some key tools that could be used to support cooperative projects in the security area. At the same time, one of the key results of these activities has been the development and strengthening of the strategic research community in the security domain. The three most important areas of the consortium's work are:

- Identification of key research and educational priorities in security and defense
- Development of the critical instruments that can help support research and education or build a general infrastructure for cooperation
- Building a strategic community through Education and Research.

Considering the PfP Consortium as a security institution, we could define four main pillars of its development:

- Documental (conceptual and normative) base: from the initial concept paper (1998) through the statement of principles (1999) to the subsequent conceptual documents
- Organizational base: starting from the structures defined by the statement for operation and administration (1999) and proceeding to all subsequent arrangements for a secretariat, a senior advisory council, and a steering committee
- Capabilities base: mostly connected with the working groups, publications, website, and other capabilities
- Resource base: provided by nations and key participating organizations.

The Consortium is a security institution that should be based on effective international cooperation with well-established democratic control (including guidance provided through the participation of many NGOs). The key aspect of the Consortium's continuing success is its capability for change management in the security and institutional environment. PFP itself has changed a great deal, and NATO's new partnerships will continue to have added impact on the Consortium.

Since its inception the Consortium has played an integration role on several levels:

- Integration between research and education that was not a practice in Warsaw Pact countries
- Integration between "hard" and "soft" security studies by inviting defense academies to work with research and educational bodies dealing with civil security, public order, crisis management, civil protection, and human security
- Integration on a regional level under the common umbrella of the PFP
- Integration between classical research and educational methods and modern IT-based tools
- Integration between studies under different programs, including NATO and EU programs
- Integration between technology-oriented disciplines and the social sciences and humanities.

The development of the Consortium could be assessed in correlation with other initiatives in the area of security research and education. SWOT (Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats) analysis by professional teams could provide an objective picture of the competitive advantages of this initiative, but even from a general review it is easy to see the uniqueness of the Consortium's scope and flexibility. These characteristics could be seen as limitations to taking an institutional approach to the forum's work. Step by step, working groups were established around existing institu-

tions; their agenda and vision, and even their very presence within the framework of the Consortium, were subject to strong institutional influences exerted by the host organizations. In my view, the Consortium is a valuable and effective change management tool in the security area through knowledge sharing and integration facilitation, which is an area where future efforts should be consolidated.

The Consortium as a Change Management Tool

The Partnership for Peace initiative was at its core a change management instrument for the defense and security sectors of the former Warsaw Pact countries. Four years after the start of the PfP, the Consortium addressed the foundation of any successful security transformation efforts by putting its emphasis on research and education. It essentially differed from NATO's Science Program, which was established in 1958 and operated under NATO's Science Committee, and which in its later years focused mostly on the integration of scientists from Partner countries. The Consortium is also different from the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Societies, which was founded in 1969. Established in the spirit of PfP, the Consortium is a flexible organization with a mandate (set forth in its original concept paper³) focused on building common understanding of security and security policy. In this respect—serving as a change management instrument and developing a network for security research and improvement of education—the progress made by the Consortium is tremendous. On the other side, as will be discussed below, the power of integration is still limited. Many of the groups are clustered around the “engines”—such as DCAF, the Austrian Defence Academy, and other institutions—and many have received particular support and leadership from the United States, but visible ownership on the part of non-NATO former Warsaw Pact countries has proved elusive. Sub-regional networks again are inspired and powered by Western institutions; there is still no other example of the caliber of the Baltic Defense College in Estonia anywhere in South East Europe, the Black Sea region, the Caucasus, or Central Asia. There are not even any such research institutes active in these regions on a virtual basis. One of the problems is that, even though the Consortium was by design established to be open to civil universities and NGOs, the primary focus on institution building and funding is still directed toward defense academies. These institutions are more conservative when it comes to participating in regional cooperation mechanisms, and are also more vulnerable to political influence and changes in government.

Looking at the most successful role of the Consortium, there are at least four levels of change to be considered:

- NATO's activities in the area of research and education
- PfP-related research and educational activities
- Internally for the countries (an illustration based on the case of Bulgaria is considered)

³ Stamey, “The Way Ahead.”

- In defined sub-regions such as SEE, the wider Black Sea Area, Caucasus, and Central Asia through building regional working groups on specific topics and the development of regional identity on security matters.

Functionally, the change was visible in the areas of:

- Technology: promoting Advanced Distance Learning (ADL), modeling and simulation (M&S), knowledge portals
- Curriculum development, education, and training: the introduction of new programs, courses, and techniques for education and training
- Research activity and publications: the development of new periodicals and a book series.

The development of working groups proved that, without the support of a strong institution (as the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces' link with the working groups on Security Sector Reform and Crisis Management, for example), it is difficult to expect effective results. Another example was the history of the group initiated in Sofia (1999) on ESDI/CESDP, later transformed to become the Euro-Atlantic Security Working Group, which was cancelled due to a lack of institutional support. Having strong support behind the Partnership Information Management System (PIMS), Modeling and Simulation, and Advanced Distance Learning Working Groups was another good example of the critical role of leadership and resource management in introducing change.

The Consortium's integration with other NATO programs, especially under the division of public diplomacy—including NATO's Science Committee programs under the aegis of the Advisory Panel on Human and Societal Dynamics of Security (established in 2004)—and with the different instruments of Science for Peace (SfP), including SfP projects, Advanced Research Workshops (ARW), Advanced Study Institutes (ASI), and Advanced Training Courses (ATC) proved to play an important role in building synergy among different initiatives of NATO and NATO countries for mutual support of the projects. The Education for Reform Initiative and the Partnership Action Plans (PAP)—and especially the Institution Building Initiative⁴—showed the integral role of the PFP Consortium as an environment that supports security research and education-related initiatives.

The PFP Consortium is large and wide-ranging, which makes it hard to expect to find easily measurable results for the whole organization. Its environment is suited for concept development and experimentation, to serving as a “test bed” for more specific initiatives in certain subject areas, regions, or even separate countries. The Consortium is designed to motivate visionary and strategic thinking. Implementation follows in the concrete projects initiated by specific stakeholder organizations or countries. The most

⁴ Velizar Shalamanov, “Defence Management and Civil Society Interaction and Co-Operation,” in *Defence Institution Building: A Sourcebook in Support of the Partnership Action Plan (PAP-DIB)*, edited by Willem F. van Eekelen and Philipp Fluri (Geneva & Vienna: DCAF/Austrian Study Group Information, September 2006), 435–66.

important role the Consortium can play in change management is at the national level, where the real capabilities are maintained: national defense academies, research institutes, universities, NGOs, national security research, education policy, and strategy development and implementation.

Influence of the Consortium on Security Research and Education in Bulgaria, South East Europe, and the Black Sea Region

During its 2001 annual meeting in Moscow, the Consortium was used as a venue to discuss the idea of the SEE Defense College as a virtual distributed network of existing defense colleges using the modern technologies that have developed within the framework of the PfP, such as ADL and SIMNET. A subsequent idea, for a Black Sea Virtual Distributed Defense & Security University, has been under discussion since 2004, including the prospect of situating it within the framework of the newly established Black Sea Working Group in the PfP Consortium. As with the SEE Defense College, however, there have been no visible developments.

At the same time, ADL and SIMNET as well as PIMS are providing a prime opportunity for cooperation between defense colleges; even without a formal regional institution, such as SEE or the Black Sea defense college, these new technologies are exerting a significant influence on the development of shared curricula and joint exercises. So it may well be the case that this form of technology-enabled cooperation is the best way to work in the Consortium environment, rather than creating new institutions from scratch that are wedded to a specific location. In this sense, the computer-assisted exercise (CAX) environment for regional civil security/crisis management cooperation in SEE⁵ and WBSA⁶ was largely discussed within NATO forums and was related to PfP Consortium activities. This linkage again created a positive situation for the use of new technologies (PIMS in particular) as a tool for the next level of cooperation.

The presence of networking activities between both people and organizations as a precondition for creating synergies in security research and education provided visible results in South East Europe and in the wider Black Sea region.⁷ The effectiveness of this approach could be attributed to the various regional initiatives rooted in PfP Consortium working groups. A specific aspect is the development of security research and education programs on the national level that are cultivated in the spirit of the PfP

⁵ Velizar Shalamanov, "Civil Security and Crisis Management: CDE Process in Bulgaria (the Role of U.S., NATO, EU in SEE)," in *The Fight Against Terrorism and Crisis Management in the Western Balkans*, ed. Iztok Prezelj (Amsterdam: IOS Press, 2008).

⁶ Velizar Shalamanov, "The Concept of Civil Security as a Tool for Security Sector Integration and Regional Cooperation in the Wider Black Sea Area," in *Establishing Security and Stability in the Wider Black Sea Area: International Politics and the New and Emerging Democracies*, eds. P.M.E. Volten and Blagovest Tashev (Amsterdam: IOS Press, 2007), 193–202.

⁷ Mary Borissova, "Building "Democratic Security" in the Wider Black Sea Area: Prospects and Challenges," *Establishing Security and Stability in the Wider Black Sea Area*, 203–36.

Consortium. In the case of Bulgaria, we could consider a process started by a group of NGOs that was focused on:

1. Establishing the SSR Coalition in Bulgaria in 2002 in support of the integration of Bulgaria in NATO and the EU
2. Commencing the SSR program at the University of Sofia, as well as establishing new programs on crisis management and Euro-Atlantic security; these programs “proliferated” in some other universities as a new area of teaching or as an instrument for the improvement of existing programs (this was the case in the Defense and Staff College, the Academy of the Ministry of Interior, the University of National and World Economy, and the New Bulgarian University) and was linked to the establishment of new Master’s degree programs
3. Establishing the Center for National Security and Defense Research within the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (in 2002)
4. Initiating NATO SfP Project’s (SfP 981149) Center of Operational Analyses (COA) in the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences⁸
5. Creating several new research NGOs to support regional studies, such as the Center for SEE Studies (CSEES), the Center for Black Sea Security Studies (CBSSS), and others
6. Launching the Center for Security Studies at the Sofia University in 2008
7. Developing a new security research program in Bulgaria, which was started in the above context and with the support of NATO Science Committee as well as the European Security Research and Innovation Forum.⁹

One of the problems identified as a result of the study on research projects for the period 1999–2008 was the issue of the governance and coordination of security studies.¹⁰ More than one hundred projects were analyzed, from the following points of view:

- Area of study
- Financing
- Use of results
- Implementing organization

⁸ Ognyan Kounchev, Rene Willems, Velizar Shalamanov, and Tsvetomir Tsachev, eds., *Proceedings of NATO ARW: “Scientific Support for Decision Making in the Security Sector”* (Amsterdam: IOS Press, 2007), vol. 12 in the NATO Science for Peace Security Series, D: Information and Communication Security.

⁹ Robert Crangle, ed., *Proceedings of NATO ARW: “Bulgarian Integration into Europe and NATO: Issues of Science Policy and Research Evaluation Practice”* (Amsterdam: IOS Press, 2006), vol. 8 in the NATO Science for Peace Security Series, D: Information and Communication Security.

¹⁰ The SECRES study was initiated in Bulgaria to support the nation’s participation in the ESRIF and FORESEC projects under Framework Program 7 of the EU.

- Used research infrastructure.

As a result, the proposal for the EU-funded Operational Program “Administrative Capacity” is under development to provide financing for the development of modern governance, management, and assessment capabilities for security-related research in the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences and partner organizations from universities and NGOs.

Conclusion: The Consortium as an Integration Tool

In the last ten years, the Consortium passed through several labor-intensive steps, including identification of topics for research and education, differentiating between working groups by topics and sub-regions, and integrating the research and education community through annual conferences, the journal *Connections* and other publications, and development of the Consortium website and the network of web pages of the various working groups. We could claim that main goals of the Consortium have been addressed successfully, and it is true that these efforts over the past decade have been beneficial in many respects. But the future development of the Consortium will only be possible through the continued integration of solid national capabilities for research and education in the security area. States have to review their own research and education strategies, organizations, infrastructure, capabilities, and resources to strengthen national governance and coordination in order to be valuable partners in the integration process within the Consortium.

In my view, the Consortium is a tool for both change management and integration, but its effectiveness and success depends on the capabilities of the countries participating in the process, as well as the capabilities of the involved institutions. In 1999, during the presentation of the Bulgarian MoD book produced for the Partners, titled *Vision, Will, and Faith*, Dr. Bob Kennedy (then-director of the George C. Marshall Center) noted very clearly that “Capabilities” would also be necessary in order to succeed. This is still the main challenge for the participants in the Consortium, because its strength is based on the integration of the capabilities of the participating nations and institutions.

The consortium can serve as an integration tool not only for nations and participating institutions, but also for the research and education related programs within NATO and the EU. This will provide genuine added value to the efforts in these formally structured organizations, which need better cooperation in the security area.

After playing a successful role as a tool of change management, it may be that the time has come to consolidate the most effective tools for strengthening the community. My personal experience is that curriculum development, operational analysis, and computer-assisted exercises are three interrelated and very powerful tools for community building. Using these tools, the PfP Consortium could focus its integration agenda on the support of institution building and cooperative projects among nations at the sub-regional level. In this sense, the Consortium could come to represent the over-reaching architecture for supporting common standards in education and research, es-

pecially in the areas of operational analysis and CAX in support of institution building and transformation.

The future challenges for the PfP Consortium are related to the challenge facing the PfP itself, as well as that facing the Public Diplomacy program within NATO. First, the Consortium and Public Diplomacy cannot be seen as the only outreach programs from NATO to its partner nations. Second, the partners are not only those nations that are members of PfP. PfP was regionalized as a result of the integration into NATO of key countries from Central and Eastern Europe to groups of countries in the Western Balkans, Caucasus, and Central Asia, as well as some affluent Western countries. There are new partner nations in the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, and other areas of the world where research and education could be important tools for strengthening security, providing legitimacy for NATO, and extending the strategic community for change. Third, the diversity of studies is contrasted with the standardization of tools: ADL, CAX, virtual distributed networks for knowledge management, etc. Fourth, in addition to the process of institution building in security research is the development of research infrastructure itself, and the development of a culture of using operational analysis in decision-making support for higher quality and transparency of security policy.

The PfP Consortium was established ten years ago as a tool to identify research areas of common interest, to differentiate the activities of various working groups, and to deepen studies divided by topics and regions. Networking, research infrastructure, shared research in high technology, and educational tools are critical integration instruments for scientists. The continued process of institution building in security research and education for NATO partners is essential, and should be focused on developing the research infrastructure that is needed to support the institutions. One of the most important tasks could be the development of strong national operational analysis (OA) capabilities in order to be able to exploit the results of different studies in the decision support process of the security institutions. In addition to ADL, the Consortium could be a leader in introducing of the methodologies of OA and CAX as key instruments in the area of security research and institution building. Practically all the studies of the working groups provide excellent input for focused OA projects. CAX could be used to facilitate the introduction of new concepts and ideas as well as to build team spirit in the international decision-making environment. It means that a special group at the Consortium Secretariat at the Marshall Center in Garmisch could provide training in the use of OA/CAX methodologies for specific problem-solving purposes in the EAPC community as well as to facilitate introduction of OA/CAX-related education in defense academies and universities dealing with security research and training. This aspect of the Consortium's activity would serve as a powerful instrument for integrating other idea/concept/data generation projects created by the working groups.

Bibliography

Kounchev, Ognyan, René Willems, Velizar Shalamanov, and Tsvetomir Tsachev. NATO ARW: Scientific Support for Decision Making in the Security Sector. Amsterdam: IOS Press, 2007.

Shalamanov, Velizar. "Defence Management and Civil Society Interaction and CoOperation." In *Defence Institution Building: A Sourcebook in Support of the Partnership Action Plan*. Geneva & Vienna, 2006.

Stamey, Victor E.. *The Way Ahead.*, 2000.

The Partnership for Peace Second Annual Conference, Sofia, Bulgaria, December 8-10. *Connections: Athena Papers* (1999).