



Preserve and Adapt: Education and Training for Responding to Conflict and Humanitarian Emergencies

Report and Recommendations by
the Integrated Education and
Training Working Group
January 2012

Table of Contents

REPORT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....iii
INTRODUCTION.....1
HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE AND DISASTER RESPONSE (HA/DR).....6
CONFLICT RESPONSE.....9
CONFLICT PREVENTION.....11

APPENDICES

SENIOR LEADERS.....15
WORKING GROUP MEMBERS.....16
SECRETARIAT MEMBERS.....17
SUBJECT MATTER EXPERTS.....18
ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....23

Executive Summary

Throughout the fall representatives of fifteen institutions involved in conflict and humanitarian assistance and disaster response conducted a strategic review of education and training in order to improve institutional cooperation, and better prepare practitioners for work in these challenging environments. The Integrated Education and Training Working Group (IETWG) was established at an August 5 meeting of senior leaders from these institutions; the working group met seven times from September 19, 2011 to January 17, 2012 with the United States Institute of Peace (USIP) acting as the secretariat. (For a list of IETWG participants see Appendix A.)

Acknowledging the increasingly complex conflict dynamics that confront the response community and the challenges to coherent, multi-institutional efforts, the Working Group focused on three areas: humanitarian assistance and disaster response, conflict response, and conflict prevention. From these meetings a set of recommendations emerged for promoting a comprehensive and cohesive education and training (E&T) approach that leverages existing E&T programs and supports international engagement in fragile, failing and conflict states.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Leadership Engagement: A proactive leadership that can work together to forcefully advocate for a shared vision of education and training is critical. The Working Group asks senior leaders to establish an **IETWG governance structure**, which includes: 1) **bi-annual Senior Leader meetings**, 2) a **Secretariat** to organize working group and leader events, and 3) a **consortium** made-up of current IETWG members that advises on integrated education and training.

Shared Vision for Shared Challenges: In a more resource-constrained and complex world, the entire community must adopt a more coherent and deliberate approach to E&T, which includes:

- The identification and development of a **foundational curriculum** to prepare staff to work competently across response environments and in different types of crises, and to develop institutional capacity for engaging in integrated, strategic responses.
- Support for **annual cross-community colloquia** to routinely share information about education and training programs, and focus the community on critical training needs.
- The creation of an **exercise support group** to help shape military exercises and develop a set of civilian exercises on issues critical to them where the military may play a supporting role.
- The creation of a **lessons and mapping group** to document what lessons exist from recent missions to inform education and training, what education and training exists across the community and the mapping of institutional roles and responsibilities to serve as the foundation for integrated education and training curricula.

The attached report expands on the overarching themes and recommendations, and provides a delineated set of recommendations for each response area. Humanitarian assistance and disaster response, conflict response and conflict prevention face different education and training needs and challenges. As senior leaders consider next steps in this process, these specific recommendations may also provide a course of action for the proposed IETWG governance bodies.

Integrated Education and Training Working Group

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SENIOR LEADERSHIP: PRESERVE AND ADAPT

INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, there have been many lessons about effective responses to international and intrastate conflict. A principal conclusion is the need for much better cooperation among response organizations – governmental and inter-governmental organizations, non-governmental (NGOs) and civil society organizations (CSOs). This cooperation should begin pre-crisis, but usually occurs much later, when organizations are deeply entrenched in the process, with their own missions, rules of engagement, and planning processes.

To encourage early cooperation, institutions from across the response community engaged in a strategic review of education and training (E&T) for responding to conflict and humanitarian emergencies. On August 5, 2011, senior leaders and representatives of these agencies endorsed the creation of the Integrated Education and Training Working Group (IETWG) to carry out the review. The U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP) acted as the secretariat. (For a list of IETWG participants see Appendix A.)

The IETWG met seven times from September 19, 2011 to January 17, 2012. The first meeting was devoted to identifying future trends, building on remarks by Former Assistant Secretary of State Chester Crocker. These trends guided working group discussion throughout the fall:

Increased numbers of international response actors make management of response efforts a challenge. In addition, other factors include:

- Increased international capacity in mediation, positive trends in peacekeeping, and the emerging role of regional organizations and actors;

ABOUT THE IETWG

The Integrated Education and Training Working Group (IETWG) was tasked in August 2011 to convene a group of representatives from across governmental and intergovernmental organizations, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and civil society organizations (CSOs) to engage in a strategic review of education and training for responding to conflict and humanitarian emergencies.

- Increased participation leading to risks of uncoordinated action and forum-shopping;
- Rising states (China, India, Brazil) that have a strong potential in this area, but have not yet shown a consistent commitment to conflict management; and
- Increasing capacity and number of civil society organizations (CSOs) in complex conflict environments that need to be more deeply engaged to define integrated peacebuilding goals and strategies, and to identify complementary approaches.

At the same time the international community is challenged by:

- Intervention fatigue, particularly in major operations involving combat forces;
- Resource constraints.

In addition, challenges confronting the United States and other national governments include:

- The absence of an international response framework, as for instance called for in the State Department’s Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR), to guide inter-agency responses; and,
- Inadequate or non-existent legislative authorities to enable effective response.

There are increasingly complex conflict dynamics that don’t “fit” current institutional structures and mandates, including:

- Serial conflict countries “caught” in repeated cycles of violence, making conflicts more intractable;
- Sub-national conflicts;
- Inter-linked drivers of conflict (e.g., international terrorist groups exploiting local grievances, criminal groups capturing instruments of state power);
- Countries that are neither democracies nor autocracies, but unhappy mixtures of discordant systems that are extremely conflict prone;

PARTICIPATING ORGANIZATIONS

Alliance for Peacebuilding
 InterAction
 International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)
 United Nations
 U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)
 U.S. Department of Agriculture
 U.S. Department of Commerce
 U.S. Department of Defense
 U.S. Department of Energy
 U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
 U.S. Department of Homeland Security
 U.S. Department of Justice
 U.S. Department of State
 U.S. Department of Transportation
 U.S. Institute of Peace (USIP)

- Climate change occurring in conflict-affected or conflict-prone areas; and,
- Rising transnational threats.

Acknowledging these circumstances, the Working Group decided to focus on three areas: **conflict prevention, conflict response, and humanitarian assistance/disaster response**. Each of these topics was explored by representatives of 15 institutions and subject matter experts, and a set of recommendations was developed for education and training in each specific area contained in the body of this report.

The IETWG identified cross-cutting recommendations that relate to this entire spectrum of operations and responses for E&T:

ENGAGEMENT OF LEADERSHIP

Above all, the Working Group felt that the area of leadership engagement was critical. Over the past decade, there have been a number of similar efforts to create shared visions of education and training for conflict prevention and management. They succeeded when leadership was proactive in recommending an agenda for change, and had a clear understanding and consistent vision of institutional roles and responsibilities. In order to prepare practitioners to work in these environments, senior leadership will need to get involved directly and be forceful advocates for a comprehensive and cohesive E&T approach.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. *IETWG Governance*

The Working Group asks senior leaders to consider the creation of a **consortium** that advises on integrated education and training, with a focus on clarifying institutional roles and responsibilities to make integrated E&T appropriate and relevant; reviews goals; and provides recommendations to **senior leaders on a bi-annual basis**. An organization should be designated and resourced to form a **Secretariat** that will manage the IETWG process, organizing consortium and senior leader meetings and supporting the implementation of its decisions.

2. *IETWG Outreach*

The Working Group asks senior leaders to work with and direct the Secretariat and working group members to **disseminate IETWG findings and recommendations**, including briefing interested members of the U.S. Congress and engaging with human resources departments; and to consider broadening membership in the working group to include other institutions involved in missions.

A SHARED VISION FOR SHARED CHALLENGES

Currently, there are many well-regarded E&T programs, but energy and value have been lost to too many autonomous efforts and no consistent vision. Constrained resources will dictate change in how education and training is delivered and in its content. To successfully engage in this resource-constrained and more complex world will require a more coherent and deliberate approach by the entire E&T community.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Development of Shared Curriculum

Foundational Curriculum: Identify and develop a set of courses that can prepare staff to work competently in different types of crises. The IETWG discussed appropriate curricula for each response effort, and outlined a suite of foundational courses that can prepare practitioners to work across these environments. This means, in a time of constrained resources, a set of courses can be developed and/or leveraged that prepare staff to work competently in different crises. This foundational curriculum includes principles of conflict management, negotiation, mediation, assessment, metrics and evaluation, planning and design, program management, cooperation and coordination, and cultural adaptability. Most importantly, it would provide participants with an understanding of institutional roles and responsibilities to avoid ad hoc and duplicative approaches and develop the foundation for integrated, strategic response.

Support Annual Cross-Community Colloquia. Colloquia of education and training providers and practitioners from across the community could give counsel about education needs and opportunities, and help focus training on critical needs. Participants noted that they receive a great deal of information on courses, but need more assistance in bringing appropriate or prioritized education and training to their institution. Field work is also rapidly changing and education and training institutions would benefit from shared identification of new trends.

Civilian and Military Exercises: Create an Exercise Support Group. The current significant demand for civilian participation in military exercises needs modification. Civilians need to develop a set of exercises on issues critical to them where the military may play a supporting role. Civilians also need the opportunity to help shape military exercises. The IETWG recommended the creation of an Exercise Support Group to support the objectives above.

Establish a Lessons and Mapping Group. A lessons and mapping group would allow the larger community to document what lessons exist from recent missions, what education and training exist across the community, and what new forms of education and training need development. It would also allow the mapping of institutional roles and responsibilities to serve as the foundation for integrated education and training curricula.

2. *Enhance Support for Flexible Delivery Systems*

The current education and training system is becoming more flexible, more accessible across the diverse community, and more suited to the current response environment that is transitioning from large-scale interventions. The IETWG asks senior leaders to redouble efforts to enhance more flexible options such as: in the field training, distance learning, hybrid courses that combine on-line and in-class elements, and the admission of staff to each other's programs.

The remainder of this report provides specific recommendations on each topic: humanitarian assistance and disaster response, conflict response and conflict prevention. The IETWG would like to highlight the significant amount of education and training that already exists to prepare practitioners for difficult, challenging environments. Participants are mindful that, in a time of budget constraints, the recommendations need to be resourceful and build on existing efforts.

Humanitarian Assistance/Disaster Response (HA/DR)

RAISE AWARENESS OF EXISTING PROFESSIONAL HA/DR & ENHANCE PREPARATION OF PERSONNEL

THE SITUATION

Disasters across the globe—from the famine in the drought-plagued Horn of Africa to the earthquakes that leveled Haiti and ravaged nuclear reactors in Japan—present multiple and often unprecedented challenges for first responders. Leaders of major contributing nations and agencies are often compelled to respond repeatedly to these unfolding events with inadequate understanding of the field, resulting in: 1) immediate life-saving relief that is difficult to transition to a larger strategic response, 2) strategies that emphasize the political gains from high-visibility response; and 3) misperceptions among some policy-makers and operators about the principles and practice of humanitarian assistance and disaster response (HA/DR).

Working Group participants agreed that:

- The current pace of simultaneous and/or back to back HA/DR operations will likely continue into the future and resources to address the most critical needs will be extremely limited;
- Interventions will continue to require the participation of multiple and diverse actors from the affected host nation(s), international donors and their civilian and military agencies and nongovernmental and intergovernmental organizations that specialize in relief operations;
- Operations themselves are increasing in complexity and may be occurring in fragile, failed or conflict affected states presenting unique dilemmas for participating agencies; and
- New technologies and social media are having an impact on the field with little understanding of the implications for effective response.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING CHALLENGES

Working Group participants agreed that **HA/DR should be considered a professional field and career that is developed through education and training and experience.** Further, that though HA/DR is a highly technical field, **there is a need for a curriculum that increases the level of awareness and understanding about how the international infrastructure for HA/DR operates.**

Specific challenges highlighted by the Working Group that bear specifically on preparation and education and training include:

- Agency personnel that conduct these operations receive no training or extremely limited training and often encounter each other for the first time on the ground without basic understanding of the roles, responsibilities, operating procedures and governance structures of participating agencies and/or agency personnel that are sent have no previous HA/DR experience at all.
- Military personnel from the U.S. and other key contributing nations have no specific doctrine nor adequate education and training to equip them with the knowledge of the nongovernmental and intergovernmental HA/DR community and methodologies and common operating procedures for HA/DR.
- Current responses to HA/DR situations flow from leaders operating across multiple agencies and multiple agency personnel attempting to “share the space” in the field. The lack of understanding across these agencies about each other’s roles and responsibilities—both in the government and non-governmental sectors—results in sub-optimal results on the ground for the intended recipients of assistance.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. *Focus on increased understanding of major contributing agencies—both in and outside of government—to improve delivery of assistance to affected communities*

Recognizing the severe deficits in preparation for personnel operating in these environments in this sector, Working Group participants urged that senior leaders address this problem through the following:

- a. Map institutional roles with sensitivity to humanitarian principles and space, and identify existing education and training programs and gaps.
- b. Increase leader awareness of HA/DR principles, capabilities and best practices, including at the Deputy Assistant Secretary level, ambassadorial level, USAID mission leaders, general officers and equivalent leaders of nongovernmental and intergovernmental agencies.
- c. Develop a senior leader HA/DR tabletop exercise for both governmental and nongovernmental leadership.
- d. Develop a HA/DR course building on existing curricula, including USAID’s Office of Disaster Assistance Joint Humanitarian Operations Course (JHOC), the UN’s Civil-Military Coordination course (CIM-Coord), the Naval Post Graduate School’s “Sharing the Space”

course and the ICRC's International Humanitarian Law Course for operators at the GS 14/15 and O6 level.

- e. Expand offerings of JHOC, CIM-Coord and ICRC IHL courses throughout HA/DR response community, and especially in integrated educational settings, such as:
 - J7 will identify opportunities for dissemination of current HA/DR education and training (JHOC/CIM-Coord) and ICRC's International Humanitarian Law Course to military training venues.
 - Civilians identify opportunities for dissemination of JHOC/CIM-Coord and ICRC's International Human Law Course in joint educational experiences with the military.
 - f. Have the proposed Exercise Support Group develop priority HA/DR exercises for government, intergovernmental and nongovernment personnel (see recommendation above on establishment of an exercise support group).
2. *Build a professional cadre of HA/DR responders and the capacity of host nation(s) to mitigate and respond to disaster and humanitarian crises*
- a. Institutionalize education and training to develop and maintain a cadre of HA/DR responders.
 - b. Identify government (both civilian and military agencies), nongovernmental and intergovernmental agency programs that build the capacity of host nation to mitigate and respond to HA/DR crises.
 - c. Identify case studies that illustrate humanitarian principles, best practices and lessons learned.
 - d. Develop and disseminate good advising practices, including courses on mentoring and advising.

Conflict Response

PRESERVE, LEVERAGE AND ADVANCE EXISTING CAPACITY

THE SITUATION

While there has been considerable progress made over the past few years in the coordination of efforts in non-permissive environments by the U.S. government, international organizations and nongovernmental entities, the need to preserve, leverage and advance structures, processes and education and training which promote shared knowledge and enhanced cooperation in effectively responding to conflict is paramount.

There is still room to strengthen capacity and shape education and training for future environments. For example, the State Department's first Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review notes the existence of institutional weaknesses such as little assessment and strategic planning before having to "surge" resources and personnel to deal with conflict, the need for strengthened leadership, and a lack of lessons learned to inform our future engagements. U.S. Presidential Security Directive 10, which established an interagency review on mass atrocities prevention and response, notes that the U.S. lacks a policy framework and supporting interagency mechanism for prevention and response to mass atrocities and genocide. Part of this IETWG interagency review on mass atrocities prevention and response is to examine ways to increase the capacity of US government personnel. Enhanced training and education would help meet the need to prepare personnel to effectively address mass atrocity. The IETWG acknowledged as a given that we need to continue to enhance training and education to prepare personnel for "non-traditional" diplomatic and development operational roles. We also need to preserve readiness capacity through integrated assessment and planning.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING CHALLENGES

The Working Group highlighted new trends in civilian-military interaction that bear specifically on preparation and education and training for conflict response. It agreed that the U.S. would be unlikely to engage in future wars on the scale of Iraq and Afghanistan, and the international community may also hold back on its engagement. However, the IETWG recognized that civilian institutions would still work in conflict environments, without benefit of military protection or with the military operating in different modes (civil affairs, partnership capacity efforts etc.) Working Group members recognized that, in spite of shrinking budgets, civilian-military cooperation had to advance to a much more active, robust effort that includes integrated assessment and planning and education and training. Understanding the overwhelming interest for civilian participation in military exercises, and recognizing their resource and staff constraints, non-military Working Group members advocated for a process to prioritize the vast number of military offerings.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. *Preserve education and training gains*

IETWG participants recognized that there exists a significant body of training for conflict response but that information management is its own challenge. The working group encouraged increased awareness and acceptance of core, foundational skills for all response actors and the need for specific trainings for specific environments.

- a. In support of the development of a foundational curriculum, map fundamental curriculum and basic skill sets, drawing on existing work such as the State-DOD-USAID competencies and essential tasks for conflict response activities, and the RAND and USIP reports on civilian-military training and education in order to build awareness and consensus to their utility (see Appendix E).
- b. Have the proposed IETWG Lessons Learned Working Group develop good practices and principles for education and training based on “evidence-based” approaches, which incorporate lessons learned content, after-action reviews and assessments and impact evaluations, as utilized by organizations represented in the IETWG.
- c. Under the proposed IETWG Exercise Support Group, consider and promote ongoing exercises that are flexible and streamlined to accommodate limited civilian resources;. (The USIP-facilitated Civilian-Military Working Group could, for example, work with Ft Leavenworth combined Arms Center to identify and support a series of short duration civilian table top exercises on key themes such as rule of law, food security, etc. which would be run in conjunction with military leadership exercises.)

2. *Integrating a conflict lens: leadership and management*

Conflict response training needs to be mainstreamed into professional development at all levels, particularly leadership and management tiers; this process involves developing strategies with Human Resources managers and training providers.

The IETWG recommended a mapping exercise of current leadership and management training in major institutions, to determine needs and gaps for areas of training for conflict response as identified by the IETWG, including increased awareness of roles, responsibilities and authorities of entities involved in conflict response; understanding foreign assistance programming in conflict environments; assessment, planning and implementation processes, etc.

Conflict Prevention

HARNESS EXISTING TOOLS AND CAPACITY TO SHARE THE SPACE

THE SITUATION

Significant conflict prevention capacity exists. Analytical capacity is available in the form of monitoring and early warning systems, understanding how states fall into conflict, and tools for identifying conflict drivers and resiliencies. Nongovernmental organizations characterize their work primarily as structural prevention and have been building lessons learned for decades. Increasingly, the U.S. government and international organizations, such as the World Bank and the United Nations, are re-crafting traditional work (security, development, diplomacy, and economic) to fortify vulnerable and conflict-prone states. The U.S. government is also placing increasing emphasis on reorienting its conflict response capacity. This shift will place government actors increasingly in the space that nongovernmental actors have worked in for many years.

To date this existing and emerging capacity is not used consistently and systematically to prevent conflict. Initiatives to protect vulnerable populations (including, Responsibility to Protect, prevention of gender-based violence) and prevent mass atrocities highlight the difficulties in developing coherent strategies and operational approaches for conflict prevention.

Acknowledging these circumstances, the IETWG notes the importance of further and better defining of prevention, including a clearer understanding of how and if conflict response techniques do apply, and identifying appropriate institutional roles and responsibilities. The Working Group also agreed that leaders and practitioners need to:

DEFINING CONFLICT PREVENTION

For the purposes of this report, the IETWG defines prevention as activities to avert newly emerging conflicts (e.g., Macedonia, 1992 and Libya, 2011), also known as **primary prevention**.

- Recognize that fragile and failed states are neither developing nor necessarily secure and standard security assistance and development programs may in fact aggravate conflict vulnerabilities.
- Develop coherent multi-tooled and multi-actor strategies for vulnerable states of the future that are encumbered with more obdurate conflict sets caused by serial incidents of violence and the co-mingling of conflict drivers.
- Recognize that nongovernmental and civil society organizations have developed education and training based on their considerable experience in structural prevention, which should be used to inform other institutions as they shift to prevention work and to develop more coherent official/non-official approaches.

HARNESSING EXISTING CAPACITY: THE ROLE OF EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Education and training has a central role to play in introducing new prevention tools and approaches to conventional foreign policy work by providing **access to critical conflict management experts and skills** (such as conflict assessment, mediation and negotiation, etc.). It can also help develop **coherent multi-actor prevention responses**, which require a shared perspective on the cause of conflict, a shared strategy, and a firm understanding of institutional roles and capacities—practices that integrated education and training can provide.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Map institutional roles and develop lessons on how institutions do prevention and how conflict response and traditional diplomacy/development work might be applicable to prevention with special focus on the experiences of non-governmental and civil society organizations.
2. The Busan Declaration, which provided commitment to and consensus on a development approach for engaging fragile and conflict-affected states, provides a unique opportunity

THE BUSAN DECLARATION

The Fourth High Level Forum on Aid Effectiveness, was held in Busan, South Korea from November 29-December 1, 2011.

It produced a final document that, for the first time, establishes an agreed framework for development cooperation among traditional donors, South-South cooperators, the BRIC countries, civil society organizations, and private funders. The Declaration included commitments to promoting sustainable development in fragile and conflict-affected states. (See mapping recommendation.)

Sources: OECD, www.aideffectiveness.org

to discuss USG, NGO and civil society roles and more coherent approaches to assessment, planning, etc. Use Busan recommendations to guide a “roles and mapping” session.

3. Based on existent education and training, develop a framework for conflict prevention curricula, identifying core skills and competencies.
4. Take advantage of upcoming integrated conflict prevention education and training opportunities
 - a. In June, Ft. Leavenworth/Combined Arms Center is developing a Mass Atrocity Response Operation two-day table top exercise for civilians to be held in conjunction with a military exercise.
 - b. UNITAR is developing courses on preventive diplomacy based on a United Nations study on the topic. Working group members are welcome to send participants.

Appendices

Appendix A: Integrated Education and Training Senior Leader Advisors

ALLIANCE FOR PEACEBUILDING

MELANIE GREENBERG

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

PATRICIA SHEIKH

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

LAURA JUNOR

FRANK DIGIOVANNI

MAJOR GENERAL RALPH BAKER

MAJOR GENERAL JOHN WEIDA

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND

SECURITY

KEITH HOLTERMANN

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

BILL BRYAN

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ROBERT CARR TREVILLIAN

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

AMBASSADOR TRACEY JACOBSON

AMBASSADOR ROBERT LOFTIS

RUTH WHITESIDE

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ROBERT LEE

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

KEVIN YESKEY

INTERACTION

SAM WORTHINGTON

LINDSAY COATES

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE

RED CROSS

MARTIN DE BOER

MARY WERTZ

MARKUS GEISSER

UNITED NATIONS

YVONNE LODICO

MICHAEL MARX

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

AMBASSADOR DONALD STEINBERG

NANCY LINDBORG

Appendix B: Integrated Education and Training Working Group Members (listed by organization)

3-D HUMAN SECURITY

LISA SCHIRCH

ALLIANCE FOR PEACEBUILDING

MELANIE GREENBERG

CARE

LINDA POTEAT

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

LAWRENCE BARBIERI

JAMES BRIGHT

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

MERRIAM MASHATT

CODY DIETRICH

OLIVER FISCHER

JUSTIN SLOAN

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

COLONEL JOSEPH ANDERSON

LIEUTENANT COLONEL JENNIFER ANTHIS

MIKE ESPER

WILLIAM FLAVIN

KRISTEN GORDON

CAPTAIN CRAIG HARRIS

LIEUTENANT COLONEL ROBERT KLEIN

JAMES "MARTY" KLOTZ

ANNE KNIGHT

SCOTT MANN

COLONEL STEVEN MILLER

GARY QUAY

COLONEL JIM RUF

JENNIFER SMOAK

ROBERT WEBSTER

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

JOHN MCILVAIN

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND

SECURITY

RACHEL WISHNER

JESS BRATTON

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

ROBERT COBURN

JUDD RAY

MARK MOGLE

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JUDY FILIP

STACY GILBERT

KATHY HADDA

JASON LADNIER

ANDREW LOOMIS

BLAKE PUCKETT

PAUL TURNER

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

JANET BENINI

VINCE PEARCE

JENNIFER ROBERSON

SCOTT WYATT

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

CARLTON BOWERMAN

SANDRA COSGROVE

ANNE CUMMINGS

DR. DIANA HADZIBEGOVIC

THOMAS MACKAY

INSTITUTE FOR MULTITRACK

DIPLOMACY

KAREN DICKMAN

INTERACTION

PETER BUTH

JOEL CHARNEY

TRACY O'HEIR

INTERNATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE

RED CROSS

MARK SILVERMAN

JAKE KURTZER

MERCY CORPS

JENNIFER GRAHAM

BRIAN GRZELKOWSKI

NATIONAL DEFENSE UNIVERSITY

DALE ERICKSON

PARTNERS FOR DEMOCRATIC CHANGE

TERESA CRAWFORD

SEARCH FOR COMMON GROUND

NICK OATLEY

TULANE UNIVERSITY

KY LUU

UNITED NATIONS

MICHAEL MARX

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

ELEANOR BEDFORD

STEVE CATLIN

ROBERT JENKINS

CHRIS LAFARGUE

KATE LEGATES

NEIL LEVINE

SONJA NIEUWEJAAR

MARK PICKETT

TIM SIKES

U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE FELLOWS AND STAFF

JONAS CLAES

NADIA GERSPACHER

QUERINE HANLON

LAWRENCE ROSSIN

FREDERICK TIPSON

WORLD VISION

RANDY TIFT

Appendix C: Integrated Education and Training Working Group Secretariat Members

CHAIR

AMBASSADOR RICHARD H. SOLOMON, PRESIDENT, U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE

STAFF

PAMELA AALL, PROVOST, ACADEMY FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT MANAGEMENT AND PEACEBUILDING, U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE

BETH COLE, DEAN OF INSTITUTIONAL AFFAIRS, ACADEMY FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT MANAGEMENT AND PEACEBUILDING, U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE

ANNIE DAVIES, SENIOR PROGRAM ASSISTANT, ACADEMY FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT MANAGEMENT AND PEACEBUILDING, U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE

STORM JACKSON, OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE—READINESS TRAINING READINESS AND STRATEGY, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

BRIAN ROSE, SENIOR PROGRAM SPECIALIST, INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE

KAY SPENCER, RESEARCH ASSISTANT, ACADEMY FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT MANAGEMENT AND PEACEBUILDING, U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE

LAUREN VAN METRE, DEAN OF STUDENTS, ACADEMY FOR INTERNATIONAL CONFLICT MANAGEMENT AND PEACEBUILDING, U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE

MARCIA WONG, DIRECTOR, INTERGOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS, U.S. INSTITUTE OF PEACE

Appendix D: Integrated Education and Training Subject Matter Experts

SEPTEMBER 19, 2011: MAPPING SESSION:

AMBASSADOR CHESTER A. CROCKER

OCTOBER 17, 2011: HA/DR:

SHELDON HIMELFARB, UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE DIRECTOR,
CENTER FOR INNOVATION: MEDIA, CONFLICT, AND PEACEBUILDING;
CENTER FOR INNOVATION: SCIENCE, TECHNOLOGY, AND PEACEBUILDING

NOVEMBER 10, 2011: CONFLICT RESPONSE:

ROBERT M. PERITO, UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE DIRECTOR,
SECURITY SECTOR GOVERNANCE

DECEMBER 8, 2011: CONFLICT PREVENTION:

MICHAEL LUND, UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE JENNINGS
RANDOLPH SENIOR FELLOW

HOLLY BENNER, WORLD BANK
FRAGILE AND CONFLICT-AFFECTED COUNTRIES GROUP

FRANK C. DIGIOVANNI, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
SES, DIRECTOR, TRAINING AND READINESS AND STRATEGY, OFFICE OF
THE DEPUTY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

YVONNE LODICO,
UNITED NATIONS INSTITUTE FOR TRAINING AND RESEARCH
DIRECTOR, NEW YORK OFFICE

AMBASSADOR CHESTER A. CROCKER

Chester A. Crocker is the James R. Schlesinger professor of strategic studies at Georgetown University's Walsh School of Foreign Service and serves on the board of its Institute for the Study of Diplomacy. Dr. Crocker's teaching and research focus on international security and conflict management.

From 1981 to 1989, Dr. Crocker served as Assistant Secretary of State for African Affairs. He developed the strategy and led the diplomacy that produced the treaties signed by Angola, Cuba, and South Africa in New York in December 1988. These agreements resulted in Namibia's independence (March 1990) and the withdrawal of foreign forces from Namibia and Angola. President Ronald Reagan granted him the President's Citizens Medal, the country's second highest civilian award.

Dr. Crocker chaired the board of the United States Institute of Peace (1992-2004) and continues to serve as a director of this independent, nonpartisan institution created and funded by Congress to strengthen knowledge and practice in international conflict. He serves on the boards of Universal Corporation, Inc., a leading independent trading company in tobacco and agricultural products; Good Governance Group Ltd, a business intelligence advisory service; Bell Pottinger Communications USA, a communications and public relations firm; He is a member of the World Bank's Independent Advisory Board on governance and anti-corruption; is a founding member of the Global Leadership Foundation, a leading international NGO that advises leaders facing governance and conflict challenges; and also serves on the international advisory board of International Affairs (London) and the editorial board of Foreign Policy Bulletin. Dr. Crocker consults as advisor on strategy and negotiation to a number of U.S. and European firms.

Dr. Crocker's previous professional experience includes service as news editor of Africa Report magazine (1968-69) and staff officer at the National Security Council (1970-72) where he worked on Middle East, Indian Ocean, and African issues. He first joined Georgetown University as director of its Master of Science in Foreign Service program, serving concurrently as associate professor of international relations (1972-80). He served as director of African studies at the Center for Strategic and International Studies (1976-80).

Dr. Crocker lectures and writes on international politics, U.S. foreign policy, conflict management and security issues, and African affairs. He has appeared on numerous television shows, as a dinner or keynote speaker at conferences in the U.S., Europe and Africa, and as a witness in Congressional hearings. His book, *High Noon in Southern Africa: Making Peace in a Rough Neighborhood*, was published by Norton in 1993. He is the co-author of *Taming Intractable Conflicts: Mediation in the Hardest Cases* (2004) and co-editor with Fen O. Hampson and Pamela Aall of: *Rewiring Regional Security in a Fragmented World* (2011), *Leashing the Dogs of War: Conflict Management in a Divided World* (2007), *Grasping the Nettle: Analyzing Cases of Intractable Conflict* (2005), *Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict* (2001), *Herding Cats: Multiparty Mediation in a Complex World* (1999) and *Managing Global Chaos: Sources of and Responses to International Conflict* (1996).

Born in New York City in 1941, Dr. Crocker received his B.A. degree from Ohio State University (1963), graduating Phi Beta Kappa, with distinction in history. He received his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies. He is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, The International Institute of Strategic Studies, and the American Academy of Diplomacy.

SHELDON HIMELFARB

Sheldon Himelfarb joined USIP from The Corporate Executive Board, where he was on the Technology Practice Leadership Team, working with Chief Information Officers from governments, universities, and multi-national corporations. Prior to this, he served as foreign policy adviser to a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, the head of North American Documentary Development for Yorkshire TV, and the CEO/Executive Producer for Common Ground Productions, the media division of Search for Common Ground. He is an award-winning filmmaker, former commentator for National Public Radio (Sunday Morning Edition) and author of numerous articles on politics, popular culture and conflict. He has managed peacebuilding programs in numerous conflicts, including Bosnia, Iraq, Angola, Liberia, Macedonia, Burundi and received the Capitol Area Peace Maker award from American University. He holds a Ph.D. from Oxford University and a B.A. in political science from Johns Hopkins University. He has held visiting or guest scholar positions at the Brookings Institution, Harvard University and the Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University.

ROBERT M. PERITO

Robert M. Perito directs USIP's Security Sector Governance Center under the Centers of Innovation. He also directs the Haiti and the Peacekeeping Lessons Learned Projects. Before joining the Institute, he was a Foreign Service officer with the U.S. Department of State, retiring with the rank of minister-counselor. He was deputy executive secretary of the National Security Council (1988-1989). Perito received a Presidential Meritorious Service Award in 1990 for leading the U.S. delegation in the Angola peace talks and two State Department superior honor awards.

Perito led the International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Program at the U.S. Department of Justice, which trained police in international peace operations (1995-2001). Perito was a Peace Corps volunteer in Nigeria (1965-67).

Perito has taught at Princeton, American and George Mason universities. He holds a B.A. in international relations from Denver University and an M.A. in peace operations policy from George Mason University. Perito has given extensive interviews on Haiti, Afghanistan, and Iraq to major media outlets. Perito is the author of *Where is the Lone Ranger When We Need Him? America's Search for a Post Conflict Security Force*; *The American Experience with Police in Peace Operations*; and co-author of *Police in War: Fighting Insurgency, Terrorism and Violent Crime*.

MICHAEL LUND

Michael Lund is a former senior specialist of conflict and peacebuilding at Management Systems International, Inc. His research at USIP examines the factors that enabled certain authoritarian regimes to transition relatively peacefully into pluralistic and stable political orders, while other such regimes succumbed to violent conflicts, state collapse, or neo-authoritarianism. Among factors he will probe are the role of the military, economic growth, elite power-sharing, indigenous bridging institutions, political leadership, popular pressures, and international influences. The research will generate guidelines about the types and sequences of policies that can both democratize and prevent violent conflict in transitioning regimes - two widely accepted policy goals that are often contradictory.

Lund has done field-level assessments in sub-Saharan Africa, the Balkans, the Caucasus, Central and East Asia, and South America regarding the sources of intra-state conflicts and the effectiveness of diplomacy, military, development, and governance programs in preventing conflicts and in post-conflict stabilization. This work was done for USAID, the U.S. Political Instability Task Force, the United Nations, the European Union, World Bank, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD),

Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), Carnegie Commission for Preventing Deadly Conflicts, Council on Foreign Relations, International Development Research Centre, International Peace Institute, Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, and other organizations. Lund was a Peace Corps volunteer in Ethiopia and has taught at Cornell, UCLA, Johns Hopkins, the University of Maryland, and George Mason University. He completed an M.Th. at Yale University and received his M.A. and Ph.D. in political science from the University of Chicago.

HOLLY BENNER

Holly Benner brings a strong background on conflict issues, security sector reform, monitoring and evaluation, and diplomatic, development and security cooperation to the team. She was previously Assistant Director at the Brookings Institution for the Managing Global Insecurity Project, focused on promoting multilateral reform to address transnational threats.

Holly has worked for various U.S. government agencies and offices on conflict management and peace building issues. At the Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization at the Department of State and the Office of Conflict Management and Mitigation at USAID, she worked on conflict assessments, interagency planning and monitoring and evaluation plans for programming in fragile and post-conflict countries.

Holly also served in the Political-Military Affairs Bureau at the Department of State. From 2005 – 2006 she was a Conflict Advisor in the U.S. Embassy in Nepal and provided technical assistance on security sector reform. Earlier, as part of the Carter Center’s conflict resolution program, she contributed to negotiation efforts in East Timor and Sudan. Holly holds a MA from the Fletcher School at Tufts University and a BA from Colorado College.

FRANK C. DIGIOVANNI

Frank C. DiGiovanni serves as the Director, Training Readiness and Strategy, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Readiness). His responsibilities include policy and oversight of military training readiness and capability modernization, the Department's \$4.3B Combatant Commander Exercise Engagement and Training Transformation and the sustainment of military training ranges. Mr. DiGiovanni oversees the development of Live, Virtual and Constructive Training Standards and Architectures, Advanced Distributed Learning Initiatives, the creation of a “virtual world” training capability, Service Institutional training, Service advanced digital training instrumentation, and multi-level security training architectures. He serves as the senior DoD training member on the Modeling and Simulation Steering Committee and is the U.S. National Coordinator for DoD training policies impacting NATO and PfP training. Mr. DiGiovanni co-chairs the Interagency Policy Coordination Board on Training, Exercises, Experimentation, and Education. He oversees efforts and policies associated with sustaining the DoD’s access to its land, air and sea training space and for developing policy, procedures, strategic communication and the research agenda associated with energy infrastructure and its impact on the ability of the Department to conduct readiness training activities.

His military awards include the Defense Superior Service Medal, Defense Meritorious Service Medal, Global War on Terrorism Expeditionary Medal, Humanitarian Medal, Air Force Expeditionary Service Ribbon with Combat Zone Identifier and the NATO Medal, Yugoslavia.

YVONNE C. LODICO

Dr. Yvonne C. Lodico serves as the Head of the UNITAR New York Office. Prior to joining UNITAR, she served as special advisor with the UN integrated mission in Timor-Leste for nearly four years. On the mission, she also served as the focal point for women. In addition to serving with the mission in Timor, she also served on three other UN missions in sub-Saharan Africa, as well as served as lawyer with the UN Office for Outer Space Affairs. Further, Ms. Lodico has taught Human Rights Law and advised on international affairs and law.

Her education includes degrees in law, international affairs and religion, from respectively New York University, Columbia University and Yale University. At Yale, she received the MacFaddin scholarship. She has published on topics on space law, peacekeeping, post conflict recovery, humanitarian intervention and democratic governance.

Appendix E: Annotated Bibliography

FELDSCHER, KAREN. N.D. *TECHNOLOGY BOOSTS HUMANITARIAN EFFORTS*. *NEWS AT HARVARD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH: FEATURES*. [HTTP://WWW.HSPH.HARVARD.EDU/NEWS/FEATURES/FEATURES/TECHNOLOGY-HUMANITARIAN-EFFORTS-VANROOYEN.HTML](http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/news/features/features/technology-humanitarian-efforts-vanrooyen.html) (ACCESSED JANUARY 10, 2012).

Coping with humanitarian emergencies brought on by war, famine, or a natural disaster is rife with challenges. Aid workers can face armed militias, an earthquake-stricken landscape of blocked roads and crumbling buildings, masses of displaced people on the move, or a confusing situation in which dozens of aid organizations are all trying to help at the same time—but are not coordinating with each other. Given the challenges, it's essential for humanitarian organizations to utilize new technologies that can help with communication, information-gathering, and data analysis. A research and academic center focused on humanitarian issues, Harvard Humanitarian Initiative runs a number of programs aimed at helping governments, non-governmental organizations, and the United Nations make the best possible use of the latest technology while delivering humanitarian aid.

HENRY L STIMSON CENTER, AMERICAN FOREIGN SERVICE ASSOCIATION, AND AMERICAN ACADEMY OF DIPLOMACY. 2011. *FORGING A 21ST-CENTURY DIPLOMATIC SERVICE FOR THE UNITED STATES THROUGH PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING*, FEBRUARY. WASHINGTON, DC: STIMSON CENTER. [HTTP://WWW.ACADEMYOFDIPLOMACY.ORG/PUBLICATIONS/FORGING%20A%2021ST%20CENTURY%20DIPLOMATIC%20SERVICE%20-%20FULL%20CONTENT.PDF](http://www.academyofdiplomacy.org/publications/foraging%20a%2021st%20century%20diplomatic%20service%20-%20full%20content.pdf).

Education and training for 21st-century diplomatic service must be part of a coherent pattern of professional development to ensure that from entry level through mid-level ranks State Department Foreign Service Officers (FSOs) have a clear understanding of the calling as protectors of national interests through negotiation whenever possible and in post-conflict stabilization, when required. FSOs must be prepared both for specific assignments and increasingly senior coordination, oversight responsibilities, and leadership. Like military officers and corporate leaders, FSOs, especially at the senior level, require the ability to think beyond the moment and tactical needs — to act strategically, to plan and execute complex operations and policy initiatives, and to lead effectively in a vastly more varied foreign affairs environment than existed even a decade ago. The professional development of FSOs should include, in addition to sustained practical training, a comprehensive and well-articulated curriculum to be accomplished over time, with the goal of producing greater intellectual and operational breadth and a wider command of the great issues of the day affecting U.S. national security and global interests.

JAYAWICKRAMA, SHERINE. 2011. *DEVELOPING MANAGERS AND LEADERS: EXPERIENCES AND LESSONS FROM INTERNATIONAL NGOS*, OCTOBER. HAUSER CENTER FOR NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS — HARVARD HUMANITARIAN INITIATIVE SPECIAL REPORT. [HTTP://HHI.HARVARD.EDU/IMAGES/RESOURCES/REPORTS/DEVELOPING%20MANAGERS%20AND%20LEADERS%2010-2011.PDF](http://hhi.harvard.edu/images/resources/reports/developing%20managers%20and%20leaders%2010-2011.pdf).

This paper – a collaboration of the Hauser Center for Nonprofit Organizations and the Harvard Humanitarian Initiative – is an exploration of how INGOs approach the development of managers and leaders. It discusses the context, practice and lessons related to management and leadership development in a handful of large INGOs focused on humanitarian and development efforts. For the past decade or so, INGOs have been paying increasing attention to developing managers and leaders. This has resulted in a myriad of efforts not only within individual organizations but also across organizations (via coalitions and joint initiatives). For-profit and nonprofit academic institutions and consulting firms also increasingly provide management and leadership development services to INGOs. This paper takes stock of some of these efforts, drawing lessons from these diverse experiences and identifying challenges for the future. It is written both for INGO staff seeking a broad, comparative view of the issues, experiences and lessons related to management and leadership development in INGOs, and for scholars and consultants seeking an understanding of management and leadership development needs and challenges in INGOs.

LUND MICHAEL. 2008. CONFLICT PREVENTION: THEORY IN PURSUIT OF POLICY AND PRACTICE. IN HANDBOOK OF CONFLICT RESOLUTION. WILLIAM ZARTMAN, JACOB BERCOVITCH, AND VIKTOR KREMYNYK, EDS. SAGE PUBLICATIONS.

Given the evidence that inaction is wasteful and preventive labors can bear fruit, international actors could be collecting and applying what has been learned from recent experience to manage the tensions around the world from which future conflicts will emerge: mitigating sources of terrorism and extremism; averting genocides and other mass atrocities; buttressing fragile governments; reducing weapons of mass destruction; alleviating competition over oil and water; and defusing inter-state rivalries such as China– Taiwan and among the major powers. Yet these actors show little interest in building on recent accomplishments to reduce the current risks (e.g., the deterioration of Zimbabwe and possible renewed war between Ethiopia and Eritrea). Why this apparent gap exists between the promise of conflict prevention and its more deliberate pursuit is the puzzle this chapter seeks to unravel.

NORRIS, JOHN, ABIGAIL LONG, SARAH MARGON, AND DAVID ABRAMOWITZ. 2011. IT ALL STARTS WITH TRAINING: CRISIS PREVENTION AND U.S. FOREIGN AFFAIRS AGENCIES, 14 DECEMBER. WASHINGTON, DC: CENTER FOR AMERICAN PROGRESS AND HUMANITY UNITED.
[HTTP://WWW.AMERICANPROGRESS.ORG/ISSUES/2011/12/CRISIS_PREVENTION.HTML](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/2011/12/crisis_prevention.html) (ACCESSED JANUARY 10, 2012).

Significantly improved training courses and professional development opportunities are critically needed at core U.S. foreign affairs agencies, namely the Department of State and United States Agency for International Development, or USAID. Without enhanced training, diplomats will continue to lack the broad range of tools they need to deal with the many complicated and challenging global issues they regularly encounter whether on the ground or back in Washington. A key tool is being better at conflict prevention given the increasing regularity with which political instability can emerge anywhere in the world. Secretary of State Clinton noted, “With the right tools, training, and leadership, our diplomats

and development experts can defuse crises before they explode.” With the right training, diplomats and development experts can advance democracy, galvanize economic growth, and strengthen the rule of law before a conflict emerges—not after.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE-PLANNING. 2011. 3D PLANNING: DIPLOMACY, DEVELOPMENT, DEFENSE, 15 SEPTEMBER. PRE-DECISIONAL WORKING DRAFT.

SZAYNA, THOMAS S., DEREK EATON, JAMES E. BARNETT II, BROOKE STEARNS LAWSON, TERRENCE K. KELLY, AND ZACHARY HALDEMAN. 2009. INTEGRATING CIVILIAN AGENCIES IN STABILITY OPERATIONS. SANTA MONICA: RAND CORPORATION.

[HTTP://WWW.RAND.ORG/PUBS/MONOGRAPHS/2009/RAND_MG801.PDF.](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2009/RAND_MG801.pdf)

Since 2003, there has been a great deal of activity to revise the way that the United States plans and conducts Stabilization, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR) operations. The question examined in this report is how the Army can assist in making key civilian agencies more capable partners to the Army in the planning and execution of stability operations. The research sought to identify the specific agencies with capabilities relevant to stability operations and the areas of leverage that the U.S. Army has when it comes to making these agencies more effective partners for the Army in stability operations.

SZAYNA, THOMAS S., DEREK EATON, AND AMY RICHARDSON. 2007. PREPARING THE ARMY FOR STABILITY OPERATIONS: DOCTRINAL AND INTERAGENCY ISSUES. SANTA MONICA: RAND CORPORATION.

[HTTP://WWW.RAND.ORG/PUBS/MONOGRAPHS/2007/RAND_MG646.PDF.](http://www.rand.org/pubs/monographs/2007/RAND_MG646.pdf)

In 2004–2006, the U.S. government acted to revise the entire way that the planning and implementation of Stabilization, Security, Transition, and Reconstruction (SSTR) operations are conducted. The primary emphasis of the changes is on ensuring a common U.S. strategy rather than a collection of individual departmental and agency efforts and on mobilizing and involving all available U.S. government assets in the effort. The proximate reason for the policy shift stems from the exposing of gaps in the U.S. ability to administer Afghanistan and Iraq after the U.S.-led ousters of the Taliban and Ba’athist regimes. But the effort to create U.S. government capabilities to conduct SSTR operations in a more unified and coherent fashion rests on the deeper conviction that, as part of the U.S. strategy to deal with transnational terrorist groups, the United States must have the capabilities to increase the governance capacities of weak states, reduce the drivers of and catalysts to conflict, and assist in peacebuilding at all stages of pre- or post-conflict transformation. According to the Joint Operating Concept for Military Support to SSTR operations, these operations are civilian-led and conducted and coordinated with the involvement of all the available resources of the U.S. government (military and civilian), nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and international partners. Although military assets are an essential component of many SSTR operations, specific military goals and objectives are only a portion of the larger SSTR operation.

THE WORLD BANK. 2011. WORLD DEVELOPMENT REPORT 2011: CONFLICT SECURITY AND DEVELOPMENT.

This World Development Report (WDR) asks what spurs risks of violence, why conflict prevention and recovery have proven so difficult to address, and what can be done by national leaders and their development, security, and diplomatic partners to help restore a stable development path in the world's most fragile and violence-torn areas. The central message of the Report is that strengthening legitimate institutions and governance to provide citizen security, justice, and jobs is crucial to break cycles of violence. Restoring confidence and transforming security, justice, and economic institutions is possible within a generation, even in countries that have experienced severe conflict. But that requires determined national leadership and an international system "refitted" to address 21st-century risks: refocusing assistance on preventing criminal and political violence, reforming the procedures of international agencies, responding at a regional level, and renewing cooperative efforts among lower-, middle-, and higher-income countries. The Report envisages a layered approach to effective global action, with local, national, regional, and international roles.

TRAINING, EDUCATION, EXERCISES AND EXPERIMENTS SUB-IPC (TE3). 2011. CIVILIAN RESPONSE CORPS FUNCTIONAL ESSENTIAL TASK LIST, 16 FEBRUARY. WASHINGTON, DC: GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

The Civilian Response Corps Functional Essential Task List is an important step forward in ensuring the U.S. Government (USG) has the civilian capacity to carry out stabilization and reconstruction activities as mandated by the Congressional Reconstruction and Stabilization Civilian Management Act of 2008 (P.L. 110-417). This effort is the product of a collaborative interagency effort to provide increased clarity regarding the capabilities and the operational activities of the Civilian Response Corps. The list is the result of numerous interagency discussions from April to October 2010 under the auspices of the Training, Education, Exercises and Experiments sub-Interagency Policy Committee (TE3 sub-IPC), with input from nearly every partner agency in the Civilian Response Corps and key offices of S/CRS. This list does not attempt to define new Civilian Response Corps tasks so much as it catalogues current Civilian Response Corps efforts to perform its legislative mandate in support of USG foreign policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE. 2008. NATIONAL DEFENSE STRATEGY, JUNE. WASHINGTON, DC: GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

[HTTP://WWW.DEFENSE.GOV/NEWS/2008%20NATIONAL%20DEFENSE%20STRATEGY.PDF.](http://www.defense.gov/news/2008%20national%20defense%20strategy.pdf)

The National Defense Strategy (NDS) serves as the Department's capstone document in this long-term effort. It flows from the NSS and informs the National Military Strategy. It also provides a framework for other DoD strategic guidance, specifically on campaign and contingency planning, force development, and intelligence. It reflects the results of the 2006 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and lessons learned from on-going operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. It addresses how the U.S. Armed Forces will fight and win America's wars and how we seek to work with and through partner nations to shape opportunities in the international environment to enhance security and avert conflict.

UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE AND THE CONSORTIUM FOR COMPLEX OPERATIONS. 2008. SHARING THE SPACE, APRIL.

Based on numerous surveys, workshops and focus groups, as well as extensive discussion with members of the key sectors presently involved with complex operations, this study team identifies a number of key issues and recommendations. Some of these may inform follow-up CCO activities, such as workshops, conferences, or academic dialogue; while others might be addressed by policy makers and others in the field. These findings are presented across the following issue areas; Whole of Government / Whole of Community; Leadership and Management; Situational and Cultural Awareness; Local Capacity Building; Lessons Learned Systems; Information and Public Diplomacy; and Professional Development.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT. 2010. *THE FIRST QUADRENNIAL DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT REVIEW*. WASHINGTON, DC: GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE. [HTTP://WWW.STATE.GOV/DOCUMENTS/ORGANIZATION/153142.PDF](http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/153142.pdf).

The Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review (QDDR) is an assessment of how the U.S. Department of State and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) can increase efficiency, accountability, and effectiveness on an evolving world stage. Released in December 2010, it provides a blueprint for elevating “civilian power” to advance U.S. national interest and improve partnerships with other elements of national power, including the U.S. military.

The report lays out a strategy to (1) adapt to the diplomatic landscape of the 21st century; (2) elevate and modernize development to deliver results; (3) strengthen civilian capacity to prevent and respond to crises and conflict; and (4) enhance efforts to save money, increase the effectiveness of planning and budgeting, and emphasize impact and accountability by measuring results.