

# **Learning to deploy civilian capabilities: how the UN, OSCE and EU improve their performance in crisis management**

*28 April 2017*

**Hylke Dijkstra, Petar Petrov and Ewa Mahr**

Department of Political Science, Maastricht University, The Netherlands

## **CORRESPONDENCE DETAILS**

Hylke Dijkstra  
Maastricht University  
Department of Political Science  
P.O. Box 616  
6200 MD Maastricht  
The Netherlands  
[h.dijkstra@maastrichtuniversity.nl](mailto:h.dijkstra@maastrichtuniversity.nl)

## **ABSTRACT**

International organizations continuously deploy civilian capabilities as part of their peacekeeping and crisis management operations, which presents them with significant challenges. Not only is the quantity of civilian deployments increasing rapidly, civilian missions are also often more diverse and complex than the traditional multilateral military operations. This article analyses how international organizations have developed their civilian capabilities to deal with a growing number and fast evolving types of operations. Whereas the previous academic and policy literature has addressed this question for individual international organizations, the article uniquely compares developments in the UN, EU, and OSCE, three of the largest civilian actors. Drawing on the concepts of organizational learning, it shows that all three organizations have made significant improvements, over the last decade, in how they deploy civilian capabilities. The changes they have made, however, vary across these organizations. We show that the ability of these organizations to learn and improve their performance is highly dependent on the broader institutional context in which they operate.

## **KEYWORDS**

international organizations; security; civilian capabilities; United Nations; European Union; Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The empirical section of this article builds on a previously published policy-oriented report by Hylke Dijkstra, Petar Petrov, and Ewa Mahr (2016), “Report comparing EU, UN and OSCE conflict prevention and peacebuilding capabilities,” *EU-CIVCAP Report*, DL4.1, online available from [https://eucivcap.files.wordpress.com/2017/03/eucivcap\\_deliverable\\_4-1.pdf](https://eucivcap.files.wordpress.com/2017/03/eucivcap_deliverable_4-1.pdf).

## FUNDING

This article is based on results from the EU-CIVCAP project (<https://www.eu-civcap.net>) which has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 653227.

## NOTES ON THE AUTHORS

*Hylke Dijkstra* is an Assistant Professor (with tenure) at the Department of Political Science of Maastricht University, The Netherlands. He is a researcher in the EU-CIVCAP project.

*Petar Petrov* is an Assistant Professor (with tenure) at the Department of Political Science, Maastricht University. He is a researcher in the EU-CIVCAP project.

*Ewa Mahr* is a PhD Candidate at the Campus Brussels, Maastricht University. She is a researcher in the EU-CIVCAP project.

## Introduction

International organizations increasingly deploy civilian capabilities as part of their peacekeeping and crisis management operations. While there were, for example, only 44 civilian police officers involved in United Nations (UN) peacekeeping missions in 1990, their number averaged over 13,000 in 2016.<sup>1</sup> In addition to the UN, regional organizations now deploy significant civilian capabilities. The European Union (EU), for instance, deployed more than 1,600 civilian experts to Kosovo in 2008 as part of its Common Security and Defence Policy (CSDP), which includes another dozen ongoing civilian missions.<sup>2</sup> The Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) similarly has a wide range of civilian missions, including a large-scale monitoring mission in Ukraine consisting of more than 800 international staff.<sup>3</sup>

Deploying civilian capabilities is not only challenging from a purely numerical perspective. The civilian missions of international organizations are often more diverse and complex than the traditional multilateral military operations. For instance, while soldiers are recruited and trained for expeditionary missions, the career path of an average police agent or judge does not necessarily include a stint abroad.<sup>4</sup> Furthermore, while soldiers are part of formed units, such as a platoon, company or battalion, civilian officials are oftentimes deployed in missions on the basis of their individual expertise. Soldiers also bring their own equipment on operations, and it is not always clear what type of equipment civilian missions staff require to do their job. Finally, the mandates of civilian missions vary from riot control to monitoring peace agreements and even aviation security.

This article analyses how international organizations develop their civilian capabilities to deal with a growing number and fast evolving types of operations. Whereas the previous academic and policy literature has addressed this question for individual international organizations,<sup>5</sup> this article uniquely compares developments in the UN, EU, and OSCE, three of the largest civilian actors. Drawing on the concepts of organizational learning,<sup>6</sup> the article shows that all three organizations have made significant improvements, over the last decade, in how they deploy civilian capabilities. The changes they made, in this respect, however, vary across these organizations. We show that their ability to learn and improve their conduct is highly dependent on the broader institutional context in which they operate.

The article starts with a review of the academic literature on organizational learning. We notice a considerable degree of theoretical sophistication and empirical testing in recent publications on learning, particularly with respect to UN peacekeeping and EU security policy. The emphasis in this literature has remained, however, on individual international organizations. The article subsequently analyses for each of the three organizations (UN, OSCE and EU) how they have sought to make improvements with respect to the financing, staff and equipment of civilian missions. Our purpose here is not to 'test' learning theory, but rather to use theory to better understand empirical instances. The article concludes with a comparison of the findings and uses empirical insight to provide some

---

1 United Nations (1990), *Summary of United Nations Peace-keeping Forces by Countries*; United Nations (2016), *Contributors to United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*.

2 Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, *SIPRI Yearbook 2009*, Appendix 3A.

3 OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine (SMM), *Status report as of 23 March 2017*.

4 Korski & Gowan, *Can the EU Rebuild Failing States?*, p. 44.

5 Benner and Rotmann, "Learning to Learn?"; Benner, Mergenthaler and Rotmann, *The New World of UN Peace Operations*; Junk, Mancini, Seibel, and Blume, *The Management of UN Peacekeeping*; Smith, *Europe's Common Security and Defence Policy*; Faleg, *The EU's Common Security and Defence Policy*; Bossong, "EU civilian crisis management and organizational learning." A notable exception is Dijkstra, *International Organizations and Military Affairs*, which takes a comparative perspective but focuses on military operations.

6 Argyris and Schön, *Organizational Learning*; Levitt & March, "Organizational learning"; Levy, "Learning and foreign policy"

new lines for theoretical thinking about learning in international organizations.

### Changing international organizations based on experience

Organizational learning has been a focal concept in several disciplines including sociology, public administration, military studies, and business management for decades.<sup>7</sup> With the exception of the work by Ernst B. Haas in the 1990s,<sup>8</sup> students of international organizations have largely ignored learning perspectives. This was perhaps not surprising, given that scholars for a long time generally assumed that international organizations had limited agency. Recent studies have, however, started to gradually address this gap with respect to organizational learning. In particular, various scholars have focused on learning and UN peacekeeping,<sup>9</sup> others analysed the empirical domain of global environmental governance,<sup>10</sup> and there are those who started studying organizational learning in the European Union.<sup>11</sup> There are now also the first meta studies and stock-taking exercises focusing on international organizations more generally.<sup>12</sup>

Noteworthy is the visible rise in publications on learning in the area of EU security policy. These studies are conceptually and empirically strong and provide a good starting point for the analysis of this article. Adebahr pioneered through his work of the EU's Special Representatives (EUSRs).<sup>13</sup> Bossong specifically analysed how learning evolved in the domain of EU crisis management, noting that learning has remained limited to technical support issues and is strongly conditioned by high-level political dynamics.<sup>14</sup> In his book, Faleg tests the 'learning by doing' argument in the evolution of CSDP,<sup>15</sup> demonstrating how the accumulated practice feeds into learning processes, which in turn leads to policy change. Finally, Smith delves into 'experiential institutional learning' in the CSDP arguing that institutional expansion and adaptation led to widening of the operational remit of the EU.<sup>16</sup> In particular he identifies a circular learning-by-doing dynamic whereby every new mission launched by the EU triggers the respective policy makers to improve the available institutional procedures and thus influence the planning and conduct of future CSDP missions.

It has almost become a cliché to note that organizational learning is a difficult concept to define. As Adebahr observes '...there is no common or in any way prevailing concept in the theory of organizational learning'.<sup>17</sup> To Benner, Mergenthaler and Rotmann, research on learning shows a high degree of heterogeneity,<sup>18</sup> while Levy famously noted that 'learning is difficult to define, isolate, measure and apply empirically'.<sup>19</sup> It is therefore important that we first establish the baseline of what we mean with the concept of learning and how we identify it empirically.

---

7 Argyris, *Reasoning, learning, and action*; Sabatier, "An advocacy coalition framework of policy change"; Aldrich, *Organizations Evolving*; Easterby-Smith and Lyles, *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*.

8 Haas, *When knowledge is power*; Haas & Haas, "Learning to learn"

9 Benner, Mergenthaler and Rotmann, *The New World of UN Peace Operations*; Hirschmann "Organizational learning in United Nations' peacekeeping exit strategies"; Howard, *UN peacekeeping in civil wars*; Antal, Junk, and Schumann, "Organizational Learning and Peace Operations"; Mai, Klimecki, and Döring, "Learning and Identity in the Field"

10 Siebenhüner, "Learning in international organizations"

11 Sabel and Zeitlin, "Learning from Difference"; Zito & Schout, "Learning theory reconsidered"

12 Benner, Eckhard and Rotmann, "Learning in international organizations"

13 Adebahr, *Learning and change in European foreign policy*

14 Bossong, "EU civilian crisis management and organizational learning."

15 Faleg, *The EU's Common Security and Defence Policy*, p. 2

16 Smith, *Europe's Common Security and Defence Policy*

17 Adebahr, *Learning and change in European foreign policy*, p. 85

18 Benner, Mergenthaler and Rotmann, *The New World of UN Peace Operations*, p. 53

19 Levy, "Learning and foreign policy", p. 280

Despite definitional discussions, we actually witness a convergence around common elements in the most recent studies on organizational learning. Adebahr defines organizational learning on two levels: understood as the rewriting of rules (organisational routines) and as a result of reflection (the cognitive practice of collective information processing).<sup>20</sup> For Bossong, organizational learning needs to be seen as more than just individual learning within an organization. Learning points to the larger process of observing changes in 'codified forms of knowledge, routines and operating procedures that individuals are expected to comply with'.<sup>21</sup> The typical process includes 'proactive information collection, over codification and internal advocacy, to dissemination and training'.<sup>22</sup> Benner, Mergenthaler and Rotmann also focus on the importance of rules, knowledge and institutionalization as for them organizational learning is a knowledge-based process of questioning the existing organizational rules with the aim of changing them and ultimately changing the organizational practice.<sup>23</sup> Similarly, Faleg lines up with the views of Haas<sup>24</sup> and defines learning as 'the process by which consensual knowledge is used to specify causal relationships in new ways so that the results affect the content of public policy'.<sup>25</sup> Finally, Smith defines experiential institutional learning as 'changes in institutions' functions, procedures and capabilities as a result of new information, observation, or experience'.<sup>26</sup> For this article, we adopt Smith's succinct definition linking (1) new information, observation, and particularly experience to (2) institutional change.

A key question has been how to measure organizational learning. Many scholars provide us with ambitious standards by seeking to understand how learning affects ideas, beliefs and norms. Thus, Levy distinguishes between 'simple' learning that is expressed by delineating what works and where changes need to be made based on those fledging norms already in existence; and 'complex learning' which appears once a full set of stable beliefs, attitudes and norms develops.<sup>27</sup> Similarly Bossong adopts the terminology of 'single-loop learning' – understood as a simple adjustment of organizational processes to improve task performance – and 'double-loop learning' – denoting a 'deeper' engagement with organizational objectives or values.<sup>28</sup> Faleg also underlines the ideational aspect demonstrating that learning has policy impact when the consensus on the lessons learned from the past is underpinned by a common set of normative and principled beliefs; and that policy impact turns into observable policy evolution when the knowledge is embedded in communities of practice that structure experience and define the way actors socialize and learn.<sup>29</sup>

This paper has a more modest goal: to trace the effects of the learning process on the changing practices of three international organizations in the area of civilian crisis management. It answers the question how international organizations develop their civilian capabilities to deal with a growing number and fast evolving types of operations. To do so we need to look at indicators that point that a process of learning is taking place. Smith observes that changes across specific institutional dimensions can be seen as such indicators. For the purpose of our paper, we focus on *changes in the resources* and *rules* related to deploying civilian capabilities.<sup>30</sup> Changes in the resources are about the accumulation of finance, personnel and equipment by international

---

20 Adebahr, *Learning and change in European foreign policy*, p. 97

21 Bossong, "EU civilian crisis management and organizational learning," p. 96

22 Ibid.

23 Benner, Mergenthaler and Rotmann, *The New World of UN Peace Operations*, p.55, 56.

24 Haas, *When knowledge is power*, p. 23

25 Faleg, *The EU's Common Security and Defence Policy*, p. 3

26 Smith, *Europe's Common Security and Defence Policy*

27 Levy, "Learning and foreign policy", p. 286

28 Bossong, "EU civilian crisis management and organizational learning," p. 97

29 Faleg, *The EU's Common Security and Defence Policy*, p. 3

30 The third indicator of Smith, *Europe's Common Security and Defence Policy* concerns the changes in the *responsibilities* of the international organizations and their missions. Our empirical emphasis is, however, on the types of *resources* international organizations have developed and the *rules* they have established to deploy them.

organizations in support of their civilian deployments. For instance, if international organizations make pre-deployment training available for staff, informed by a previous experience, this would count as changes in the resources. Changes in rules are understood as modifications of existing formal and informal institutional structures, procedures and routines or the creation of entirely new ones with respect to the deployment of resources. For instance, if procurement procedures are made more flexible this is an example of changes to the rules regarding finance.

Measuring change is one thing, establishing the link between (1) new information, observation, or experience and (2) institutional change is quite another. Based on previous research in sociology, public administration, and business management, Benner, Eckhard and Rotmann provide a useful list of possible intervening variables that help us explain why certain international organizations may be better at learning than others.<sup>31</sup> Their list includes intervening variables such as formal design, resources for knowledge management, reporting procedures, incentive systems, culture, leadership, political pressure, and bureaucratic politics. They subsequently group these variables by distinguishing between (a) institutional and (b) behavioural/political factors that may facilitate or obstruct learning in international organizations.<sup>32</sup> We find it useful to think along these as it helps us to make sense about organizational learning in the UN, OSCE and EU. After all, the three organizations have very different institutional features informed to a considerable degree by path dependence and historical events. At the same time, these organizations also have very different types of membership which are likely to affect the political drivers and obstacles for change.

### **Improving civilian deployments: lessons learned in the UN, OSCE and EU**

So far, this article has discussed from a conceptual point of view how international organizations learn. The remainder of the article uses this conceptual discussion as a starting point to analyse how experience, observation and new information (gathered as a result of the deployment of civilian capabilities) has resulted in institutional change in the UN, OSCE and EU. By providing a unique comparative perspective, we are in a good position to appreciate the significance of learning in individual cases. Indeed, we find that while learning has taken place in all three organizations, they have attached priorities to different aspects of civilian deployment. It is therefore critical to consider the wider institutional context of these three organizations in which learning takes place. Indeed, we show that variation in institutional context is more important than variation in membership.

While the UN, OSCE and EU deploy civilian missions, it is not straightforward to compare them. For instance, UN peacekeeping missions often have civilian and military components, while the EU makes a distinction between civilian and military missions. Furthermore, while the EUSRs are not part of the EU civilian missions, similar roles in the UN and OSCE are often precisely labelled as (political) missions. For our article, we take a narrow definition of civilian missions. This is mainly for practical reasons. Analysing all civilian actions in conflict prevention, crisis management and peacebuilding in the UN, OSCE and EU would not allow us to go sufficiently in depth. Because the civilian deployments of the UN, OSCE and EU are not entirely similar, we discuss them one-by-one. For each organization we focus on how experience, observation and new information result in changes to the *resources* and the *rules* governing those resources.

#### *United Nations: coping with numbers*

While the UN sent police officers to Congo as part of its peacekeeping operation as early as 1960,

---

31 Benner, Eckhard and Rotmann, "Learning in international organizations", table 27.1

32 Benner, Eckhard and Rotmann, "Learning in international organizations", table 27.2

civilian deployments were limited during the Cold War.<sup>33</sup> Currently it has, among others, 13,000+ civilian police officers deployed.<sup>34</sup> The UN gained serious experience in terms of civilian missions with the establishment of UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) and the UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in former Yugoslavia, both in 1992.<sup>35</sup> In 1995, the UN established its police-only mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (UNMIBH). The next step came with the transitional administration missions in Kosovo and East Timor in 1999. The importance of the civilian components in peacekeeping operations further developed during the 2000s. Almost all new UN operations are now multidimensional deployments with a considerable civilian component.

In addition to the civilian components of UN peacekeeping operations, the UN has also established a range of political and peacebuilding missions. This includes a fairly wide category of missions. Three origins can be identified. First, the UN Secretary-General has a formal mandate for the peaceful settlement of disputes.<sup>36</sup> This has resulted in the appointment of numerous special envoys as well as missions.<sup>37</sup> Second, following the *An Agenda for Peace* report, the UN placed emphasis on conflict prevention and peacebuilding.<sup>38</sup> This has triggered the deployment of UN peacebuilding missions.<sup>39</sup> Finally, in several countries there is no need for blue helmets. In Iraq and Afghanistan, for example, military forces are provided by other actors. As such, the UN only concentrates on civilian tasks resulting in the deployment of political missions.<sup>40</sup>

The UN therefore deploys peacekeeping operations and political missions. When it comes to the deployment of civilian capabilities, it is useful to distinguish between finance, staff, and equipment and mission support. The Global Field Support Strategy (2010-15) of the UN Department of Field Support (DFS), for instance, addressed these issues.<sup>41</sup> The strategy was informed by the surge in peacekeeping deployments during the 2000s. Following the landmark *Brahimi report* of 2000<sup>42</sup> and the establishment of DFS in 2007, this was an attempt to rationalize the deployment of military and civilian capacities. As Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon wrote at the start of the process '[t]he overall intention of this ... strategy is to *transform* service delivery to field missions. It is designed as an integrated comprehensive programme that draws on the *lessons learned from several decades of operational experience*.'<sup>43</sup>

The Global Field Support Strategy was organized as a five-year transformation process with annual progress reports from the Secretary-General discussed by the member states in the various relevant committees. Without downplaying the political context, this was a genuine attempt to improve performance through practical and technical measures based on experience. Strong emphasis was on the need for rapid deployment, through making available more start-up money, the recruitment of staff and addressing vacancy levels, and optimizing procedures including in the global and regional services centres.<sup>44</sup> To understand how the UN addressed such challenges, we will discuss of the critical resources for the deployment of civilian capabilities: finance, staff and equipment.

---

33 See further Hansen, "From Congo to Kosovo"; Bellamy and Williams, *Understanding Peacekeeping*, pp. 377-96.

34 United Nations (2016), *Contributors to United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*.

35 UNTAC had 3,600+ civilian police; UNPROFOR 600+.

36 Article 99 of UN Charter.

37 Mani, "Peaceful settlement of disputes and conflict prevention," pp. 309-10.

38 United Nations Secretary-General, *An Agenda for Peace*

39 Paris, "Post-conflict peacebuilding," pp. 406-10.

40 Paris, "Post-conflict peacebuilding," pp. 410-11.

41 United Nations Secretary-General, *Global field support strategy*; United Nations Department of Field Support, *Global Field Support Strategy 2010-2015*

42 United Nations, *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations* (2000)

43 United Nations Secretary-General, *Global field support strategy*, p. 3. Emphasis added.

44 United Nations Secretary-General, *Global field support strategy*

It is useful to start with the financing of political missions as they fall under the biennial general UN budget. This is paid for by the member states on the basis of their GNI and population size. Poor countries get discounts, UNSC members pay more, and the US benefits from a 22% ceiling. The total UN budget is about \$3 billion per year.<sup>45</sup> This pays for all regular UN staff, the headquarters and operational expenditure. A fifth of the regular UN budget goes to the political missions.<sup>46</sup> That so much money goes to these missions is a source of tension between the UNSC, which authorizes the missions, and the General Assembly, which authorizes the budget.<sup>47</sup> It creates deployment problems as well. As the Secretary-General notes, the “current funding arrangements also do not have the flexibility to respond to the funding requirements that arise during mission start-up, expansion or transition”.<sup>48</sup>

In contrast, each peacekeeping operation has its own budget, approved by the General Assembly on an annual basis.<sup>49</sup> GNI and population again play a key role, but the payment scale for peacekeeping differs from the UN regular budget. The US, for instance, pays 28% of the peacekeeping budget instead of 22%. There is considerable frustration that UN peacekeeping is still being treated as an extraordinary activity of the UN, particularly since it is the most important activity,<sup>50</sup> with a budget of \$8.3 billion, almost three-times larger than the regular UN budget.<sup>51</sup> In addition, there is the \$330 million annual support account for peacekeeping. This pays largely for the administrative costs at the New York headquarters.<sup>52</sup> Furthermore, there is a separate budget for the UN Logistical Base (UNLB) of nearly \$70 million. Even though funding for UN peacekeeping is extraordinary and therefore insecure, such arrangement do provide for more flexibility. Notwithstanding significant discussions over money, we see that the UN has been able to increase its budgetary resources in light of the increasing deployment demands. The UN has, however, not been able to change the key rules about the organization of the budget due to political opposition.

In terms of expenditure, there is a difference between deployed uniformed personnel (soldiers and police) by Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs) and contracted civilian personnel by missions themselves.<sup>53</sup> The UN compensates TCCs with a flat-rate reimbursement of \$1,332 for each deployed person per month. The UN furthermore provides deployed uniformed personnel with a minimal allowance depending on the mission. Civilian contracted personnel are fully paid for by the missions themselves. This includes international/UN staff in policy functions, national staff providing administrative support, enabling functions and local expertise as well as UN volunteers. While uniformed personnel substantially outnumber contracted staff, civilian personnel costs in most missions are at least 50% of uniformed personnel costs.<sup>54</sup>

While there are two categories of staff in terms of financing, in the terms of recruitment, we need to distinguish between Formed Police Units (FPUs), individual uniformed officers/experts, contracted

---

45 United Nations Secretariat, *Assessment of Member States' contributions*

46 United Nations Department of Management, *Regular Budget 2012-2013*

47 A representative from Brazil, for example, calls political missions one of the 'most important distortions' in the regular budget, United Nations, *Amid Growing Global Instability*

48 United Nations General Assembly, *Review of arrangements for funding*, paragraph 4.

49 See also Sheehan *The Economics of UN Peacekeeping*; Coleman, “The Political Economy of UN Peacekeeping”

50 The High-Level Independent Panel notes that peacekeeping is the most important UN activity and such thus not be treated as exceptional, United Nations, *Report of the High-level Independent Panel*, p. 15.

51 United Nations General Assembly, *Approved resources*.

52 While the Brahimi Report took issue with the temporary nature of the support account, it now seems more problematic that political missions have no support account. United Nations, *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations*, p. xiii. This means that shortages at headquarters are with the political rather than the peacekeeping missions. See also United Nations, *Report of the High-level Independent Panel*, p. 33.

53 For further details see Coleman, “The Political Economy of UN Peacekeeping,” pp. 8-12.

54 United Nations General Assembly, *Approved resources*.



staff, and the standing capacities. The FPU's merit attention. These are self-sustained units of about 140 deployed personnel, of which at least 120 are police officers.<sup>55</sup> While they were first deployed around the turn of the century, there has been a rapid increase in their use.<sup>56</sup> In 2016, there are 71 authorized FPU's in UN peacekeeping missions with 8,723 police officers as opposed to 3,362 individual police officers.<sup>57</sup> Their key functions are public order management, the protection of UN personnel and facilities, and high-visibility patrols and higher risk missions.<sup>58</sup> FPU's have their own command element as well as equipment and mission support. Because they are self-sustained, the force generation process is easier than with individual police. The observation that more civilian police was needed has therefore resulted in changes to resources.

For the selection of individual police officers and contracted staff, DPKO draws up the job profiles, which are circulated to the permanent missions in New York.<sup>59</sup> After an initial check through the applications, tests are organized and selections are made. While the UN has long struggled with a high vacancy rate, which the EU and OSCE also experience, it has made a strong effort to reduce it as part of its Global Field Support Strategy (from 20% to 15%).<sup>60</sup> This is a major achievement given the overall increase in deployments. It does not imply, however, that the problem is solved. Several missions still have considerable vacancy rates. Furthermore, it is also a question of the quality of personnel or the required niche capacities. An obvious example is the number of individual female police officers: while it has nearly doubled in the period 2009-13 (from 8% to 15%), the number of female police officers remains relatively low.<sup>61</sup> As a result of the Global Field Support Strategy, the UN now understands these shortcomings better, even though they may yet have to be addressed.

A final development has been the creation of standing capacities. Particularly because UN missions experienced a struggle to get officers and experts in theatre rapidly, it established a Standing Police Capacity (SPC) in 2006. With a maximum operational capacity of 40 officers, this police capability is modest, but it proved particularly helpful during the start-up phase of new missions. It can also provide assistance to the existing peacekeeping missions.<sup>62</sup> It is based at the UN Global Service Centre (UNGSC) in Brindisi, Italy. In 2010, the SPC was complemented by a modest Justice and Correction Standing Capacity (JCSC) of five persons.<sup>63</sup> While these standing capacities are relatively small in the context of total UN deployments, it is a niche capacity that helps the UN to more rapidly launch missions and provide expertise when necessary.

In terms of training, there are important distinctions as well between personnel from the member states and internationally recruited staff. Pre-deployment training is organized by the member states themselves: it is a general course on UN peacekeeping missions and has to be based on UN training standards. There is a very substantial number of training manuals available as well as a recognized network of training institutes. For internationally recruited civilian personnel, the UN Integrated Training Service (ITS) provides pre-deployment training at the Global Service Centre in Brindisi. Finally, the missions themselves organize mission induction training. This is mission and host

---

55 United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support, *Policy on Formed Police Units*, paragraphs 20-1.

56 Durch and Ker, "Police in UN Peacekeeping," table 1 and figure 2.

57 United Nations, *Formed Police Units*. United Nations, *UN Missions Summary*.

58 United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support, *Policy on Formed Police Units*, paragraphs 12-5.

59 Durch and Ker, "Police in UN Peacekeeping," pp. 13-4.

60 Durch and Ker, "Police in UN Peacekeeping," pp. 15-6, table 2, figure 3a, 3b; United Nations Secretary-General, *Fifth annual progress report*, paragraph 12(e). United Nations Department of Field Support, *Global Field Support Strategy*, p. 3.

61 Durch and Ker, "Police in UN Peacekeeping," table 3a.

62 Durch and Ker, "Police in UN Peacekeeping," table 3a.

63 United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations, *Justice & Corrections*, pp. 48-50.

country-specific training. It is coordinated by Integrated Mission Training Centres (IMTCs) within the peacekeeping missions themselves.

In terms of equipment and support, the UN has set up an elaborate mission support structure. Aside from the administrative offices of DFS in New York, the UNGSC in Brindisi, Italy, plays a central role. It is the logistical base for all UN entities, including the Funds, Programmes and Agencies. It has a warehouse and direct access to Brindisi airport. The UNGSC also provides expert teams for the start-up phase of missions. In addition to the UNGSC, the UN has the Regional Service Centre in Entebbe, Uganda. Since many UN missions are deployed in insecure regions, the idea is to pool all non-essential administrative tasks in a more secure location. The centre in Entebbe, for example, does payroll, ICT and training for the peacekeeping operations in East and Central Africa. The centralization of such functions in Entebbe has been part of a UN efficiency effort in the context of the Global Field Support Strategy.

When looking back at institutional developments in the UN with respect to civilian capabilities, we can identify a clear drive to improve performance. Across ranges of targets the UN system has used previous mission experience to optimize resources for civilian deployments and the rules governing such deployments. The pressure to learn and improve performance has come simultaneously from the extraordinary deployment numbers, which were unimaginable even during the early-2000s, and the membership cautious of spending additional money on these increased deployments. It is indeed not a surprise that, under the pressure of the growing deployment numbers and in light of an assertive Trump administration, the new UN Secretary-General António Guterres has directly launched a renewed effort to review peacekeeping and field support, which will likely results in new reforms. Most of the institutional changes, however, relate to resources themselves rather than the rules that govern the resources.

#### *Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe: learning by stealth*

OSCE missions are also a post-Cold War phenomenon. They were initially a reaction to the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991 and the wars in former Yugoslavia. Following the Helsinki Summit of 1992, the OSCE launched 'missions of long duration' to Kosovo, Sandjak, and Vojvodina as well as the Spillover Monitor Mission to Skopje.<sup>64</sup> In addition, the OSCE deployed missions to Estonia, Latvia, Moldova and Georgia to help with the political transition, and minority and human rights. Following the conclusion of the wars in former Yugoslavia, the OSCE became active in peacebuilding. It also started field activities in Central Asia. The Kosovo Verification Mission, which was withdrawn in March 1999 due to the NATO airstrikes, was the biggest OSCE mission with 1,500 staff.<sup>65</sup> The deployment of the Special Monitoring Mission in Ukraine in 2014 has led to a revival of OSCE missions. It consists 700+ civilian monitors.<sup>66</sup>

As with the UN, it is useful to start with the budgetary resources and rules. The OSCE's Unified Budget is negotiated on an annual basis by all member states. It covers the expenses for the whole organization. The negotiations are the responsibility of the Chairman-in-Office, a position that rotates every year among the membership. The 57 participating member states approve the budget by consensus. The chairmanship is assisted by the Advisory Committee on Management and Finance (ACNF) which comprises representatives of all the member states. It meets throughout the year to discuss the planning for the following year and, in particular, what should be changed, and

---

64 Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe at the time. Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, *15th meeting*, Annex 1.

65 Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, *Kosovo Verification Mission*

66 OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine (SMM), *Status report as of 23 March 2017*

where the budget should be increased or decreased. Also, each mission and each unit in the Secretariat has to submit to the ACNF its respective budget outline for the following year.

In 2016, the Unified Budget was €141.1 million which included Secretariat expenditure and field operations.<sup>67</sup> The Secretariat had a total budget of €36.4 million, while field operations had a total budget allocation of €83.8 million. Each field operation is separately budgeted with budget lines for the Head of Mission's costs, administrative costs, common costs as well as the costs for the different tasks of the missions. Mission budgets range from €17.9 million for Kosovo to €1.6 million for the Centre in Ashgabat with the most missions within the €2-7 million range. The Special Monitoring Mission in Ukraine (SMM) is exceptionally not included in the Unified Budget for 2016, which is significant as the mission budget amounted to almost €100 million. The SMM in Ukraine was not part of the Unified Budget because of its sheer scale and because it was created as an urgent response to the escalating crisis. Planning of the SMM took place in January 2014 when the work on the Unified Budget was already completed. It shows that despite the general rigidity of the OSCE budget, there is flexibility when required.

Exceptionally, every single post is justified and mentioned in the Unified Budget.<sup>68</sup> In total the Secretariat is relatively small with 320.8 full time equivalent (FTE), of which 51 FTE works for the Conflict Prevention Centre (CPC) dealing with civilian missions. The Secretariat furthermore benefits from so-called augmentations, including an additional 58.5 FTE for the field operations. Secretariat staff and augmentations are for the most part internationally contracted and general service staff. Internationally contracted staff members are limited to a 7-years term of employment, and there is a general time limitation of maximum 10-year terms of employment for the OSCE. This means that while staff can move across posts, they can only be with the OSCE for a decade. Most of the staff members (2,300+ FTE) are serving in field missions. With the exception of some of the leadership functions, almost all positions in missions are occupied by secondments and local staff. For secondments, the OSCE pay only the Board and Lodging Allowance.<sup>69</sup>

A crucial feature is the OSCE's flexibility in finding ways to respond to unforeseen circumstances or to act quickly at the early stages of a mission. This is accomplished by either achieving savings within existing operations, or by utilizing previously established contingency funds. The SMM in Ukraine, for instance, needed to be quickly deployed. In the absence of both an approved mission budget and an agreed crisis response facility, the OSCE had the option to use a contingency fund previously set aside for financing responses to unforeseen circumstances, augmented by cash savings from previous years. These two sources helped finance the initial set up and daily running of the mission for the first month.<sup>70</sup> Another important feature is that missions can also be funded by the so-called 'extra-budgetary projects'. It is up to the programme managers within the missions to devise a project. And they have to do their own fundraising in Vienna.

Deploying personnel presents a second challenge. The OSCE has developed an internal roster for rapid deployment. This roster gives the OSCE immediate access to information on available staff and their core competencies. The OSCE has tried to develop the Rapid Deployment Roster for some time already, but it would not have been utilized if it were not for the SMM mission in Ukraine. The concept is based on two steps. First, experienced staff from the OSCE secretariat and other OSCE field missions are designated as 'first responders' to form the core of a new OSCE mission. Second, this initial nucleus is replaced under the standard OSCE procedures.<sup>71</sup>

---

67 Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, *Approval of the 2016 Unified Budget*

68 Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, *Approval of the 2016 Unified Budget*, annex II

69 Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, *OSCE Employment*.

70 Neukirch, "Fast tracking monitors to Ukraine"

71 Neukirch, "Early Warning and Early Action"

As a result of the SSM in Ukraine, we have an impression of how the system works in practice. Although it was still under development at the time, the roster was opened to all staff members who were willing to be temporarily deployed to Ukraine. Four days after the decision to establish the mission, 31 first responders from the Secretariat and nine from existing field operations were deployed in Kiev. These personnel formed the nucleus of the initial monitoring and key command and administrative staff in the mission's headquarters. Five days later, the first monitors recruited via the regular secondment system arrived as well. Within a month all first responder monitors were replaced by regular seconded staff members.<sup>72</sup> For an organization under budgetary constraints, with a split membership, particularly over Ukraine, this was a considerable achievement. Finally, it is worth pointing at the OSCE training it provides to its mission personnel through standardized courses in Vienna.<sup>73</sup> This allows the OSCE to better prepare its civilian deployments.

A final feature of the OSCE model is the development of a so-called virtual pool of equipment. This removes the need to store large amounts of physical equipment and yet enables a timely and reliable access to essential material resources — from armoured vehicles to computers — when required. The OSCE has a warehouse in Vienna with equipment from missions which were closed, but it only stores small amounts of key equipment. When the OSCE develops a mission it normally asks for in-kind contributions from the host authorities, but otherwise does its own procurement. In the case of the SMM in Ukraine, everything was purchased rapidly through the procurement database and a special system of contracts. For the countries where the OSCE deploys it has 'window contracts' with certain companies. These are especially useful as the OSCE does not need to go through a vetting process but can purchase equipment without delay.

The creation of the virtual pool is also a recognition of the fact that, since the OSCE is not regularly deploying large missions at short notice (unlike the UN), keeping large amounts of items is not efficient. In particular, this system is designed to meet the needs of a team consisting of up to ten experts who need to be deployed within three days. It delivers essential mission equipment such as vehicles, satellite and mobile phones, very high frequency radios, GPS, generators, computers and printers, office furniture, personal protective equipment, security cameras, and emergency rations. The usefulness of this tool was demonstrated by the SSM in Ukraine. As a result of the pre-established database and contracts, the Secretariat made all necessary arrangements within days so that when the personnel arrived on the field, they already had access to everything required.<sup>74</sup>

Despite the OSCE's stringent budgetary procedures, and the need for consensus among its varied 57 participating member states, we have witnessed important steps towards professionalization of field support. The rapid deployment roster and the virtual pool of resources are significant innovations and extrabudgetary funding allows the OSCE to pursue specific projects. Particularly interesting is that such changes to resources and the rules were made prior to the deployment of the large-scale monitoring mission in Ukraine, and therefore in the absence of real functional pressures. This can only be explained due to the specific institutional context, which is much less institutionalized than the UN and EU, and is small-scale in character.<sup>75</sup> This has allowed the OSCE to pursue sensible practical reforms with only a limited amount of obstruction of the membership.

### *European Union: flexibility of the rules*

---

<sup>72</sup> Neukirch, "Fast tracking monitors to Ukraine"

<sup>73</sup> OSCE Resources, *Pre-arrival Information Package*

<sup>74</sup> Neukirch, "Fast tracking monitors to Ukraine"; Neukirch, "Early Warning and Early Action"

<sup>75</sup> See also Eckhard and Dijkstra, "Contested Implementation"

The EU is the latest international organization to deploy civilian missions. Following the creation of the CSDP in 1999,<sup>76</sup> the EU established its first civilian mission in January 2003. The EU Police Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina took over the responsibility for police training and police reform from the UN. Since 2003, the EU has established a wide range of civilian missions. Some of the most significant include police training in Afghanistan (2007-2016), a monitoring mission in Georgia (2008-present) and a large-scale rule of law mission in Kosovo (2008-present). Civilian CSDP missions are kept strictly separate from military operations and from other civilian EU actions. They have their own budget and command and control structures.

The civilian missions largely fall under the overall EU budget. While the member states continue to pay the salaries of their seconded personnel, other costs such as the per diems are paid for by the EU. The EU also pays for all contracted staff and for the equipment. A starting point is the EU's seven-year Multiannual Financial Framework, which sets the key parameters of the annual budgets. This budgeting procedure is inherently problematic as it is impossible to predict crises over such a long period. Particularly during the early years, funds were always in short supply precisely because missions had not been anticipated. In 2005, for example, the budget for all the civilian missions was only €59 million, which could not cover the unexpected mission in Aceh.<sup>77</sup> While the budget went up to €251 million in 2008, this proved insufficient for the new missions in Kosovo, Afghanistan and Georgia. In the current budgetary period, however, the total amount of annual funding available for civilian missions (€235-280 million) is generally sufficient.<sup>78</sup>

Problems remain with crises that suddenly arise. This was the case with the conflict in Ukraine. The launch of the SSR mission in Ukraine was, for example, 'possible only because of the transfer of funds from other budget headings'.<sup>79</sup> In response to such experiences, the EU has developed mechanisms for flexibility. Most importantly, the EU has now a budget heading for 'emergency measures' of €37 million on an annual basis. Another concern has been the difficulty to spend money on planning prior to the formal decision to deploy. Based on negative experience, including again in Aceh, two important improvements have been made. First, the EU established so-called 'preparatory measures'.<sup>80</sup> Second, following the revisions to the Crisis Management Procedures in 2013, the EU now adopts two Council Decisions during the planning process rather than one. By having a Council Decision early in the planning process, it is possible to release funding and to appoint key staff in anticipation of a mission.

Making the money available is one thing; spending it is quite another. Procurement is an area where traditionally a lot of problems occur. Essentially, there are two challenges. First, EU procurement rules are not tailor-made to the local situation in conflict countries. Second, they are complex and require specialized administrative expertise. The EU has made significant changes in terms of procurement following previous negative experiences, such as in Afghanistan. These include framework contracts, a warehouse and provisions on crisis situations. Framework contracts are important, since they are established prior to a mission. They allow the EU to select preferred suppliers. To further speed up procurement, missions can order supplies through the warehouse, which replenishes stocks through the framework contracts. Another method to create flexibility is to apply the exceptions for 'crisis situations'. The exception allows, for example, for the procurement to take place without a formal call for tenders.

---

76 European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) at the time.

77 European Union Institute for Security Studies, "CFSP Budget," p. 268; Dijkstra, *Policy-Making in EU Security and Defense*.

78 European Commission, *DRAFT General budget*, p. III/905.

79 High Representative, *Contribution to the June 2015*, p. 9.

80 Regulation (EU, Euratom) of the European Parliament and of the Council, *On the financial rules*, article 54(c).

Most of the personnel required for civilian missions are recruited on an individual basis. This is a major administrative process. In 2014, for example, there were 1,269 vacancies across the EU missions, for which 7,899 candidates applied. Some 2,122 interviews were organized and 807 candidates were eventually selected. While only two out of three vacancies were filled, there are large discrepancies between missions and across profiles. Recently launched missions tend to be popular. Recruiting staff gets more difficult once the mission is running for a couple of years. Furthermore, missions have different profiles. The monitoring mission in Georgia is about having a presence on the ground, while capacity-building missions may be about providing specialized expertise. For example, it has proved difficult to recruit qualified judges for Kosovo.

Following recruitment, mission staff take part in pre-deployment training lasting four to five days. The member states themselves have the primary responsibility for organizing pre-deployment training for their seconded staff<sup>81</sup> and the quality of training varies.<sup>82</sup> For internationally contracted staff, there is often no pre-deployment training. In response to these problems, several (pan-)European initiatives have been developed. National course providers may, for example, open up their courses to staff from other member states. More ambitious, however, was the ENTRi project which ran until 2016. It was financed by the EU and run by a pan-European consortium of training institutes. An advantage was that it fully funded participants (travel and accommodation).<sup>83</sup> As a result of the project-based set up, it was flexible and helped the member states out with pre-deployment training.

The European Security and Defence College (ESDC) has started to offer pre-deployment training in 2015.<sup>84</sup> The ambition is to have provide training about 10 times per year. The challenge is mostly financial. Member states have to cover travel and accommodation. While the ESDC offers a more institutionalized solution for pre-deployment training, these financial considerations are significant. Pre-deployment training also often remains generic. There is thus a need for additional mission induction training. Currently, in-mission training varies significantly across missions. The EU is currently harmonizing the induction training across all civilian missions. The aim is to provide two to three days of in-mission training with standardized presentations.

Civilian missions also require equipment and mission support. In 2012, the EU has made significant steps forward with the warehouse which makes sure that equipment is available prior to the deployment of missions. The warehouse is run by a private partner in Germany, contracted through a call for tender, which delivers equipment to new missions during their deployment phase as well as to existing missions in urgent cases. The warehouse has a long history. With a view to rapid deployment, it was decided that the EU needed to have a facility capable of quickly supplying new missions during deployment. The first warehouse opened in January 2010 on the premise of the EU Police Mission in Bosnia.<sup>85</sup> This was clearly a temporary solution as EUPM would close in 2012, but it was a convenient solution to circumvent EU rules.<sup>86</sup> Establishing a permanent facility was eventually accepted in November 2012.

The warehouse essentially keeps a redundant stock. Using the framework contracts, it buys a wide array of equipment. It can deliver such equipment to new missions at short notice. Subsequently, it again replenishes its own stock.<sup>87</sup> As a result of the warehouse's establishment, new missions do not

---

81 CIVCOM, *Enhancing civilian crisis management*, paragraph 9.

82 CIVCOM, *Civilian crisis management pre-deployment training*, paragraphs 7-18.

83 Interview #4, via phone, April 2016.

84 Interview #5, Brussels, April 2016.

85 Council Decision, *On the establishment of a warehouse*, operational paragraph 4.

86 United Kingdom House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee, *Ninth report of session 2010-11*, p. 112.

87 Written correspondence with EU official #9, June 2016.

have to go through the procurement process themselves and they do not have to wait for the supplier to deliver the goods in theatre. At present, the warehouse provides the mission with ICT equipment, off-road and armoured vehicles, security equipment (helmets and jackets) and medical equipment. Its supplies also include EU flags and other sorts of visibility equipment.<sup>88</sup> The warehouse is naturally useful for new missions in terms of rapid deployment. It is a clear response to previous experiences with procurement delays.

Due to the specific EU financing rules, many administrative functions have been decentralized by delegating them to the missions. This includes support functions such as HRM, finance, logistics, IT and communications. While some of these functions will have to be located within the missions on the ground (e.g. press and communications), other functions could be better organized centrally (cf. UN regional service centre). Decentralization has two related problems. First, because missions are temporary in nature, qualified staff members need to be recruited during the deployment phase and they leave when the mission ends. Second, because civilian missions are deployed typically in difficult environment, administrative staff may not be interested in long-term deployments. The net result is that it is difficult to recruit well-trained administrative staff and to retain their expertise.

The EU has looked into the possibility of establishing a Shared Services Centre, which was already raised in a lessons learned report in April 2010.<sup>89</sup> A 2011 the European Parliament motion noted that 'by addressing the personnel, logistics, procurement and financial responsibilities of the civilian CSDP missions and by relieving the Heads of Mission from part of their administrative duties', the Shared Services Centre 'would guarantee greater efficiency both by pooling administrative functions, starting with the selection and recruitment of personnel, and by centralising procurement and equipment management'.<sup>90</sup> The Council formally encouraged the EU institutions to make work of this Shared Services Centre, along with the warehouse, in its July 2012 conclusions.<sup>91</sup>

The negotiations over the Shared Services Centre have been difficult. The main premise, that the different missions would individually contribute to have this new centre in Brussels, has resulted in a debate over whether the CFSP budget can be used for these expenditures. Over time, the ambitions have been watered down: by the time that the Council agreed to establish the Mission Support Platform in April 2016, only a total of six to eight staff members were still foreseen from the original 30.<sup>92</sup> This does not even equate to one additional staff member per mission.

What we see in the EU in terms of learning strongly differs from the UN and OSCE. The EU has put in place procedures for learning with annual reports discussing experiences and proposing new measures to optimize performance. Yet because of the institutionalized nature of the EU, which goes beyond the immediate domain of the CSDP, nearly everything needs to be discussed with the member states in committees. Even practical solutions, such as a shared services centre, prove difficult. Furthermore, EU staff and budgetary rules get often in the way. The emphasis therefore has really been on seeking the maximum flexibility within the existing rules. Furthermore some new resources have been made available, such as the emergency measures.

## Conclusion

This article has analysed how the UN, OSCE and the EU develop their civilian capabilities to deal

---

88 Written correspondence with EU official #9, June 2016.; Draft Council Decision, *On the establishment of a warehouse*, pp. 7-8.

89 Council, *Annual Report*.

90 European Parliament, *MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION*, paragraph 21(c).

91 Council, *Conclusions on common security and defence policy*, Article 6.

92 Interviews #6 and #8, Brussels, April 2016.

with a growing number and fast evolving types of operations. The analysis focused on changes across specific institutional dimensions within each of the three organisations that point out if a process of learning is taking place. In particular, the analysis paid close attention on how experience, observation and new information have resulted in changes to the *resources* (finance, personnel and equipment) and the *rules* governing those resources. In providing for a comparative analysis across the EU, UN and the OSCE, we have shown that they have very different institutional features and different types of membership, which affect the political drivers and obstacles for change in that certain organizations become better at learning than others.

In the case of the UN, we identified a clear drive to improve performance in civilian capabilities. Previous mission experience was utilized in optimizing both the available resources and the rules governing the UN's civilian deployments. There was a twofold pressure for learning and performance improvement that came simultaneously from the high demand for UN deployments (that led to the extraordinary deployment numbers, from the Brahimi report in 2000 and onwards), and the push for curbs on spending and optimizing the use of the available resources backed by the majority of the UN membership.

With regards to the OSCE, the analysis uncovered the important role of several intervening variables: lower degrees of institutionalization (in comparison to the UN and the EU), stringent budgetary procedures, and the need for consensus among the highly diverse membership base. These pushed the OSCE mission and secretariat staff to suggest series of pragmatic reforms and ultimately led to professionalization of the OSCE's organizational support for field activities. In particular, two innovations sprang out of this activity: the introduction of rapid deployment roster and virtual pool of available resources. These changes to *resources* and the *rules* were made prior to the deployment of the large-scale monitoring mission in Ukraine, and therefore in the absence of real functional pressures from within the organization.

In comparison, the learning curve in the EU civilian crisis management deployments differed the most. Due to its highly institutionalized nature on the one hand, and strong intergovernmental rules and practices on the other, nearly all proposals in the domain of civilian missions need to be discussed by the member states represented in respective specialized committees. This raises the possibility for veto points and even very pragmatic solutions, for instance on training, the warehouse or the shared services centre. Thus crucial for introducing change has been the seeking of consensus through maximum flexibility within the existing rules. The EU nevertheless rigorously put in place procedures for lessons-identified and lessons-learned from past missions with proposals for optimized performance.

When comparing these three international organizations, it is clear that their distinct institutional context in which learning takes place significantly determines outcomes. While we should naturally appreciate the political and behavioural factors which affect how experience leads to change in international organizations, the more interesting finding is perhaps how institutionalization can actually constrain learning. The EU has a much more homogeneous membership than the UN and the OSCE, and yet it has also found it rather difficult to turn its experiences and its identified lessons into meaningful change. Strikingly, despite political heterogeneity, the UN and OSCE have actually managed to adopt a less-politicalized and more pragmatic approach to professionalize the deployment of civilian missions. Such findings merit further research into how the institutional context constraints and facilitates learning in international organizations.



## REFERENCE LIST

- Adebahr, Cornelius. *Learning and change in European foreign policy*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2009.
- Aldrich, Howard E. *Organizations Evolving*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1999, 1999.
- Antal, A. Berthoin, Julian Junk, and Peter Schumann, "Organizational Learning and Peace Operations." In *The Management of UN Peacekeeping: Coordination, Learning, and Leadership in Peace Operations*, edited by Julian Junk, Francesco Mancini, Wolfgang Seibel, and Till Blume (pages), Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2017.
- Argyris, Chris. *Reasoning, learning, and action: Individual and organizational*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1982.
- Argyris, Chris and Donald A. Schön. *Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1978
- Bellamy, A. and P. Williams, *Understanding Peacekeeping*, Second Edition (Cambridge: Policy Press, 2010), pp. 377-96.
- Benner, Thorsten, Steffen Eckhard, and Philipp Rotmann. "Learning in international organizations." In *Routledge Handbook of International Organization*, edited by Bob Reinalda (pages), London: Routledge.
- Benner, Thorsten, Stephan Mergenthaler, and Philipp Rotmann. *The New World of UN Peace Operations: Learning to Build Peace?* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Benner, Thorsten and Philipp Rotmann. "Learning to Learn? UN Peacebuilding and the Challenges of Building a Learning Organization." *Journal of Intervention and Statebuilding* 2 (2008): 43-62.
- Bossong, Raphael. "EU civilian crisis management and organizational learning." *European Security* 22 (2013): 94-112.
- CIVCOM. *Enhancing civilian crisis management pre-deployment training*, 17506/09 (11 December 2009).
- CIVCOM. *Civilian crisis management pre-deployment training - report on survey results and elements for way ahead*, 10976/11 (13 June 2011).
- Coleman, Katharina P. "The Political Economy of UN Peacekeeping: Incentivizing Effective Participation," *Providing for Peacekeeping* 7 (New York: International Peace Institute, 2014), online available: [http://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/publications/ipi\\_political\\_economy.pdf](http://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/publications/ipi_political_economy.pdf) (accessed 23 February 2016).
- Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe. *15th meeting of Committee of Senior Officials*, Prague (14 August 1992), Journal No. 2, Annex 1. Online available: <http://www.osce.org/documents/16159?download=true> (accessed 21 March 2016).
- Council. *Annual Report on the identification and implementation of lessons and best practices in civilian CSDP missions in 2010*, 17386/10 (19 April 2010).

Council. *Conclusions on common security and defence policy 3183rd FOREIGN AFFAIRS Council meeting Brussels* (23 July 2012).

Council Decision. *On the establishment of a warehouse for civilian crisis management missions*, 2012/698/CFSP (13 November 2012).

Dijkstra, Hylke. *Policy-Making in EU Security and Defense: An Institutional Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.

Dijkstra, Hylke. *International Organizations and Military Affairs*. London: Routledge, 2016.

Draft Council Decision. *On the establishment of a warehouse for civilian crisis management missions*, 13742/12 (20 September 2012).

Durch, William J. and Michelle Ker. "Police in UN Peacekeeping: Improving Selection, Recruitment, and Deployment," *Providing for Peacekeeping* 6 (New York: International Peace Institute, 2013).

Easterby-Smith, Mark and Marjorie A. Lyles, editors. *Handbook of Organizational Learning and Knowledge Management*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, 2011.

Eckhard, Steffen and Hylke Dijkstra, 'Contested Implementation: The Unilateral Influence of Member States on Peacebuilding Policy in Kosovo', *Global Policy*, 2017, doi: 10.1111/1758-5899.12455

European Commission. *DRAFT General budget of the European Union for the financial year 2016*, VOLUME 3, Appropriations 2016 (24 June 2015).

European Parliament. *MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION on the development of the common security and defence policy following the entry into force of the Lisbon Treaty* (29 April 2011).

European Union Institute for Security Studies. 'CFSP Budget', *Yearbook of European Security* (Paris: EU-ISS, 2013).

Giovanni, Faleg. *The EU's Common Security and Defence Policy: Learning Communities in International Organizations*, London: Palgrave, 2017.

Haas, Ernst B. *When knowledge is power: three models of change in international organizations*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1990.

Haas, Peter M. and Ernst B. Haas. "Learning to learn: improving international governance." *Global Governance*, 1 (1995): 255-284.

Hansen, Annika S. "From Congo to Kosovo: Civilian Police in Peace Operations," *Adelphi Paper* 343 (London: IISS, 2002);

High Representative. *Contribution to the June 2015 European Council*. (2015). Online available: [http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/documents/pdf/report-ahead\\_european-defenceagency.pdf](http://eeas.europa.eu/csdp/documents/pdf/report-ahead_european-defenceagency.pdf) (accessed 8 February 2016).

Hirschmann, Gisela. "Organizational learning in United Nations' peacekeeping exit strategies." *Cooperation and Conflict* 47 (2012): 368-385.

Howard, Lise Morjé. *UN peacekeeping in civil wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.

Junk, Julian, Francesco Mancini, Wolfgang Seibel, and Till Blume, editors. *The Management of UN Peacekeeping: Coordination, Learning, and Leadership in Peace Operations*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2017.

Korski, Daniel and Richard Gowan. *Can the EU Rebuild Failing States? A Review of Europe's Civilian Capacities*, London: European Council on Foreign Relations, 2009.

Levitt, Barbara and James G. March. "Organizational learning." *Annual review of sociology*, 14 (1988): 319-338.

Levy, Jack S. "Learning and foreign policy: sweeping a conceptual minefield." *International Organization*, 48 (1994): 279-312.

Mai, M., Rüdiger Klimecki, and Sebastian Döring. "Learning and Identity in the Field." In *The Management of UN Peacekeeping: Coordination, Learning, and Leadership in Peace Operations*, edited by Julian Junk, Francesco Mancini, Wolfgang Seibel, and Till Blume (pages), Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2017.

Mani, Rama. "Peaceful settlement of disputes and conflict prevention." In *The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations* edited by Thomas Weiss and Sam Daws (pages), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Neukirch, Claus. "Fast tracking monitors to Ukraine: Twenty four hours from decision to deployment, Security Community," *OSCE Magazine* 2 (2014), online available: <http://www.osce.org/magazine/122525?download=true> (accessed in May 2016).

Neukirch, Claus. "Early Warning and Early Action – Current Developments in OSCE Conflict Prevention Activities," *OSCE Yearbook 2013* (2014), online available: <http://ifsh.de/en/core/publications/osce-yearbook/yearbook-2013/> (accessed in May 2016).

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. *Approval of the 2016 Unified Budget, Decision No. 1197, PC Journal No. 1084, Agenda item 1* (31 December 2015), online available: <http://www.osce.org/pc/215416> (accessed in May 2016).

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. *OSCE Employment: International Seconded Mission Members*. 2016. Online available: <http://www.osce.org/node/70273> (accessed May 2016).

Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe. *Kosovo Verification Mission (Closed)* (n.d.), online available: <http://www.osce.org/node/44552> (accessed 4 April 2016).

OSCE Resources. *Pre-arrival Information Package for new OSCE mission members* (2015), online available: <http://www.osce.org/employment/78294> (accessed in May 2016).

OSCE Special Monitoring Mission to Ukraine (SMM). *Status report as of 23 March 2017*. Accessed 20 April 2017. <http://www.osce.org/special-monitoring-mission-to-ukraine/306911>

Paris, Roland. "Post-conflict peacebuilding." In *The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations* edited by Thomas Weiss and Sam Daws (pages), Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Regulation (EU, Euratom) of the European Parliament and of the Council, *On the financial rules applicable to the general budget of the Union*, No 966/2012 (25 October 2012).

Sabatier, Paul A. "An advocacy coalition framework of policy change and the role of policy-oriented learning therein." *Policy Sciences* 21 (1988): 129-168.

Sabel, Charles F. and Jonathan Zeitlin. "Learning from Difference: The New Architecture of Experimentalist Governance in the EU." *European Law Journal* 14 (2008): 271-327;

Sheehan, Nadège. *The Economics of UN Peacekeeping*. London: Routledge, 2011.

Siebenhüner, Bernd. "Learning in international organizations in global environmental governance." *Global Environmental Politics* 8 (2008): 92-116.

Smith, Michael E. *Europe's Common Security and Defence Policy: Capacity-Building, Experiential Learning, and Institutional Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute. *SIPRI Yearbook 2009: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

United Kingdom House of Commons European Scrutiny Committee. *Ninth report of session 2010-11* (24 November 2010).

United Nations. *Summary of United Nations Peace-keeping Forces by Countries*. 30 November 1990. Accessed 17 March 2016. <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/contributors/1990/1990.zip>

United Nations. *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations* (2000), A/55/305–S/2000/809

United Nations. *Report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations on uniting our strengths for peace: politics, partnership and people*, A/70/95 – S/2015/446 (16 June 2015).

United Nations. *Amid Growing Global Instability, Special Political Missions Crucial for Conflict Prevention, Require Separate Fund, Speakers Tell Fourth Committee* (6 November 2015), online available: <http://www.un.org/press/en/2015/gaspd598.doc.htm> (accessed 16 February 2016).

United Nations. *UN Missions Summary of Military and Police* (2016), online available: [http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/contributors/2016/feb16\\_6.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/contributors/2016/feb16_6.pdf) (accessed 11 April 2016).

United Nations. *Contributors to United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*. 31 January 2016. Accessed 17 March 2016. [http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/contributors/2016/jan16\\_1.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/contributors/2016/jan16_1.pdf)

United Nations. *Formed Police Units* (n.d.), online available:

<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/sites/police/units.shtml> (accessed 11 April 2016).

United Nations Department of Field Support. *Global Field Support Strategy 2010-2015: Overview of Context, Objectives, Results and Lessons Learned* (June 2015), online available: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/overview.pdf> (accessed 4 April 2016).

United Nations Department of Management. *Regular Budget 2012-2013* (2012), online available: <https://www.un.org/en/hq/dm/pdfs/oppba/Regular%20Budget.pdf> (accessed 16 February 2016).

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations. *Justice & Corrections: Sustainable Peace through Justice and Security* (2014), online available: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/publications/cljas/DPKO-Justice-Corrections-Update-2014.pdf> (accessed 11 April 2016).

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support. *Policy on Formed Police Units in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations* (1 March 2010), online available: [http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/sites/police/documents/formed\\_police\\_unit\\_policy\\_032010.pdf](http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/sites/police/documents/formed_police_unit_policy_032010.pdf) (accessed 11 April 2016).

United Nations General Assembly. *Review of arrangements for funding and backstopping special political missions*, A/66/340 (12 October 2011), paragraph 4.

United Nations General Assembly. *Approved resources for peacekeeping operations for the period from 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2016*, A/C.5/69/24 (26 June 2015).

United Nations Secretariat. *Assessment of Member States' contributions to the United Nations regular budget for the year 2015*, ST/ADM/SER.B/910 (29 December 2014).

United Nations Secretary-General. *An Agenda for Peace: Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping*, A/47/277 – S/24111 (17 June 1992).

United Nations Secretary-General, *Global field support strategy*, A/64/633 (26 January 2010);

United Nations Secretary-General. *Fifth annual progress report on the implementation of the global field support strategy*, A/69/651 (9 December 2014).

Zito, Anthony R. and Adriaan Schout. "Learning theory reconsidered: EU integration theories and learning." *Journal of European Public Policy*, 16 (2009): 1103-1123.