The Co-Learning Approach to Capacity-Building and Training for Security Sector Reform Practitioners – Including a Toolkit of Ten Co-learning Applications

October 1, 2011

This article discusses the particular challenges involved in training SSR practitioners and offers a series of methodologies that can be useful to trainers privileging a learning-by-doing approach.

Introduction

Security Sector Reform (SSR) is a complex, technical and highly political subject that is generally addressed under difficult circumstances. Set in a unique environment – characterised by the convergence of donor interests and recipient requirements; post-conflict situations, transitional periods or developing countries; adult participants with clear case-specific knowledge and experiences to share; and the need to carry out concrete reform programmes – SSR capacity-building and training activities demand a distinctive approach. The co-learning approach described in this article addresses these challenges as educational opportunities that can lead to positive learning outcomes for participants and facilitators alike, at the same time as they can provide practical support for ongoing SSR processes.

1 This article uses security sector reform as a generic term, covering the many other related expressions in use in conjunction with programmes aiming to change a country's security sector; e.g., security sector assistance, transformation, management, reconstruction, development. For a more detailed overview of SSR please see David Law, ed., "Security Sector Governance and Reform," DCAF Backgrounder Series on Security Sector Governance and Reform, Geneva, May 2009.

2 The co-learning approach to SSR has been developed by David Law, who at the time of writing of the original version of this article held joint appointments as Senior Fellow in the Operations Department at the Geneva-based Centre for Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) and Senior SSR Advisor of the International Security Sector Advisory Team (ISSAT). David Law has also been Coordinator of the DCAF-wide Task Force on Training. The original version of this paper was published by DCAF as an internal document in 2009. It was prepared with the assistance of Katie Meline and Gabriel Real de Azua, Research Assistants to David Law, as well as Patricia Fernandez, an intern at DCAF, who did some of the original research for this project. The current

version of the paper has benefited from several inputs by Martha Baillargeon, Research Assistant to David Law at the time of writing this draft. David Law is also especially grateful to Dr. Ann Monroe-Baillargeon, Chair of the Education Department at Alfred University, for her advice on how co-learning relates to other teaching methods.

 © Centre for Security Sector Management (CSSM), 2011

This article will introduce the co-learning approach for security sector reform (SSR) practitioners as a useful methodology for building capacity in the field of SSR. It will begin with a description of the main characteristics of SSR and the resulting implications for the training function. The second section will explain the concept of co-learning and how it can meet the special requirements demanded by capacity-building in the area of SSR. This section will also compare co-learning with other common pedagogical approaches in order to highlight its distinct characteristics, which make the co-learning approach uniquely appropriate for SSR practitioners. The conclusion will offer a few observations about the future of SSR training and, in particular, the need for further development of the co-learning approach in the field of SSR capacity building and training. Finally, moving from theory to application, the annex will review a number of the co-learning tools that have proven effective in the SSR training that the author has been associated with. Presented in a toolkit format, the author's expectation is that the various activities and exercises can be easily and effectively implemented by other facilitators and actors in the field.

SSR and the Implications for Training

Much has been written about SSR, and many different definitions are in circulation.[3] SSR is a relatively new phenomenon – the term itself was first coined in 1998. Some SSR critics charge that the understanding of what constitutes SSR has become so broad that the term can seem to have lost its usefulness as a mobilising paradigm.[4] Others allege that SSR is still a relatively untried concept, with few real successes to show for all of the hype the term has generated.[5] However, since roughly the middle of the last decade, as SSR has been mainstreamed into the development work of key intergovernmental organisations and bilateral donors, there has been a growing consensus on both the importance of SSR and the key notions underpinning the concept.[6]

3 Hendrickson and Karkoszka hold that "[d]espite the fact that security sector reform is moving up on the international agenda, it remains a new area of activity. There is

still no consensus on how to define the concept of security sector reform or on what the objectives and the priorities for international assistance should be." For more on various definitions of SSR see, for example: Dylan Hendrickson and Andrzej, Karkoszka, "The Challenges of Security Sector Reform," in SIPRI Yearbook 2002: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security," (Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2002); Herbert Wulf, "Security Sector Reform in Developing and Transitional Countries," Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, July 2004; Nicole Ball, "Dilemmas of Security Sector Reform: Response to 'Security Sector Reform in Developing and Transitional Countries,'" Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, August 2004; and Michael Brzoska, "Development Donors and the Concept of Security Sector Reform," Occasional Paper No. 4 (Geneva: The Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), November 2003).
4 For example, see David Chuter, "Understanding Security Sector Reform," Journal of Security Sector Management, Vol. 4, No. 2 (2006) for a discussion on the "broadening" and "blurring" of the SSR debate; Chuter warns that "if we are to go on using the term Security Sector Reform, we must take care to define it in terms sufficiently general to be useful, and not risk paralysis by detail."
5 For more on this, see my blog, "What's the Matter with SSR?," accessible at www.securitygovernance.org, forthcoming in fall 2011.
6 See David M. Law, editor, Intergovernmental Organisations and Security Sector Reform, DCAF Yearbook 2007, available at http://www.dcaf.ch/Publications/Series/Detail?lng=en&id=25738.

At its core, SSR revolves around three basic ideas: the analysis of the security sector, the delivery of security and the oversight of security provision. The first idea calls for understanding the entire security system and how individual actors play their role in that system, often in an interdependent and interconnected way. The second idea says that those that are responsible for delivering security must do so efficiently and with a judicious use of resources. The third idea is that democratic control of the security sector is essential if the security needs of the population are to be met effectively. For example, SSR argues that a police reform process must take into account how the police interact with other security actors – such as the courts and penal system. In addition, a reformed and efficient security force can be an even

greater threat to the population than a weak and unreformed one, if it is not subject to a system of democratic governance.

SSR has emerged as a mobilising concept, in response to concerns about the implications of a country having a dysfunctional security sector, first in post-conflict, transitioning and developing countries, and gradually more generally. The emergence of SSR has been driven by the concern that a dysfunctional security sector can impede development and economic growth, undermine human rights and the rule of law, and compromise the development, or proper functioning, of democracy, even where it has long been in place. As SSR has matured as a concept, an efficient and democratically overseen security sector has come to be seen as essential for the overall well-being of all countries.

However, SSR is a highly technical, political and conceptually challenging paradigm. It is technical because it requires expertise in dealing with, for example, management and budgetary issues. It is political because of the sensitive role of the security providers in a country's decision-making processes, and the fact that a reform process is likely to affect important relationships, with some actors losing and others gaining in influence. Finally, SSR requires specific country knowledge; working in one post-conflict country does not necessarily prepare a practitioner for working in another one.

SSR practitioners must, therefore, be able to think outside the areas of expertise within which they are accustomed to operating. While their actual engagement is almost invariably short-term, practitioners must think, as well, about the long-term implications of their engagement. They are also faced with the challenge of bringing together the efforts of the typically numerous and diverse actors – national and international, state and non-state – that become engaged in efforts to reform, transform or reconstruct a security sector, or even build one from scratch as in a formative state. The coordination challenges are invariably daunting, with actors calling for enhanced coordination but oftentimes not knowing how, or just not wanting, to do anything about it.

Facilitators of SSR training exercises must be aware of the special demands of SSR practice as they work to build participants' capacity to address the real challenges they will face in the field. The following section will introduce the co-learning method and highlight its usefulness for meeting the unique needs of SSR training.

© Centre for Security Sector Management (CSSM), 2011

What is co-learning?

There is no overarching consensus on what co-learning is all about and no one-size-fits-all definition. While a comprehensive survey of the literature that refers to co-learning is outside the scope of this paper, a cursory review reveals that co-learning has a wide range of origins and applications.

For example, co-learning is used in conjunction with a practice in Japan whereby teachers learn English at the same time as their pupils.7 Co-learning is also used to refer to a process whereby genes are found by simultaneously considering the structure and sequence of microRNA (short ribonucleic acid RNA molecule precursors that affect gene regulation in most biological processes).8 In another context altogether, "democratic co-learning" is a process for developing algorithms for machine learning applications.9 A fourth example envisages co-learning as "an integrated and community-based research approach to support natural resource management decision-making".10

The most frequent use of co-learning appears to be a process of interactive and experiential dialogue and collaborative interaction in a particular field with a specific objective. Thus "Learning 2.0: A Colorado Conversation?" describes its co-learning experience as a "…conference/unconference/meetup for teachers, administrators, students, school board members, parents, community, and anyone else who is interested in education conversations that begin with a robust learning network that is ever-expanding and just-in-time."11 A similar approach is at the core of an article entitled "Co-Learning and the Evolution of Social Activity", which "…refers to a process in which several agents simultaneously try to adapt to one another's behavior so as to produce desirable global system properties."12

Furthermore, there is no clear pedigree when it comes to the origin of the term co-learning. An article from 1996 describes "…co-learning as a philosophy of teaching that I first stumbled upon in 1996 when reading Frank Smith's book Joining the

7 Tim Murphey, Chitose Asaoka, and Mari Sekiguchi, "Primary Teachers Co-learning English with their Students," The Language Teacher, Vol. 28, No. 2 (2004): 15-18, available online at 8 Jin-Wu Nam, et al., "Human microRNA prediction through a probabilistic co-learning model of sequence and structure," Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 33, No. 11 (2005):3570-3581, available online at

9 Y. Zhou and S. Goldman, "Democratic Co-learning," 16th IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence, p. 594-602, accessible at

10 W.J. Allen, et al., "Co-learning our way to sustainability: An integrated and community-based research approach to support natural resource management decision-making," in Multiple Objective Decision Making for Land, Water and Environmental Management, S.A. El-Swaify and D.S. Yakowitz, Eds. (Boston: Lewis Publishers, 1998), Ch. 4: pp. 51-59, available online at

11 See “Learning 2.0: A Colorado Conversation” at
12 Yoav Shoham and Moshe Tennenholtz, “Co-Learning and the Evolution of Social Activity,” Stanford University Department of Computer Science, 1994, available online at http://infolab.stanford.edu/pub/cstr/reports/cs/tr/94/1511/CS-TR-94-1511.pdf.

Literacy Club. I really enjoyed the concept of co-learning, especially how it changes the role sets of teachers and students from dispensers and receptacles of knowledge to joint sojourners on the quest for knowledge understanding, and dare I say wisdom.” 13 So it may be that Frank Smith has fathered the term.
In any event, the description of co-learning provided in this article is by far the closest to the one that I have been working with (see Table 1). It seems just as likely, however, that the term has had multiple births, arrived at separately by practitioners in diverse areas responding to contextually different but structurally similar challenges. For example, I started using the term in 2002 – without any knowledge of its use elsewhere – after I decided that the hierarchical, ex-cathedra, Western-centric approach to training that I far too frequently came across in training programmes, sponsored by NATO and EU countries in the former East PfP and EU, needed to be rethought and redesigned.14
Table 1: Co-learning Characteristics15
Characteristics of a Co-learning Relationship:
Characteristics of a Co-learning Classroom Environment:
*All knowledge is valued
*Shared power among co-learners
*Reciprocal value of knowledge sharers
*Social and individualized learning
*Care for each other as people and co- learners
*Collective and individual meaning- making and identity exploration
*Trust
*“Community of practice” with situated learning
*Learning from one another
*Real world engagement and action
There are two common aspects to all the examples of co-learning referred to above: first, the notion that there are two or more learning processes underway in co-learning; and second, that there is an exchange of learning among participants and

facilitators. The co-learning approach I have been associated with embraces these elements but goes considerably further.
For me, co-learning denotes activities that take place in a learning environment in which all those participating in the process – facilitators and non-facilitators alike – have the possibility to act as both learners and teachers – and are encouraged to do so. Co-learning promotes the principle that participants can enrich one another's perceptions and insights, because they all have experience that can, and should, be brought to the table. While facilitators of co-learning activities have a clear role to play in designing and moderating learning modules, and presenting the necessary
13 Edward J. Brantmeier, "Empowerment Pedagogy: Co-learning and Teaching," Indiana University, available at see also David Law, "Security Sector Training and Education for the Second Reform Decade" (2002), available online later in 2011 at www.securitygovernance.com.
14 See David Law, "Security Sector Training and Education for the Second Reform Decade (2002), unpublished, available online in 2011 at governance.com.
15 Adapted from Brantmeir, op.cit.

framework or background information for activities, the flow of co-learning is essentially non-hierarchical, interactive and multi-directional.
With its focus on participants' experience as a key pedagogical input, co-learning also tends to be problem-oriented and reality-based. The notion of exchanging knowledge and experience gives it a collaborative bent as well.
How does co-learning differ from other pedagogical approaches?
Arguably, the co-learning approach for SSR practitioners offers a unique application of various components of common pedagogical methodologies.
Co-learning differs from the traditionalist approach, which centres on the role of the instructor. The main medium of instruction is the lecture, based on materials generated by the lecturer or his/her peers. The instructor delivers lectures with the expectation that students will learn by listening and taking notes. The competence of the teacher as a lecturer is the key factor determining the quality of students' learning. Conversely, while facilitators will often give a brief presentation to set the stage for co-learning activities or modules, the focus quickly shifts to the participants.
Constructivism instead centres on the
student. It acknowledges individual

differences in learning styles and gives
students a significant say in the choice of
subject matter and the pace of study. The
quality of learning is thereby dependent on
the motivation of the students and the quality
of their interaction with each other. The
teacher's role focuses on designing real life situations and problem-solving activities, taking into account students' prior knowledge and abilities, and facilitating them effectively.16 Co-learning bears many similarities with constructivism, but it differs from this approach in that the facilitator plays a crucial role in shaping the learning experience.

Blended learning advocates mixing various pedagogical approaches in order to best cope with the learning requirements in a given situation. As such, it can combine elements from any of the schools described above. In addition, blended learning often emphasises using instructional and web-based technologies to enhance general pedagogical approaches.17 Co-learning, likewise, incorporates elements from different teaching methods and accepts that training approaches need to be

16 Sofie M. M. Loyens, Remy M. J. P. Rikers and Henk G. Schmidt, "Students' Conceptions of Constructivist Learning in Different Programme Years and Different Learning Environments," British Journal of Educational Psychology, vol. 79 (2009): 503.

17 Margaret Driscoll, "Blended Learning: Let's Get Beyond the Hype," IBM Global Services, Consultants Point of View, Available online at https://www.ibm.com/services

© Centre for Security Sector Management (CSSM), 2011

I hear and I forget.
I see and I remember. I do and I understand.
Confucius,
Chinese philosopher & reformer (551 BC – 479 BC)

adapted to participants' needs, but its approach goes well beyond the need to use different techniques.

Cooperative learning builds upon social interdependence theory. The use of teaching methods that incorporate the five basic elements of cooperation – positive interdependence, individual accountability, promotive interaction, the appropriate use of social skills, and group processing – leads to a more positive and beneficial

learning experience for students. Students work in groups; each student has specific knowledge or expertise to share and is responsible for completing their own work, but evaluation is conducted based on group achievements. In this method, the teacher or facilitator's role is to appropriately structure cooperative learning activities, rather than to directly convey information.18 This approach most closely approximates that of co-learning.

The co-learning approach for SSR practitioners borrows from all of these approaches: The teacher or facilitator plays a central role, as in the traditionalist approach; the students or participants do as well, as in constructivism; co-learning uses a variety of methodologies, as in blended learning; and positive interdependence among participants is key in both cooperative learning and co- learning. Where co-learning differs from the other methodologies is in its emphasis on a multi-directional pedagogical process in which all participants are encouraged to be learners and teachers, and the learning modules are constructed accordingly. The co-learning approach is designed to maximise what participants can learn from one another and from the facilitator, as well as what the facilitator can learn from the other participants. It is, moreover, highly operational.

The following diagram compares the key features of these different pedagogical approaches, and highlights which elements are incorporated into the co-learning approach for SSR practitioners.

18 David W. Johnson, Roger T. Johnson and Karl Smith, "The State of Cooperative Learning in Postsecondary and Professional Settings," Educational Psychology Review, vol. 19 (2007): 15-29; and Robert E. Slavin, "Research on Cooperative Learning and Achievement: What We Know, What We Need to Know," Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University, October 1995. According to Johnson, Johnson and Smith, Positive interdependence suggests that all participants have something to share with group members and success cannot be achieved without everyone's input; positive interdependence is best understood as participants feeling that they "sink or swim" together. Individual accountability means that each participant is held accountable for contributing his or her "fair share" to the group effort. Promotive interaction means that group members encourage and support each other in order to achieve their common aims. The appropriate use of social skills is meant to explain that group members must communicate and use teamwork in order to achieve their goals. Finally, group processing means that groups must be able to periodically reflect on how they function in order to make adjustments to increase their effectiveness and improve their learning experience.

Why is the co-learning approach appropriate for training in the field of SSR?
Co-learning has proven a particularly effective approach to SSR for several reasons.
First, co-learning, like cooperative learning, leads to positive learning outcomes, such as a higher rate of information retention, strong interpersonal relations, and positive attitudes towards learning.19
Second, co-learning places participants from SSR donor and SSR implementing countries on an equal footing. SSR training is not, and should not be, a one-way street whereby donors provide knowledge and expertise, and their partners simply consume this knowledge and expertise. In fact, partners can teach donors plenty about SSR, particularly since they invariably know the situation in their countries much better than donors do. Many partner countries have also engaged in a comprehensive reform process, whereas often the donor states that wish to instruct them may have carried out little reform in their own security sectors. Co-learning is then pedagogy's answer to the question of how to secure local ownership when
19 David W. Johnson, Roger T. Johnson and Karl Smith, "The State of Cooperative Learning in Postsecondary and Professional Settings," Educational Psychology Review, vol. 19 (2007): 27.Such results are also borne out by the high ratings given to co-learning activities carried out by DCAF in programme evaluations, available for consultation at DCAF. For information on the evaluations, contact and www.dcaf.ch.

representatives of development donors and their partner countries work together in a learning situation.20
This aspect of co-learning is typically reinforced by the use of real-life material from environments where SSR has been, or is being, implemented. Owing to its emphasis on multidirectional experience exchange, co-learning facilitates the osmosis between generic knowledge of SSR that a facilitator can bring to the training, along with his or her field experience, and the in-country insights that practitioners involved in a national SSR process can contribute to the training activity.21

Third, in putting participants' ideas and perceptions on centre-stage, co-learning can be an empowering experience. Sometimes, it can be used to jump start an SSR process that has not yet started, or that has stalled, by injecting fresh insights into a policy community or acting as a catalyst for generating a critical mass of support for reform. 22

Fourth, co-learning strikes a balance between the lecture-based approach and the interactive, activities-based approach. While many educational theorists tout the effectiveness of active learning activities, others have pointed out that too little guidance in such activities leads to incomplete knowledge and misconceptions among learners.23 Setting the stage for co-learning activities with a presentation framing the subject matter ensures that students have the necessary background knowledge to fully engage.

Fifth, co-learning is a technique conducive to teaching adults. Adult learners assume a higher degree of responsibility for their own learning and bring to the table prior knowledge and diverse professional experience. The co-learning approach encourages participants to draw on this knowledge and experience to enrich their own learning experience as well as those of the facilitator and of other participants.24

Last but not least, by focusing on participants' experience and knowledge, and its exchange, co-learning helps raise awareness of the multiple demands that SSR places on practitioners and how they can be dealt with. For example, training

20 Because co-learning is not a one-directional flow of knowledge from trainer to trainees, the terms "participants" and "facilitator" are used in lieu of "students" and "teacher".

21 Typically, co-learning activities will include participants from several countries and institutional actors, both donor and partner, where the wide range of skill- and experience sets can considerably enhance the potential for co-learning..

22 As a practitioner involved in SSR field activities, I experienced this effect in both the Central African Republic and Guinea Bissau in 2008.

23 See, for example, Paul A. Kirschner, John Sweller and Richard E. Clark, "Why Minimal Guidance During Instruction Does Not Work: An Analysis of the Failure of Constructivist, Discovery, Problem-Based, Experiential, and Inquiry-Based Teaching," Educational Psychologist Vol. 41, No. 2 (2006): 75-86.

24 As is the case with any pedagogical approach, the effectiveness of co-learning activities is also shaped by factors beyond the facilitator's control such as the interaction among personalities in the learning environment, the infrastructure, etc. It is also important to note that while much of SSR subject matter lends itself to co-learning, certain topics necessitate the use of more traditional pedagogy. Clearly, instruction in the use of firearms and language training, which are sometimes subsumed in SSR programmes, does not lend itself to a co- learning approach.

modules that encourage participants to think about coordination challenges and ways of addressing them can translate into practical improvements in the field.25
What are some of the tools that lend themselves to the co-learning approach?
The annex included at the end of this article showcases several different methodologies that privilege a co-learning approach as well as examples of their use. They have been used by trainers working for a variety of sponsors and in a variety of venues.26 For example, some of the tools – scenario-planning, SWOT, and mapping – have long been used by the business community. Gaps identification or gaps analysis and simulation are no strangers to the development community, but they have been used by many other actors; for instance, during most of the Cold War, NATO ran an annual simulation exercise featuring a major "hot" East-West conflict. Benchmarking, in one form or another, is in use by organisations that compile indexes such as Freedom House's Freedom in the World or the World Bank's World Development Indicators. I began working with the other four tools – text analysis, strategy development, case-study comparison and collaborative policy creation – while teaching at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy as of 1996, but I am rather certain that they have been used by others, and I make no claim of originality.
These tools have been chosen with several considerations in mind. First, they lend themselves to interactivity and exchange among participants. Second, they can be set up so as to focus on a situation that will teach participants about challenges they will encounter in the field. Or, they can be geared to deal with existing problems, such as the need to revise a security sector reform plan that has become outdated. Third, they lend themselves to the typically diverse backgrounds of SSR training audiences, including participants from different countries, actors, ranks and functions. Fourth, they generally fit into a manageable time frame – typically a ninety-minute module – although some tools can require considerably more time in order to yield robust results. Finally, they have been used successfully, as post-training evaluations have testified.27
The following diagram displays the ten co-learning applications that will feature in the annexed toolkit.
25 For example, an SSR simulation exercise can have participants role-playing different actors in a SSR setting with different priorities and national or professional cultures and having to devise a joint action plan. programmes.

Types of Co-Learning Activities28

The Future of SSR training: why the co-learning approach needs to be further developed

As was observed in the introduction, SSR is still a young and relatively untried paradigm for addressing complex development and security issues. Accordingly, the SSR training agenda is still very much evolving. Looking ahead, what are some of the areas and issues which this agenda should seek to address in the future?

First, there are a number of gaps in the conceptualisation of SSR that need to be filled and integrated into SSR training approaches. For example, it has only been recently that the SSR community has turned its attention to the need for training programmes that address jointly security and justice sector reform, and try to ensure that practitioners in these respective areas work for common purposes. Much more needs to be done here. Another area where there is a training deficit includes the relationship between poverty, conflict and employment, as highlighted in the 2011 World Development Report: Conflict, Security and Development.29 Then there is the question of the sociological profiles of different security providers – police, military,…

29 See the 2011 World Development Report , available at http://wdronline.worldbank.org/

intelligence services and the like – and the implications of the differences in their approaches for SSR implementation. The regional dimension of SSR is similarly underdeveloped in the current training agenda.30 As practitioners and academics alike come to appreciate the intricacies of SSR, the field will continue to grow, incorporating more diverse and complex topics. The ever-expanding nature of SSR highlights not only the usefulness, but also the necessity, of applying the co-learning method; in order to effectively address the changing issues of SSR, Practitioners must learn from their own and others' experiences.

A related issue concerns the next generation of SSR training. The introductory SSR

training course ("level one"), developed by the DCAF International Security Sector Advisory Team (TEAM), is now, three years after its launching, a mature product and arguably the gold standard in SSR training. What are needed now are more advanced SSR training courses that will better cater to the needs of practitioners working on SSR in the field. While the co-learning approach helps adjust the structure of trainings to better meet the needs of participants, the content of trainings will also need to be adapted. This will likely need to go in three directions: first, training on the SSR programme cycle – for example, assessments, programme design, monitoring, evaluation; second, training on cross-cutting issues such as budget management, mediation and coordination; and third, training devoted to the various components of SSR such as police reform, border management and defence reform – from an SSR perspective, to be sure.

SSR should also be more present in university curricula. To my knowledge, the only SSR course offered at university level is the Security Sector Management programme at Cranfield.31 There is certainly room for similar programmes to be made available on other continents. If not all universities can allow themselves an SSR degree, they can introduce SSR modules or activities, such as those presented in the annex of this article, in their programmes in the areas of development, political science and public policy.32

Finally, there are still very few actors that have an effective capacity to design and deliver SSR training programmes. Several members of the Association for Security Sector Education and Training (ASSET) show promise in this area and are now offering SSR courses. The organisation has the potential to broaden and deepen the training agenda, and make sure that SSR training capacity becomes more evenly distributed geographically. That said, SSR training still suffers from the dilemma that sparked its emergence: too little expertise in the development community on security issues and too little expertise in the security community on development issues – just

30 The DCAF Training Toolkit for Training Parliamentary Staff Advisors and Civil Servants, which describes methodologies for training young professionals participating in the Parliamentary Staff Advisors Programme for Southeastern Europe, offers several tools that can be used for regional capacity-building in the area of SSR. Written by Teodora Fuior, David Law and Marc Remillard, with the assistance of Martha Baillargeon, Research Assistant to David Law, the toolkit will be available in fall 2011. It will also be possible to access it at .

31 For information on the programme, see 32 For the outlines of such a possible module, see the training and teaching page of www.securitygovernance.com

witness the debate about policy approaches of the donor community in Afghanistan. On the whole, however, SSR training has made important inroads since the first concerted efforts were made to roll out SSR training in 2008. But the effort to transform working experiences in the field and headquarters into viable vehicles for SSR co-learning must continue apace.

Conclusion

Security Sector Reform capacity-building and training programmes favour a co-learning approach, because of the nature of the issue, the inter-relationships among its practitioners and the tendency for its practitioners to be mature learners. After first addressing the nature of SSR and its implications for trainings, this article has explored the origins of the co-learning and offered a rationale for applying the concept in the field of SSR. Then, the article has described a selection of methodologies successfully conducted during trainings that the author has been associated with. There are doubtlessly many more to be developed, drawing on the growing field experience of SSR, but the tools and activities presented should offer a strong starting point for those facilitators seeking to apply the co-learning.

Beyond this, and in light of the author's reflections on the future of SRR training, it may well be that the approach developed for co-learning will prove to be more generally useful in the field of security studies, and perhaps even helpful in creating new symmetries among practitioners and theoreticians in other fields of enquiry. This is, at any rate, the hope that underlies this article.

Works Consulted

Allen, W.J., et al. "Co-learning our way to sustainability: An integrated and community- based research approach to support natural resource management decision-making." In Multiple Objective Decision Making for Land, Water and Environmental Management. S.A. El-Swaify and D.S. Yakowitz, Eds. Boston: Lewis Publishers, 1998, Ch. 4: pp. 51-59. Available online at

Anzai, Yuichiro and Herbert A. Simon. "The Theory of Learning by Doing." Psychological Review Vol. 86, No. 2 (1979): 124-140.
Ball, Nicole. "Dilemmas of Security Sector Reform: Response to 'Security Sector Reform in Developing and Transitional Countries.'" Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, August 2004.
Barron, Brigid J.S. et. al. "Doing with Understanding: Lessons from Research on Problem- and Project-Based Learning." Journal of the Learning Sciences Vol. 7, No. 3/4 (1998): 271-311.
Bodner, George M. "Constructivism: A Theory of Knowledge." Journal of Chemistry Education Vol. 63, No.10 (1986): 873-878.
Bonwell, Charles C. and James A. Eison. "Active Learning: Creating Excitement in the Classroom." Available online at
Brantmeier, Edward J. "Empowerment Pedagogy: Co-learning and Teaching." Indiana University. Available online at
Brzoska, Michael. "Development Donors and the Concept of Security Sector Reform," Occasional Paper No. 4. Geneva: The Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF), November 2003.
Chuter, David. "Understanding Security Sector Reform." Journal of Security Sector Management, Vol. 4, No. 2 (2006).
Driscoll, Margaret. "Blended Learning: Let's Get Beyond the Hype." IBM Global Services, Consultants Point of View. Available online at 07.ibm.com/services/pdf/blended_learning.pdf.
Gokhale, Anuradha A. "Collaborative Learning Enhances Critical Thinking." Journal of Technology Education Vol. 7, No. 1 (1995): 23-30.
Hendrickson, Dylan and Andrzej, Karkoszka. "The Challenges of Security Sector Reform." In SIPRI Yearbook 2002: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security." Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2002.
Johnson, David W., Roger T. Johnson and Karl Smith. "The State of Cooperative Learning in Postsecondary and Professional Settings." Educational Psychology Review, Vol. 19 (2007): 15-29.
Kirscher, Paul, John Sweller and Richard E. Clark. "Why Minimal Guidance During

 © Centre for Security Sector Management (CSSM), 2011

Instruction Does Not Work: An Analysis of the Failure of Constructivist, Discovery, Problem-Based, Experiential, and Inquiry-Based Teaching." Educational Psychologist

Vol. 41, No. 2 (2006): 75-86.
Lave, Jean and Etienne Wagner. Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
Law, David. "Security Sector Training and Education for the Second Reform Decade," 2002. Available online later in 2011 at www.securitygovernance.com.
Loyens, Sofie M. M., Remy M. J. P. Rikers and Henk G. Schmidt. "Students' Conceptions of Constructivisit Learning in Different Programme Years and Different Learning Environments." British Journal of Educational Psychology, Vol. 79 (2009): 501-514.
Murphey, Tim, Chitose Asaoka, and Mari Sekiguchi. "Primary Teachers Co-learning English with their Students." The Language Teacher, Vol. 28, No. 2 (2004): 15-18. Available online at _Materials_Devlpmt_files/murpheyPrimTsLearn.pdf.
Nam, Jin-Wu, et al. "Human microRNA prediction through a probabilistic co-learning model of sequence and structure." Nucleic Acids Research, Vol. 33, No. 11 (2005):3570-3581. Available online at
Nanjappa, Aloka and Michael M. Grant. "Constructing on Constructivism: The Role of Technology." Electronic Journal for the Integration of Technology in Education. Available online at
Shoham, Yoav and Moshe Tennenholtz. "Co-Learning and the Evolution of Social Activity." Stanford University Department of Computer Science, 1994. Available online at
Slavin, Robert E. "Research on Cooperative Learning and Achievement: What We Know, What We Need to Know." Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed at Risk, Johns Hopkins University, October 1995.
Smith, Barbara Leigh and Jean T. MacGregor. "What is Collaborative Learning?" Available online at
Sparrow, Len et al. "Student centred learning: Is it possible?" Available online at
Stahl, Gerry, Timothy Koschmann and Dan Suthers. "Computer-supported collaborative learning: An historical perspective." Available online at
Wulf, Herbert. "Security Sector Reform in Developing and Transitional Countries." Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, July 2004.
Zhou, Y. and S. Goldman. "Democratic Co-learning." 16th IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence, p. 594-602. Accessible at http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/xpl/freeabs_all.jsp?arnumber=1374241.

 © Centre for Security Sector Management (CSSM), 2011

Annex.
Toolkit of Ten Co-learning Applications for SSR Education and Training
This toolkit provides descriptions of ten co-learning applications used by the author with arrange of audiences in various contexts.
All these tools require the facilitator to play an active role in
1. settingoutthebackgroundparticipantswillneedtoengageintheexercise,
2. establishingitsstructureandanygroundrules,
3. monitoringandguidingparticipants’brainstormingontheissueathand,
4. ensuring effective debriefing in the plenary of discussions carried out in smaller groups and
5. helpingparticipantsdrawconclusionsfromtheirwork.
Most of these descriptions include a diagram showing the main results generated during the co-learning exercise. These can be rather sophisticated as in the case of scenario planning or collaborative policy creation, or highly rudimentary as in the case of the outcomes of the SWOT or gaps identification exercises featured here. When co-learning is used for training purposes, the process will tend to be more

important than the product; when a co-learning application is used as a platform for developing policy, the onus will of course be on achieving a robust outcome.
Scenario Planning
Scenario-planning is designed to help one think about the different ways a particular phenomenon may evolve in the future. Unlike traditional planning methods, scenario planning is multi-futuristic, conceiving of the future in terms of various possible outcomes. It avoids the established practice of trying to predict a single future as the one that will come to pass.
Scenario planning was originally developed for thinking about situations in which a thermonuclear war might or might not take place. Later it was used by oil industry actors to help anticipate the evolution of energy prices. Later still, scenario-planning was used as a method for anticipating the different ways countries or communities might evolve. 33
Scenario planning creates a dialogue among the participants involved in the exercise, supporting their efforts to find a common language and understanding of the factors and forces shaping the trajectory of the phenomenon under study. The three or four

scenarios generated through this process provide a platform for a discussion of the strategies and policies required to optimise outcomes. Scenario planning can be helpful in a variety of SSR-related situations. For example, it can serve as a useful vehicle for developing conflict prevention and resolution strategies, or for preparing the ground for the development of a national or regional security strategy.

As an example of the need to think about the different ways the present can become future, see the following illustration. This shows the situation as perceived on the western and eastern sides of the Berlin Wall in the early fall of 1989. The respective political elites tended to project their official presents forward as the inevitable or the preferred future, while ignoring the factors that were at work in creating a new reality: the post-Cold War World.

33 For more information about scenario planning and its history see “Why Scenarios?” Global Business Network, accessed 9 August 2011 from http://www.gbn.com/about/scenario_planning.php.

Perceived Futures before the Fall of the Berlin Wall (early fall 1989)34

34 This diagram was conceptualised and drawn by Nikolai Khlystov in 2009.

As an example of the contrasting futures that can be imagined for a phenomenon, the following graph emerged from an exercise during which participants attempted to capture the different ways the threat spectrum facing the Euro-Atlantic Community might evolve in the period running up to 2020. 35

Euro-Atlantic Threat Scenarios to 202036

states still dominate

human and environmental causes of conflict

primarily human causes of conflict

non-state actors increasingly important

35 This exercise was carried out in 2004 at an Advanced Research Workshop sponsored by the NATO Science for Peace and Stability Programme and the

authorities of the Government of Bulgaria.
36 In this scenario exercise, two driving forces were used to construct a matrix showing three ways the threat spectrum facing the Euro-Atlantic community might evolve in the period to 2020. The horizontal axis relates to whether security issues continue to be primarily about conflict driven by human beings or whether they are shaped by an admixture of human and environmental causes (whereby it is acknowledged that many environmental problems are the result of human abuse of the environment). The vertical axis has as its extremes a world in which states are still the dominant actors and one in which they have been displaced in their leading role by non-state actors. Globawin is a scenario in which the Euro-Atlantic community successfully mobilises other states of the world community against the human causes of conflict. Stateloss is a scenario in which the failure of the Euro-Atlantic community to do so heralds the eclipse of the state as the primary actor in the international system to the benefit of the non-state actor. Ecocrash is a scenario in which the efforts of various
types of actors to stem rising human and environmentally-generated conflict do not succeed, with ecological collapse resulting.

SWOT Analysis

A SWOT analysis is a strategic planning tool used to identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of a given actor in a given situation. It has traditionally been used in wide variety of decision-making environments, from business to post-conflict settings.

SWOT analysis works with internal factors, which are the strengths and weaknesses internal to the organisation or country under analysis, and external factors, which consist of the opportunities and threats presented by the external environment. The aim of a SWOT analysis is to identify the key factors determining whether the actor under consideration will be able to achieve its objectives. This approach can be used to design strategies to reinforce strengths and opportunities, and diminish the effects of weaknesses and threats.

In the area of SSR, SWOT exercises can be particularly useful in helping to devise strategies for new countries or for post-conflict environments. In focusing participants' attention on the opportunities and strengths inherent in a given situation, not just the threats and weaknesses, which can easily appear overwhelming

in such environments, a SWOT exercise can support efforts to “rebrand” security sector actors discredited by their role in conflict.
Below is an example of a SWOT exercise carried out in 2008 with a group of Bolivians from the main security forces and the ministries responsible for them, as well as, parliamentarians and civil society representatives. 37 These results are made available in the original language, as is the case with a number of other exercises reviewed in this article, to make the point that SSR exercises will often have to be conducted in the language of the country of their implementation. The experience of involvement in the process is invariably more important that the results of the process. At the same time, the results can prove to be useful as one of the initial building blocks in the design of a national approach to SSR.
37 This exercise was part of a two-day consultation held in 2009 under the auspices of the Development Assistance Committee of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, and supported by the Dutch and British governments.

Results of SWOT/ DAFO Exercise on the Bolivian Security Sector
Debilidades
Amenazas
Fortalezas
Oportunidades
Carencia de cultura
Falta una sola doctrina
Falta de marco jurídico
Falta de un sitio de información
Falta de recursos en general
Corrupción
Falta de Transversabilidad
Legislación dispersa
Débil control de fronteras
Demografía
Fraccionamiento del Estado
Crimen internacional
Violencia en conflicto social
Delincuencia

Racismo
Pobreza
Posiciones radicales
Ingerencia
Iniciativa
Plan de sug. Existe
Posibilidad modernización
Existencia de organismos
Experiencias de las comunidades
Vigente el sistema democrático
Voluntad política
Financiación y ayuda
Apoyo al sistema democrático
Naciones y organizaciones internacionales que apoyen la democratización del sistema
Estado de derecho
Nueva constitución Marco propicio para luchar contra la inseguridad
Voluntad de cambio
Coordinación interinstitucional
Security Sector Mapping
Like a number of other exercises reviewed in this article, mapping comes to us from the business world. Mapping with security sector actors is different in that it is done mainly in an interactive manner and in real time; business mapping exercises tend, at least initially, to be carried out behind closed doors. Mapping exercises are used to scope the parameters and characteristics of the country or issue under examination. In dealing with SSR, mapping can be particularly useful in providing a platform for identifying the actors involved in various aspects of SSR and their interrelationships. This type of exercise can help ensure that participants in an SSR process have a common awareness of who is who in a country's or community's security sector, and that they understand its main characteristics. As such, it can give participants in an SSR process a common framework for analysis and dialogue, and enhance the prospects that policy will be developed from a comprehensive awareness of security sector realities.

Initial inputs for the exercise can be solicited in an online consultation and used to

create a draft map for subsequent discussion at a workshop.38 For an example of a result of a mapping exercise, see the map below generated by the SSR Preparatory Committee of the Central African Republic.39
Map of the Central African Republic's Security Sector
Forces de sécurité statutaires / non statutaires
Corps exécutifs/civiles:
Gouvernement
Le Président de la République
Le Premier Ministre
Le Ministère de l'Intérieur (dont Maires, Préfets) Le Ministère de la Défense Nationale
Le Ministère des Affaires Etrangères
Le Ministère de la Justice
Le Ministère des Finances
Le Ministère du Transport
Le Ministère des Eaux et Forêts
Le Ministère du Plan, de l'Economie et de la
Coopération Internationale
Le Ministère des Mines et Energie
Conseil Supérieur de la Défense Nationale
Formations armées non statutaires:
Forces de sécurité privé
Société de gardiennage
Les zaraguina, FDPC, APRD, UFDR, les
braconiers, les archers, les braqueurs Les groupes d'autodéfense
Les milices des partis politiques
Corps législatifs:
Députés
Conseillers des Chambres Economiques et
Sociales Commission Défense
Chef de l'Etat (légifère par Ordonnance Conseil municipal Commission des Lois
Forces de sécurité statutaires:
Les FACA
La police nationale et municipale La gendarmerie
Les forces paramilitaires (douanes,
agents des Eaux et Forêts) Les services de renseignement et de
sécurité
Acteurs extérieurs:
Les armées étrangères sans mandat légitime
MINURCAT

EUFOR Chad/CAR
Union africaine
Cour Pénale Internationale
La CEEAC, la Commission du bassin du
lac Tchad
Conférence internationale sur la région
des Grands Lacs
Cour de la Justice de la CEMAC
Cour Commune de Justice et d'Arbitrage de OHADA
Organisations de la société civile:
ONGs des droits de l'homme des femmes, jeunesse medias, syndicats partis politiques confessions religieuses
Justice et institutions du maintien:
Conseil Supérieur de la Magistrature Magistrats, Avocats, Notaires
Huissiers de justice, police judiciare Chefs de quartier/village et les Notables
Régisseurs, greffiers, gardiens de prison
38 For more on mapping, see the section on this subject in the Training Toolkit for Parliamentary Staffers developed by the DCAF Operations Department for SEE and CEE, forthcoming in 2011, and to be available at www.securitygovernance.org.
39 This map was produced during an OECD DAC consultation that took place in Bangui in January 2008.

Mapping can also be used to map other SSR-relevant aspects. For example, the following map shows the bewilderingly complex line-up of actors involved in Canada's SSR effort in Afghanistan, from the perspective of 2009.40
Map of Canada's Actors Conducting SSR in and for Afghanistan
Government Departments in Ottawa
•The Prime Minister
•Ministries (Defence, Foreign Affairs, CIDA, Justice, Public Safety, Finance)
•Correctional Service of Canada
•Ombudsmen
•The Afghanistan Task Force
•Stabilisation and Reconstruction Task Force (START) •SSR Working Group
In-country multilateral coordination mechanisms

•Joint Coordination & Monitoring Board (JCMB)
•Law & Order Trust Fund for Afghanistan (LOFTA)
•Policy Action Group (PAG) •Combined Security Transition
Command – Afghanistan (CSTC-A)
&
Legislative bodies:
•Parliament and its Special Committee on Afghanistan
Canadian statutory security forces in Afghanistan:
•Canadian Forces
•Royal Canadian Mounted Police •Canadian Border Services
Civil society organisations:
•NGOs involved in developing policy advice and disseminating information
•Think tanks
•Media (domestic and international) •Academic institutions
•The business community
IGOs through which Canada delivers programmes:
NATO
UN
World Bank IMF
G7 OSCE
Canadian representation in Afghanistan
•Embassy
•Joint Task Force – Afghanistan (JTF-AFG) •Kandahar Provincial Reconstruction Team (PRT) •Operational Mentor Liaison Team (OMLT) •Strategic Advisory Team – Afghanistan (SAT-A) •Canadian Afghan National Training Centre
Detachment (C ANTC Det.)
Gaps Identification
In this approach, participants carry out an evaluation of their country's security sector, identifying priority gaps and problem areas as a precursor to brainstorming an action plan. For an example, see the results below of an exercise carried out in Sarajevo in 2007 in which military students from four Western Balkan countries were asked to identify the three key gaps in their countries' security sectors. Interestingly, the exercise revealed significant differences in the gaps analysis of the representatives of the participating countries.
40 This map is based on material produced for the article "Security Sector Reform in Afghanistan: the Canadian Approach" in The Afghanistan Challenge: Hard Realities and Strategic Choices, edited by Hans-Georg Ehrhart and Charles Pentland. The map was also used in a whole-of-government consultation carried out for the Canadian

authorities by the International Security Sector Advisory Team (ISSAT) of the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) in October 2008.

Identification of Key Gaps in the Security Sectors of Bosnia-Herzegovina, Serbia, Croatia and Macedonia

BiH
Serbia
Croatia
Macedonia
Professional provision of security at a reasonable cost
X
X
Representative security forces
X
Transparent operations
National security policy
X
X
Proper management
Accountability
X
Judicial framework
X
Civil society
X
X
Cooperation among domestic forces
X
X
Regional and international integration
X

Benchmarking

In benchmarking activities, participants look at how the performance of their security sectors fares in comparison with established benchmarks. Each exercise focuses on

benchmarks in a specific area of SSR, such as efficiency and effectiveness or democratic governance of the security sector. Typically, a benchmarking exercise begins with a presentation on, and discussion of, the key variables under consideration and the indicators devised to measure security sector performance with regard to these variables.

Benchmarking lends itself to comparative analysis. It can be used to foster dialogue and build confidence among regional actors or even among state and non-state actors from different regional environments. As an example of an SSR benchmarking system that can be used for such an exercise, the following is an excerpt on judicial control from a framework developed by the Belgrade-based

Centre on Civil-Military Relations (now the Belgrade Institute for Security Studies) with the support of DCAF in 2007.41 The first box indicates the five representative issues to be evaluated in assessing the effectiveness of judicial control. The second box gives a partial explanation of the grading system to be used – in this case the indicators justifying the lowest grade of one out of a maximum grade of five.

Benchmarks for Assessing Judicial Control

Judicial Control

Fields of observation:

- Constitutional and legal (including by-laws) regulations and the development of competences, procedures and instruments for judicial control over the security sector and specific actors
- Regulation of competences and procedures for judicial control for the implementation of special measures and procedures
- Legally regulated obligations referring to the cooperation of security actors and judicial authorities
- Frequency and results of control (types and numbers of annulled acts and decisions and directives of the executive government)
- Public accessibility of judicial control records

Sample Grading System for Benchmarks

Grade 1:

- lack of clear and well-defined regulations (constitutional, legal) for democratic civil control and public supervision of the security forces and the civil management authorities

- no legal guarantees to ensure that security forces are unbiased in their adherence to parties, special interests and ideologies
- lack of clear and precise legislation for controlling and supervising the application of special/emergency measures
- non-existence of clear legal obligations of the security actors towards the authorities exercising control and supervision
- the results of control and supervision are not accessible to the public and reporting on these matters is quite negligent
- lack of special departments for internal control, revision and supervision; those instances that do exist are not adequately equipped (in terms of technology, human resources and finance) for doing their job
- independent control institutions lack resources and competence
- security forces and their civil management authorities do not respect decisions coming from other state authorities, in particular those emanating from the independent control mechanisms

41 This has since developed into a project supported by a network of think tanks from the Western Balkans, with funding from Norway.

Simulation

Simulation or gaming exercises simulate a real or imaginary situation in order to help participants learn how to analyse a situation and practice working together with different actors and procedures in an SSR environment, which will typically be one of crisis. Exercises usually consist of one to three phases, each one introducing a significant change in the situation that participants have to address. These phases can be complemented by presentations made by experts from the field. Ideally, these experts will also play an advisory role in the active phase of the simulation, as well as in the closing session, focusing on the policy implications emerging from the exercise. The following illustration is the lead-in from an exercise conducted in 2006 in Pristina. It simulated a crisis caused by a cloud of poisonous gas emanating from the divided Serb-Albanian locality of Mitrovitsa that moved over the areas occupied by the different communities, necessitating a multi-community response. This exercise underlined the critical importance of enhancing coordination to deal with civil emergencies among the authorities in both Kosovo and Serbia proper.

Lead-In from Kosovo Scenario Planning Exercise

A Security Management Simulation Exercise for
Kosovo's Security Sector
24-25 July 2006

Text Analysis
In a text analysis exercise, participants are asked to evaluate a document, which has been generated by practitioners in a SSR process, against what they have learned about SSR in the training course, in order to identify its strong and weak points and to suggest how the text can be improved. This approach can be particularly useful in examining documents that have been developed in the field against best practices. This could involve, for example, scrutinising an assessment report carried out in a country where an SSR programme is being contemplated or an evaluation report on an SSR process that has been carried out. It could also consist of analysing a national SSR strategy; for example, see below the results of an exercise in which the SSR committee in Guinea Bissau did an analysis, in 2008, of the national strategy developed two years before.
O que falta na estrategia?
1. gouvernança do sector da segurança
2. implicação da sociedade civil
3. desenvolvimento da capacidade nacional
4. utilizado da capacites estrangeiros
5. coerência da comunidade estrangeiro
6. o que e possível sem dinheiros?
7. prioritários
8. sustentabilidade das reformas
9. vontade politica
10. visão dela segurança do pais
11. outras?

Strategy Development

This type of exercise involves participants in the development of specific strategies aimed at achieving broader SSR goals. In formulating these strategies, participants identify stakeholders and develop a plan for ensuring the stakeholders' involvement and support for SSR. After contemplating which tools and strategies are best suited to the given context, participants elaborate on concrete steps to be taken in the SSR process. For an example of this type of exercise, see below the results of a DCAF-sponsored exercise conducted with a group of staffers working with defence and security committees from Southeastern European countries in 2009-2011.

Outline of PSAP Regional Security Vision

Introduction

What Makes SEE a Region? The Regional Context

The Legacy

The Status Quo

Regional Security Assessment

Regional Strategic Objectives Regional Values and Principles Regional Risks and Threats

Mechanisms for Building Regional Security in SSE

Parliamentary Affairs

Defence Cooperation

Police and Border Security Justice Cooperation

Cyber Security

Counter – terrorism

Rebranding SSE

Good People

Good Environment

Good Politics

Good Security Cooperation

 © Centre for Security Sector Management (CSSM), 2011

Comparative Case Studies

In this kind of exercise, experts present case studies on SSR implementation and then, using a framework proposed by the facilitator, compare the case studies, identify the lessons to be learned and set priorities for improving SSR delivery. Such an exercise is typically introduced by presentations on the general features of the issue under examination, such as how the dynamics of a post-conflict security sector differ from a

non-conflict one. The grid below is one of three developed to compare how key factors determine SSR outcomes in selected post-conflict environments. It emerged from a research project that DCAF conducted with the Bonn International Centre for Conversion (BICC) in 2005-2006.[42]

Assessing Key External Factors Impacting SSR Success

Country Indicator	Haiti	Timor-Leste	Sierra Leone	Afghanistan
Strategic value to major/regional power?	+	+	+	+
International Community Knowledge of environment?	–	–	+/-	–
Coherent external SSR strategy?	–	–	+	–
SSR efforts effectively coordinated?	–	+/-	+/-	–
Sufficient resources available for SSR?	–	+/-	–	+/-

Collaborative Policy Creation

In collaborative policy creation, security sector officials from different countries provide information on their national approaches towards a given security sector issue. A questionnaire is circulated and participants’ responses are integrated into a

comparative table. This is followed by a face-to-face session in which participants elaborate their responses, seek out the comparative elements and discuss

42 David M. Law, "The Post-Conflict Security Sector", DCAF Policy Paper 14 (2006): 1-17. See also David M. Law, "Conclusion: Security Sector (Re) Construction in Post-Conflict Settings", International Peacekeeping Vol. 13, No. 1 (2006): 111-123.

contentious aspects. The results of the questionnaire and ensuing discussion are used to recognise general trends, discern best practices and formulate policy recommendations. The issue on Defence Attachés in the DCAF Backgrounder Series on Security Sector Reform and Governance, of which the cover page is shown below, is the result of just such a comparative effort. 43

43 To access this and other documents in the Backgrounder series, go to The Backgrounders are available online in some fifteen different languages.

Russian Version of the Defence Attaché Backgrounder