The south Caucasus and NATO's defence education enhancement programme. The measurement of its effectiveness

Khayal Iskandarov [1] [A]; Piotr Gawliczek [2] [B]

[A] War College of the Armed Forces, Republic of Azerbaijan
[B] University of Warmia and Mazury, Poland

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to review NATO's Defence Education Enhancement Programme (DEEP) and to bring to the fore the measures of effectiveness regarding its implementation and to determine its shortcomings in the South Caucasus region. At the same time, the paper highlights the efforts of the DEEP teams to influence the partner educators through dialogue and encouragement. The authors refer to the best examples considering the measures of effectiveness. Considering the outcomes achieved by the partner nations, they endeavoured to apply Kirkpatrick model for measuring DEEP's effectiveness in the South Caucasus countries. The paper discusses how they can more effectively address the challenges in their professional military education (PME) through their tailored DEEPs. The paper analyzes the processes that led by the South Caucasus nations, their national interests and what steps still need to be taken to realize their ambitions to be intellectually interoperable with NATO forces.

Key words: NATO, DEEP, South Caucasus, measurement, effectiveness.

Introduction

Education and training are one of the main domains of cooperation between NATO and partner nations. It is what is motivating NATO to shift its attention from weapons systems to joint, multinational and interagency education and training of those people who more broadly develop and employ the doctrines, strategies and policies that integrate all the instruments of power – political, military, economic and informational – to produce leaders better equipped to deal with a range of issues that define the twenty-first-century security environment: "smart power" (James Keagle, 2010). It may sound strange, however these initiatives provide NATO with a very important, albeit different role in today's global security landscape (Aaron Willschick, 2013).

The nations in the South-Caucasus region have been struggling to reach Western standards in every possible field since they got their independence from the USSR. Their armed forces were founded in the period of chaos resulting from the collapse of the Soviet Union when all three countries were suffering from wars. Therefore, defence education occupies one the first places among these fields regarding the geopolitical landscape of the region. There are different tools and means to realize the desire to improve their PME. NATO has supported the South-Caucasus countries together with other post-Soviet states in reforming their respective security sectors in line with Western standards and bringing them closer to the Alliance. It presents the best tools to keep up with the developed or at least developing countries. And DEEP is one of these productive tools to facilitate their integration into Western structures. Measuring the

effectiveness of this programme is vital to determine whether it is appropriate for partner nation, or there are any problems with its implementation. Various researchers, like A.G. Stolberg, S. Johnson, L. Kupe, F. Labarre, P. Jolicoeur, H. Mölder, N. Murray, P. Gawliczek and K. Iskandarov addressed different aspects of DEEP and its role in cooperation between NATO and partner nations. However, there the

measurement of its effectiveness has not been studied at all. Then it begs the question of "How to measure the effectiveness of DEEP's implementation?" Comparative analysis, synthesis, inductive and deductive methods have been used in the paper to come up with conclusive outcomes and recommendations for the countries in the region.

Results and discussion

The evolution of Defence Education Enhancement Programme. Until the mid-2000s, NATO support to partner states had primarily focused on the guidelines of the 1999 Training and Education Enhancement Program (TEEP), which was intended to promote interoperability "in the field" (Jean d'Andurain, 2012). TEEP concentrates on the promotion of partners' training and educational capabilities. One of the concrete outcomes is the establishment of PfP Training Centres (Holger Mölder). NATO defence reform efforts gained added momentum with the creation of the Partnership Action Plan on Defines Institution Building (PAP-DIB) at the 2004 Istanbul Summit. The PAP-DIB Action Plan outlines the specific goals that NATO and partner states want to achieve in the area of defence institution building (Jean d'Andurain). Dr. David Emelifeonwu of the Canadian Defense Academy (CDA) led a multinational team of educators from allied and partner states to draft a Reference Curriculum for Defence Institution Building, the first multinational collaborative effort of its kind on behalf of partner defence education. The term "Reference Curriculum" carries special meaning in this context. It is offered to partners not as an exact prescription to be adopted wholesale but rather as a set of generic suggestions to consider in drafting their own course content, drawing on the methods in curriculum development they see in the document. Another Reference Curriculum followed two years later; an ambitious effort centered on generic Officer Professional Military Education. A third effort is on Non-Commissioned Officer Professional Military

Education (John Berry, 2012).

In 2006, the Education and Training for Defence Reform Initiative was introduced, paving the way for the creation of a new area of cooperation with partners. Finally, in 2007 Defence Education Enhancement Programme (DEEP) was launched (Defense Education, 2019). Kazakhstan was selected as the place to test all these ideas. With strong support from both the United States Central Command and the Office of the Secretary of Defence, the Consortium launched its first pilot DEEP with Kazakhstan's NDU in late 2007. Most of the "rules of the road" for future DEEPs were developed in this pilot project. The first step was the selection of the program leader, Dr. Al Stolberg of the U.S. Army War College. Familiar with planning and implementing security cooperation programs in many nations in Europe and Eurasia as part of his assignments to the Joint Staff and United States European Command, Dr. Stolberg's position on the teaching faculty of the War College made him a natural choice to lead the DEEP (John Berry, 2012). This initial success in Kazakhstan provided the essential confidence for the Consortium to launch other DEEPs in 2008. NATO played a key role at this point. Working informally with the NATO Missions of Georgia, Azerbaijan, and Armenia, and using the mechanism of the Individual Partnership Action Plan (IPAP), NATO's International Staff urged these countries to add defence education to their IPAP goals. In quick succession, a senior MOD official from these countries asked a senior NATO official, usually at the Assistant Secretary-General level, to open a dialogue on potential

education reforms. The Kazakh DEEP opened the door to launch these additional programs (John Berry, 2012).

DEEP is an invaluable tool to develop educational institutions in the defence sector and contribute to all dimensions of interoperability. The main goal of the Programme is to enhance the international security throughout professionalization of the officers and civilian employees' education system in the partner states according to the NATO standards (Annual summary, 2019). Through faculty development, curriculum development and peer-to-peer consultations, the DEEP Programme fosters defence capacity building, cooperative capability development and standardization, and promotes interoperability of processes and methodologies to enhance democratic institutions (Defence Education). According to Dr. Raphael Perl, PfP Consortium executive director, "what makes DEEPs attractive is implementing a non-cookie-cutter approach to defence education and defence institution building in post-Communist societies and beyond" (NATO Allies, 2014). The key aspect of DEEP is the connections it facilitates between senior educators from defence education institutions in NATO countries and affiliated institutions. Another key function of DEEP is in helping sustain regional stability through multinational education and research (Aaron Willschick, 2013). A successful and effective DEEP requires stakeholders, participating nations and volunteers to balance the short view with the long view. Rapid change is not always sustainable change. A possible indicator of success is to have host nation defence institutions meet their IPAP goals, incorporate reference curriculum methods and sources into their own programs of instructions and adopt learner-centric knowledge delivery methods. The aim is the attainment of the "operational" objectives of the programme: intellectual interoperability, like-mindedness, in short, integration (Frédéric Labarre, 2016).

DEEP endeavors through dialogue and encouragement to influence partner educators in the direction of the following objectives (Annual Report 2012, 2013):

guide and mentor reforms in professional and military education, both in individual defence education institutions and in a defence-wide holistic approach to professional military education;

promote learner-centered education and innovative use of instructional technologies;

encourage and enable the use of learning objectives which facilitate a depth of learning that can be readily applied through practice and partner experience;

assist in the development of faculty assessments and action plans to employ these methods in support of partner goals contained in their IPAPs with NATO or bilateral arrangements with the U.S.

In coordination with the PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes, the Partnership Training and Education Centers, the George C. Marshall Center and the Bureau for International Language Coordination as well as with specific allied and partner defence education institutions, NATO is leading or supporting eight tailored DEEPs (Jean d'Andurain). Since 2007, NATO has conducted DEEPs with Armenia, Azerbaijan, and Georgia. The PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Institutes (PfPC) has played a leading role in bringing together allies and partners to develop and execute DEEPs. These programmes, which are tailored to meet individual partner requirements, provide opportunities for the PfP partners to develop both their defence education curricula and faculty. Good curricula would also contribute to understanding the holistic nature of professional military education, the hierarchy of schools that lead from Cadet to Colonel (John Berry). Not only do these programs provide an effective way to transform national security establishments and enhance the security capabilities of partners, they also do so in a way that does not provoke neighboring nations. In the case of the countries fraught with frozen conflict, it may be the best means to avoid the region becoming a "shatter zone" along the rim land, and "marginal areas" to Mackinder's pivot and heartland thesis – a prominent line of thought in NATO as it wrestles

with security challenges and opportunities in the region (James Keagle). The United States, working in close cooperation with North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) headquarters, has signaled the importance of defence education in its engagement with a number of former Soviet Union states and NATO partner nations of interest through the creation of the DEEP (Alan G. Stolberg, 2018).

DEEP facilitates (or provides the opportunity to incorporate) the incorporation of Western or modern norms and methods in the field of PME for officers and NCOs while preserving host nation prerogatives as independent states, as well as ensuring ownership of the outcome (Frédéric Labarre, 2016).

The measurement of DEEP's effectiveness. Once a baseline is set and an Action Plan has been agreed upon between NATO and the partner (or bilaterally), the Curriculum and Teaching Development Team (CTDT) makes repeated visits to the country to assist both curricula and faculty development as needed. In some cases, this means that the team co-teaches course for a couple of days with the host-nation assumes the primary role. The CTDT remains ready to assist or provide additional information on needed basis. Depending on a country's needs and the availability of allies to support program implementation, the CTDTs may be conducted on a multinational or bilateral basis. A NATO representative may also be involved in crafting the Action Plan (in accordance with NATO agreements, such as IPAPs) and/or the NATO Liaison Officer (LO) in the region may play a role. The NATO LO may be active in crafting the plan, executing the CTDT, and consulting with the partner between visits to ensure that the process is moving forward as scheduled (James Keagle). The requesting country has an opportunity to send members of its teaching staff on "Shadow Faculty" visits to other military education institutions (Frédéric Labarre, 2016). To ensure support from all sides, the DEEP PME Action Plans are also briefed at NATO Headquarters in the Political and Partnership Committee (James Keagle). DEEP programme also includes deployment of Mobile Education Training Teams (METTs), which could

be useful tools for promoting the regional dimension of defence education and increasing the number of students (Marija Ignjatijevic). Throughout this process, students and institutions are transformed towards the goals of education institution modernization and interoperability with NATO. For instance, in Kazakhstan, the educators' workshops have been so successful that the Kazakh NDU has the ability to sustain its own faculty development programs; a clear sign of successful adaptation (Frédéric Labarre, 2016). Thus, the effectiveness of DEEP implementation is of the utmost importance. It is necessary that we know how our resources are used and find out whether they are spent effectively or not. The experience informs us that success is driven by the level of the work performed and on how manageable the group is as it meets and performs its work. It is essential to periodically review the entire process for its holistic effectiveness. The evaluation of any programme has certain aims to achieve. These are inextricably linked to the determination of change in the behaviour and the attitude. Hence evaluation of any programme must inform us whether the programme has been able to deliver the goals and objectives. There are historical, personal and even political sensitivities which dictate the pace of success, and what themes can be addressed (Annual Report 2012, 2016). As Peter Drucker stated: "If you can't measure it, you can't manage it" (Barbora Maronkova, 2018). According to James Harrington, "Measurement is the first step that leads to control and eventually to improvement. If you can't measure something, you can't understand it. If you can't understand it, you can't control it. If you can't control it, you can't improve it" (Mechanism to Measure, 2018). But how to measure whether DEEP implementation in the South countries is effective or not? Effectiveness is the central term that is used in assessing and measuring the performance of any programme. Dockery defines "a measure of effectiveness" as "any mutually agreeable parameter of the problem which induces a rank ordering on the perceived set of goals" (Neill Smith). Drucker (Heli Hookana, 2011) associates' effectiveness

with "doing the right things". Effectiveness is the extent to which, the objectives of a programme are achieved. It refers to the outcomes produced by DEEP activities. Effectiveness depends on judging observable actions or behaviours leading to the accomplishment of the certain goals (Heli Hookana, 2011). Thus, the effectiveness of DEEPs refers to the usefulness of the programme output in relation to the expectations and needs of the partner. The process of setting up effectiveness measurement begins with outlining the complete partner expectations and needs detail. These expectations would then be converted into measurable targets and expectations. Lastly the measurement methods would need to be outlined. It helps to elaborate a little more on the effectiveness measurement process and the attributes that are used as measurements. In most cases it is generally seen that the partner expectations and requirements are not defined clearly with specifications in terms of the delivery format, frequency and so on (BPI). There are several ways to measure whether DEEP works or not. However, there is no universal standard. Frédéric Labarre and Pierre Jolicoeur have proposed seven measures of effectiveness regarding the implementation of DEEP (Frédéric Labarre, 2016):

adoption of Western-oriented PME academic structures and degree requirements;

inclusion of Western-oriented materials in new courses;

adoption of learner-centric approaches to teaching;

adoption and development of non-commissioned officer (NCO) education;

participation of host nation (that is, partner nation) educators in PfP Consortium programs;

high-level support for DEEP from host nation authorities;

contribution to Alliance goals.

DEEP objectives are met when the partner's professional military education institution is self-sufficient and no longer requires external assistance, its curriculum satisfies all course needs, and a process exists to ensure a continuous curriculum review. The professional military education institution faculty should be able to teach all classes using modern teaching techniques and have an internal sustainment capability to train their new faculty in modern teaching methodology (Defence Education).

The quality of aforementioned measures hinges on the professionals from two sides (DEEP and partner nation). Considering these measures, Alan G. Stolberg presents examples of success in Kazakhstan (Alan G., 2012):

Pedagogy events have a positive influence on the KAZ NDU faculty. Interactive teaching techniques are now being used widely by the entire faculty. Students are being asked to "think", use "critical thinking" skills and "exchange ideas". It is also applied to gaming, exercises and map-related operations planning;

A new course in the curriculum called "NATO Standards for Home Front Maintenance" has been launched and KAZ NDU forged a long-term relationship with the Romanian NDU for maintenance and logistics issues;

Leadership theory has been incorporated into the permanent curriculum's management course;

Iraq/Afghanistan air force, army aviation and artillery lessons learned are formally incorporated into the curriculum by the Operational Arts Department;

Lectures on Western interpretation and teaching of international humanitarian law are now included in the curriculum of a course titled "Basics of International Humanitarian Law".

The level of progress and transformation depends on how much effort education institutions make to operationalize changes derived from the conduct of DEEP activities, particularly in the areas of faculty development and curriculum development. Categories of measure of effectiveness vary from country to country and the following are identified as the most relevant (Defence Education):

adoption of modern teaching methodologies by PME faculty;

inclusion of new subject matter in existing course curricula and development of new courses;

adoption of Non-Commissioned Officers' Education.

Therefore, the commander's personal

investment in the study, and the institution's resources provide the venue for innovation through critical thinking (Thang Tran, 2018). Once the cadets and junior/senior officers entered the bachelor and graduate/PhD programs (tactical, operational and strategic levels), they should be able to elevate their critical thinking on all levels. In his white paper on Joint Education, General Martin Dempsey requires joint PME to develop the "habits of mind essential to our profession" − that is critical thinking (Nicholas Murray, 2014). Benefiting from the experience of seasoned experts definitely contributes to this process. Integrated PME programs provides an opportunity to replicate the projects that the cadets/officers at leading NATO military institutions carry out. DEEP enables the South Caucasus nations to invest their time and resources properly. Most importantly, lessons learned from the staff with academic and field experience will be passed down to future military professionals through blended experiences. As Frédéric Labarre and Pierre Jolicoeur suggested: "Reciprocity is essential to any effective and dynamic partnership. When host nations start providing DEEP initiatives with content or newly-acquired skills, they cease to be consumers of the program, and become contributors. Such an outcome multiplies the strength and reach of the programme, and shows that Euro-Atlantic values and principles are harmonized" (Frédéric Labarre, 2016).

NATO as an organization is apt to become attuned to more complex, rapidly evolving, and increasingly unpredictable security environment. It makes the Alliance more attractive. For instance, Wales Summit Declaration highlights Alliance's members commitment to developing cyber defence capabilities and their vision of integrating cyber defence into NATO operations and operational/contingency planning, as well as their pledge of improving the level of cyber defence education, training, and exercise activities through NATO training and education bodies. Partnerships were underscored to be essential to the way NATO works (Wales

Summit, 2014). At the Warsaw Summit, Allies agreed that enhancing the cyber defences of national networks and infrastructure had become a matter of priority. One of seven main objectives the Allies pledged to pursue was once again to foster cyber education, training, and exercises it was underscored at Wales Summit (Warsaw Summit, 2016). 20 Allies and 2 partner countries participate in cyber defence Smart Defence projects. 19 partners have Individual Partnership and Cooperation Programmes with an integrated cyber component. 16 partners have cyber defence integrated into partnership plans (The Secretary, 2015). DEEP was pronounced once again to be a tool to build defence capacity and interoperability (Wales Summit). This approach in its turn prompted partner nations to get closer to the Alliance.

Taking the outcomes and achievements of DEEP in the South Caucasus into account an Annual report of PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes highlights following points regarding particular nations:

Armenia. Launched in 2008 at the instigation of NATO and with the support of the CDA, the Armenia DEEP has proceeded slowly and carefully in order to build confidence with senior Armenian officials (Alan Stolberg). Armenian Ministry of Defence PME priorities are (Defence Institution):

Senior officer staff education;

Junior officer staff education;

National Defence Research University (NDRU) project;

NCO education.

Emphasis in Command and Staff Course (COSC), which was inaugurated in 2013, is on continued mentoring of faculty and developing a quality assurance framework for the COSC (Alan Stolberg). In the context of an Austrian-led DEEP with Serbia, Serbian officers advise Armenian counterparts on how to combine military and academic education for their officers (The Secretary, 2015).

Azerbaijan. DEEP has been in existence since 2009. The DEEP for Azerbaijan began with modest objectives and has grown slowly but steadily (Alan Stolberg). The first element of the

program, non-commissioned officers' training was provided by the representatives from ACT, ACO, Lithuania and the US. Specialized Officer's Training, the second element began with a review of the courses offered at the Azerbaijani Education and Training Center by NATO representatives from the Czech Republic, Poland, Romania and the US. The third and the most significant element of the NATO DEEP initiative is the effort to improve and modernize the courses of study available to senior military and governmental officials in Azerbaijan. Baku's principal desire was to enhance its curriculum in defence strategy and planning. NATO responded enthusiastically (Thomas Fedyszyn, 2012). Azerbaijan has adopted a national approach to accreditation and will only emulate the European Bologna Standard in the long-term. Apart from these facts, the Adjuncture and Science branch was established in the War College of the Armed Forces which contributes to the development of PME and defence industry. In order to be interoperable with NATO allies and partners, or indeed to benefit from professional development courses organized by NATO, knowledge of English is a prerequisite. Thus, the Foreign Language and Partnership Centre functions under the aegis of the War College, with the purpose of imparting training in different foreign languages to the personnel of the Armed Forces, enabling our military personnel to communicate in English at a reasonable level of proficiency (STANAG levels 2-3) and providing them with an opportunity to learn NATO tactics in the military domain (Elman Nasirov). These two sectors are potential domains for further engagement of DEEP in Azerbaijan.

Georgia. Working in Georgia since 2008. Emphasis is on roles and missions of the National Defence Academy (NDA) and the four-year Military Academy, as well as faculty development with Educator Workshops on Faculty Development, a workshop on Assessment and Evaluation of Student Learning, and an exchange of "Best Practices" among a number of European military education institutions (Alan Stolberg). Working on a "train the trainer" model, Georgian professors teach

other partners "how to teach" in this field (Defence Institution).

DEEP stands out as one of the major reasons why NATO has remained a relevant international actor into the 21st century. Collective education and training have been ongoing since the inception of the Alliance in 1949, but never to this extent. If NATO can continue to develop DEEP and expand its functions to new places then it could well end up becoming the primary force for regional stability in the world. It is often overlooked or forgotten, but institutional change must come from within a country rather than be exported from other places. DEEP does well in providing assistance to shape the defence institutions of a developing country and has aided NATO in remaining a relevant, international actor (Aaron Willschick). However, Frédéric Labarreand and Pierre Jolicoeur present five important challenges facing DEEP implementation (Frédéric Labarre, 2016):

ensuring that DEEPs are tailored to the host nation, rather than to the provider;

adapting the schedule of DEEP work to unforeseen political developments;

identifying an end state;

internationalizing the program;

measuring DEEP performance.

Thus, if we take into account that there is a will in the South Caucasus to benefit from NATO partnership tools, then DEEP is the main instrument, which facilitates the development of important professional and personal skills. Armies in the region may impart the skills and knowledge that help them develop new capabilities and better utilize their existing resources. In this way, they will enhance their interoperability with NATO forces. The results of the analysis show that Kazakhstan is ahead of most of post-soviet countries regarding the success of DEEP (Frédéric Labarre, 2016). In fact, Georgia is the most successful user of NATO mechanisms. However, we take Kazakhstan as an example for Armenia and Azerbaijan, because that is not NATO-aspired country because of regional geopolitical situation. The ideas suggested in the paper may increase the effectiveness of the implementation of DEEP in

those countries.

Taking the outcomes achieved by the partner nations and identified challenges of the programme implementation into consideration, we can apply Kirkpatrick model (Eric Smith, 2012) for measuring DEEP's effectiveness. It enables us to work out what has been done and what should be done next. This model has a four-step approach to evaluation:

1. Reaction. This level measures how partners respond to the initiative, its importance, and convenience of programme implementation. According to the analysis of the programme implementation and formal, as well as informal conversations among the participants of different events organized within DEEP, we may deduce that all three nations respond positively, smoothly and effectively to instructions of the DEEP team.

2. Learning. Showing the impact of learning is important as it allows the partner nations to know exactly what all positive results the learning process may bring. The arranged events have a positive influence on military institutions. New courses are included into their curriculums. Approximately 15 events were held within DEEP in the South Caucasus in 2019. Different memoranda have been signed between allied and partner institutions which enable the latters' personnel to interact with various professionals. Lessons learned from NATO operations are applied either in the form of subjects or seminars/conferences/workshops.

3. Behaviour. It is important to measure the performance, because the primary purpose of learning is to improve results by imparting new skills and knowledge and then actually enable the participants to apply them to their jobs. Any programme can be evaluated based upon the extent to which, the behaviour of the participants change. Assessing behaviour change is critical because a change in behavior is necessary if there is to be a change in an overall

performance (Eric Smith, 2012). According to the observations and interviews over time, military institutions and their personnel are on the way transforming towards the goals of interoperability with NATO.

4. Results. It includes the outcomes linked to programme goals that both sides aim at achieving throughout the cooperation. In comparison with previous years now there are more officers/NCOs in the South Caucasus countries that are intellectually interoperable with of the NATO's based on the observation and "on-the-job practical evaluation". Their increased engagement in NATO activities, productivity of the arranged events, partner satisfaction, etc. are the direct results of DEEP programme. Kirkpatrick (Eric Smith, 2012) provides guidelines for evaluating results that include; using a control group, allowing time for results to be achieved, evaluating before and after the events (arranged within the programme) that are administered and most importantly to be satisfied.

It should be noted that, behaviour change and result of the program implementation require the time and resources (Rose Polchin, 2014). The biggest challenge is to identify which outcomes, benefits, or final results are most closely linked to the purpose of the programme and to come up with an effective way to measure these outcomes in the long term. The effort to implement distance learning in the higher military educational institutions is a case in point. However, it may not be practical if the partner nation is not dedicated. In addition, there is a need to assess the system, tools and processes the partner nation has in place to collect the data necessary to report on these levels. Nevertheless, failing to assess the effectiveness of a programme beyond reaction and learning measurements would severely limit any possibility of sustained behavior change (Eric Smith).

Conclusions

Utilizing NATO DEEP in pursuit of peace and prosperity in the South Caucasus region is professional and non-political. Potential areas of

cooperation, like preparation of junior and senior officers, improvement of professional NCO system, distance learning, curriculum

development at master and PhD levels, exchange of academic experience based on this programme contribute to peace and security all three nations are concerned with. The active implementation of NATO's DEEP programme by the countries in the South Caucasus significantly affects the integration process of the whole region, which is struggling to catch up with the Western (at least Central and Eastern European) countries regardless of different obstacles. However, there is a need to measure the effectiveness of DEEP consistently, which is a formidable challenge. Therefore, there is a desperate need to launch a mechanism to measure the effectiveness of the programme implementation. This mechanism should entail evaluation, creation of model for success, conduct of regular survey and in-depth interviews (formal and informal), practical guidance and support for partner nations. Thus, some smart choices have to be made and

benchmarks (for instance from Kazakhstan model) have to be set to understand the current level of cooperation. Regarding the effectiveness of DEEP's implementation, the focus should be on the outcome of the programme. It is incorrectly interpreted to mean that the impact of programme implementation is political. Its implementation simply boosts the performance of some certain activities (for instance PME activities). The important thing is to follow appropriate techniques and procedures proposed by the DEEP team. The right people from both sides need to work together to build a fruitful relationship. Thus, the measurement of effectiveness solely shows whether we are doing the "right things", it is up to each and every person who is involved in the programme implementation to help to determine the appropriate next steps, and then to take proper actions.

References

Annual Report 2012, PfP Consortium of Defence Academies and Security Studies Institutes, Vienna and Garmisch-Partenkirchen, March 11, 2013, Available from: https://bit.ly/2lMOOLU.

Annual summary of the NATO DEEP programme, Tuesday, July 02, 2019, Available from: https://bit.ly/2lL2iaG.

Berry, John, *"*Defense Education Enhancement Program: The Consortium Perspective", *Connections: The Quarterly Journal* 11, no. 4 (2012): 27-33.

BPI – Introduction to Process Effectiveness Measurement, Available from: https://bit.ly/2AGrDa4.

D'Andurain, Jean, and Alan G. Stolberg, "Defense Education Enhancement Program: The NATO Functional Clearing-House on Defense Education", *Connections* Vol. 11, No. 4 (Fall 2012): 53-58, Available from: https://bit.ly/2k7vkRt.

Defense Education Enhancement Programme (DEEP), Last updated: March 05, 2019, Available from: https://bit.ly/2wBdQSU.

Defence Institution Building PME Bi-Monthly Report DEEP, AMEP, and other DEEP

Programs Background and Historical Information, Available from: https://bit.ly/2mbhIFL.

Fedyszyn, Thomas, "Moving Westward: The Azerbaijan DEEP Experience", *Connections: The Quarterly Journal* 11, no. 4 (2012): 91-97.

Gawliczek Piotr, Wojciech Guzewicz, Khayal Iskandarov, *Defence Education Enhancement Programme as vehicle to strengthen and stimulate cooperation between NATO and partners. Case studies – South Caucasus and Ukraine. ADL perspective,* Wydawnictwo UWM, Olsztyn 2020.

Hookana Heli, "Measurement of effectiveness, efficiency and quality in public sector services – interventionist empirical investigations", Managing Sustainability? Proceedings of the 12th Management International Conference 2011 Portorož, Slovenia, 23-26 November (2011), 491-510, Available from: https://bit.ly/352sgJ5.

Iskandarov, K., & Gawliczek, P. (2019). The south Caucasus and NATO'S defence education enhancement programme. Retrospective analysis. *Journal of Scientific Papers «Social Development and Security», 9*(5), 3-14. DOI:

10.33445/sds.2019.9.5.1

Keagle, James, Tiffany Petros, "Building partner capacity through education: NATO engagement with the Partnership for Peace", *Connections: The Quarterly Journal* 10, no. 1 (2010): 46-63.

Labarre, Frédéric & Pierre Jolicoeur, "Shaping and measuring military culture development: a case study of the defence education enhancement program", *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, Volume *22*, Issue *2* (2016): 135-146, Available from: https://bit.ly/2kddfSg.

Maronkova, Barbora, *From crawling to walking: progress in evaluating the effectiveness of public diplomacy: Lessons from NATO*, CPD perspectives on public diplomacy, Paper 1, 2018, (Los Angeles, Figueroa Press, February 2018), Available from: https://bit.ly/2kJoRwj.

Mechanism to Measure the Overall Effectiveness of People Management Practices of an Organization, April 19, 2019, Available from: https://bit.ly/2nmdRGL.

Mölder, Holger, The evolution of NATO's partnerships strategy - Democratic peace or clash of civilizations? University of Tartu, Available from: https://bit.ly/2njIpbw.

Murray, Nicholas, "The Role of Professional Military Education in Mission Command", January 1, 2014, Available from: https://bit.ly/2kAvNMc.

NATO Allies underscore Defence Education Enhancement Program, September 18, 2014, Available from: https://bit.ly/2kBVg8a.

Polchin, Rose, Measuring the effectiveness of your training program, July 02, 2014, Available from: https://ubm.io/2VgaNZ9.

Smith, Eric Assessment of the Effectiveness of Development Activities, 2012, Seminar Research Paper Series Schmidt Labor Research Center, University of Rhode Island, Available from: https://bit.ly/2oaPbRS.

Smith, Neill, A Framework to Model and Measure System Effectiveness, Available from: https://bit.ly/32YNQfz.

Stolberg, Alan G. Defense Education Enhancement Program: The Kazakhstan Experience, *Connections,* Vol. 11, No. 4 (Fall 2012):108-113.

Stolberg, Alan G., Stuart Johnson, Laura Kupe, "Building Partner-Nation Capacity through the Defence Education Enhancement Program", Jan 31, 2018, Available from: https://bit.ly/2rn7Fg3.

Tran, Thang, Michael Oliveira, Josh Sider, and Leo Blanken, "Ignorance and professional military education: The case for operational engagement", November 7, 2018, Available from: https://bit.ly/2yTxx7i.

Wales Summit Declaration, 05 Sep. 2014, Last updated: 30 Aug. 2018, Available from: https://bit.ly/2QFyWVS.

Warsaw Summit Declaration, 09 Jul. 2016, Last updated: 29 Mar. 2017, Available from: https://bit.ly/2hI5I96.

Willschick, Aaron, "In too "DEEP". NATO as an institutional educator", February 22, 2013, Available from: https://bit.ly/2m9fGG9.