

**KOSOVO CASE STUDY - FIRST 18 MONTHS:  
MARCH 1999 TO SEPTEMBER 2000**

**WITH ADDENDUM COMPARING NATO – UN INTERACTIONS IN  
BOSNIA IFOR AND KOSOVO KFOR**

**CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS:**

**Bill Piersol**

**Gary Horne**

**Ulrike Lechner**

**Agatino Mursia**

May 1, 2009



## INTRODUCTION

The NATO led Kosovo air campaign in 1999, and subsequent United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), with its authorised security force led by NATO's Kosovo Force (KFOR), was a response to Serbian systematic persecution of the predominant Albanian population that makes up Kosovo. During the same time, NATO was still engaged in its peacekeeping intervention in Bosnia (IFOR/SFOR) within the territory of the former Yugoslavia which commenced in December 1995.

While there were similarities between the circumstances that led to IFOR in Bosnia and KFOR in Kosovo, there were also significant differences. One difference was the relationship between the combatants. In Bosnia the three protagonists; the Croats, Bosnians, and Serbs, all are of Slavic origin with a common origin and language (Wentz, 2002, p.50). The significant difference was religion, with Croats being Roman Catholic, Bosnians Muslims, and Serbs Christian Orthodox. The catalyst for the Bosnian war were territorial ambitions of the leaders of neighbouring states; Slobodan Milosevic of Serbia and Franjo Trudjman of Croatia respectively. In Kosovo, the protagonists were members of one State, Serbia. Kosovo was a province of Serbia that at times over the ages enjoyed more and then less autonomy. The inhabitants of Kosovo province were overwhelmingly of Albanian ethnicity and did not share a common language with the Serbs. In the 1990's under Milosevic, the Serbian federal government systematically and overwhelmingly skewed the rights to the Serb minority at the expense of the majority Kosovo Albanians. This was done by the Serbian Federal government, stacking all instruments of federal and provincial government power and security forces within Kosovo with Serb nationalists.

There were also differences in significance of scale between the Bosnia and Kosovo interventions on how NATO entered the conflict areas. In Bosnia, the Dayton Peace Agreement signed in November 1995 allowed for an unopposed NATO ground force into Bosnia on a Peace Enforcement mission. While there were already UN peacekeepers in place (some of which became part of the NATO IFOR) in Bosnia, there was not the same level of a persistent punishing NATO led bombing campaign prior to the introduction of NATO led ground forces as there was in Kosovo. In Kosovo, as a result of an inability to get Serbia to agree to a comprehensive peace plan in the midst of an active ethnic cleansing campaign against the Kosovos by the Serbs, NATO led a 78 day air-war against targets in Serbia and Serbian forces in Kosovo that consisted of over 38,000 combat sorties. It was this punishing bombing campaign that forced Serbia to sign a Military Technical Agreement which allowed KFOR to enter Kosovo unopposed, along with the withdrawal from Kosovo of Serbian security forces.

The addendum looks more in depth at specifically comparing and contrasting the nature of interactions between the respective NATO HQ and the UN in Bosnia and in Kosovo.

## **APPLYING THE NATO C2 MATURITY MODEL TO THE KOSOVO THEATER**

Applying the NATO C2 Maturity Model in retrospect to KFOR is extremely valuable due to the complexity of the operation. It contained with abundance all the interactive dynamics that the maturity model seeks to measure in warfare, peacekeeping, humanitarian aid initiatives, joint law enforcement, and restoration of government services. Additionally it offers an opportunity to see if there were any C2 enterprise lessons that were learned from IFOR and SFOR that were applied to KFOR.

Just as in any other complex endeavour, the whole effort cannot be proclaimed to have achieved and operated at one specific maturity level. There are wide ranges of interactions between different players, some more dependent, and some more independent of each other. What we can do is look at the KFOR experience, as Larry Wentz calls it, and break it down into different arenas if you will. This does allow for objective generalities regarding maturity levels achieved in different areas based on the evidence of the nature of the interactions. For this case study, the NATO experiences in Kosovo were broken down as follows:

- The Air War
- KFOR – UNMIK Interactions
- KFOR – Sector Multinational Brigades Interactions
- KFOR – Humanitarian / NGO Interactions

### **AIR WAR**

The NATO bombing campaign, whose objective was to force Serbia to abandon its strategy of ethnic repression in Kosovo, started on March 24, 1999 and ended on June 10, 1999 when Serbia signed a Military Technical Agreement with NATO. Planning for such a campaign started the previous year. On Sept 24, 1998, NATO Defense Ministers approved issuance of Activation Warnings for 2 different types of air operations. The first was a full five-phased air operation to ultimately eliminate major elements of Yugoslavian military and security force capability. The second was a Limited Air Response to be used in response to a serious but limited incident in Kosovo. As early as May 98, well in advance of the activation order, planning staffs at all levels had initiated work to identify the classes, types, and specific characteristics of targets needed to meet the goals of the two alternatives. (DOD report to congress, 2000, p. 21)

While the overall air planning and campaign itself was predominately coordinated, the actual tactical execution at times was at the de-conflicted and even conflicted levels due to information interoperability barriers that were not solved during the campaign (a fact that can be said created or added to the demand signal for a NATO Network Enabled Capability). Target selection was a contentious issue all by itself within NATO, and that process which required consensus generally ranged from Conflicted to De-Conflicted.

### **Coordinated Air Planning**

The NATO operational focus for the Air Operation was at the Combined Air Operations Centre in Vincenza, Italy and is where the coordinated air plan would be developed. National representatives

at the centre would act as the liaison between the CAOC and their national headquarters (MOD UK Lessons Learned, 2000, para 6.14).

Throughout Operation Allied Force, NATO maintained effective and efficient control over an intricately layered airspace in what was perhaps the most complex and challenging environment in which combat aircraft have ever operated (DoD Report to Congress, 2000, p. xiv). 78 days of around-the-clock operations and over 38,000 combat sorties against very active Yugoslav integrated air defences (DoD Report to Congress, 2000, p. xvii). NATO command structure allowed the Supreme Allied Commander to employ effectively those assets that the NATO members had committed to the operation. NATO also demonstrated a capability to conduct sustained and effective combined operations on a multinational basis. (DoD Report to Congress, 2000, p. xix). 14 of the 19 NATO nations contributed forces to the operation, with non-U.S. NATO air forces flying 15,000 sorties (39%). NATO nations provided host nation support for basing and over flight access that was critical for all aircraft participating in Operation Allied Force. (DoD Report to Congress, 2000, p. 78). Generally, strikes would start with missile strikes from Naval and Air Force assets simultaneously, and the detailed timing and synchronisation of the manned aircraft behind the missiles. (Clark, 2001, p. 123).

### **De-Conflicted Target Approval Process**

NATO developed mechanisms for delegating target approval authority to military commanders. For selected categories of targets – for example, targets in downtown Belgrade, in Montenegro, or targets likely to involve high collateral damage – NATO reserved approval for higher political authorities. NATO leaders used this mechanism to ensure that member nations were fully cognisant of particularly sensitive military operations, and, thereby, to help sustain the unity of alliance. (DoD Report to Congress, 2000, preface p. xx)

There were criticisms of the graduated approach to the air operations because it did not follow the doctrine of early and heavy strikes against strategic targets. An initial heavy approach was not taken to allow Milosevic to concede after initial strikes which might be precluded by a heavy first strike. Secondly, the launch of a major military campaign was in domestic, legal, and political terms not an easy decision for a number of NATO allies. Concern about public opinion was evident in some countries. A graduated approach to the start of the air operation made it possible to build support for the aims and objectives of NATO's strategy. (MOD UK Lessons Learned, 2000, para 7.4).

As the Air War progressed, the processes of approving targets, striking the targets, reading the results and re-striking were confusing. The original plans had presumed that the SACEUR would have the authority to strike targets within overall categories approved by NATO political leaders, but Washington had introduced a target-by-target approval requirement. The other Allies began to be increasingly demanding, too. It was British law that targets struck by any aircraft based in the UK had to be approved by their lawyers, the French demanded greater insight into the targeting and strikes, and of course there had to be continuing consultation with NATO HQ and with other countries too. (Clark, 2001, p. 224).

The targeting issue was exposing what SACEUR (Gen Clark) came to understand as a fundamental difference within the Alliance on the nature of the campaign. Some were increasingly committed to the idea of strategic strikes, going after the heart of Milosevic's power. Others were more interested

in limiting the strikes to Kosovo, trying to hit the ground forces, and avoiding actions that might antagonise or damage Serbia further (Clark, 2001, p. 237).

### Information Interoperability Confliction

Information interoperability was sometimes a major problem – during both U.S. Joint operations and combined NATO operations. Interoperability concerns were noted both in C4 infrastructure and dissemination (release ability). Dissemination networking and procedures were ad hoc, and it was never possible to present a common operational picture to joint and allied commanders. (DoD report to congress, 2000, p. 41)

The lack of a compatible secure air-to-air communications system with Allies during the air operations caused problems. (MOD UK Lessons Learned, 2000, para 7.42). Some allied aircraft were not equipped with either the crypto devices or keying material to conduct secure communications with other elements of the force. As a result, airborne C2 aircraft and other allied aircraft had to pass information in the clear, severely compromising operations security (DoD Report to Congress, 2000, p. 74).

Air Strikes against Serb forces in Kosovo were further complicated by the continuing humanitarian convoys that were coming in from Greece, initiated by NGOs attempting to alleviate suffering on the ground. These convoys were largely uncoordinated and out of communications. The last thing anyone wanted to do was hit a Greek truck by mistake but they could not be blocked or controlled. They were just another battlefield hazard (Clark, 2001, p. 277).

Maturity of C2 Space During Air War

Collective Purposes, Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Rich, Broad, Tailored and Dynamic	Agile	Maturity of C2 Approach
Collective Purposes	Collective Authority	Continuous or Nearly Continuous Operational	Generalised Operational	Rich and Broad Operational	Collaborative	
Collective Plus Constraints	Selected Collective Authorities	Periodic	Specialised	Constraints Plus	Coordinated	
Collective Constraints Only	Independent with Constraints	Episodic Tactical	Narrowly Focused Tactical	Only About Constraints Tactical	De-Conflicted	
None	Independent	None	No Mechanism	Organic Info Only	Conflicted	
Collective Objectives	Allocation of Authority and Responsibility	Continuity of Interaction	Interaction Mechanism			
Decision Rights		Patterns of Interaction		Information Sharing		

**Collective Objectives:** During the air war, the agreed upon objective was to bomb Serbian targets so that Serbia would cease its ethnic cleansing campaign against the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo and sign an agreement which would allow international oversight of the province. What was not agreed upon, in fact there were often opposing view points, was the nature of targets, their locations, and the pace of the bombings. While there were some targets that were always green to hit, i.e. Serb forces and their equipment involved in action in Kosovo, the majority of strategic

targets which would handicap Serbia more quickly, were subject to an expanded process of consensus from within the NATO countries. The level of Collective Constraints Only best represents the level within Collective Objectives.

**Allocation of Authority and Responsibility:** The level of Selected Collective Authorities best describes the level reached here. There was some adjustment of roles, responsibilities and authorities related to some functions being coordinated, but this was not across the board for all functions – sometimes de-confliction was what was agreed to.

**Continuity of Interaction:** At the strategic and operational level interactions during the Air War was continuous or nearly continuous, although perhaps drawn-out because of the process. These interactions occurred at the NATO Combined Air Operations Centre (CAOC) in Italy. Officers representing their nation would liaison between CAOC and their nation and back to relay national decisions when needed or injected. At the tactical level, Continuity of Interaction was severely disrupted due incompatibility of communication systems.

**Interaction Mechanism:** At the operational level, the interaction mechanisms were generalised in which all relevant parties could participate (in person, teleconference, or videoconference). At the tactical level, systems interoperability problems resulted in the use of the mechanisms to de-conflict—sometimes passing secure information in the open

**Information Sharing:** At the operational level, information sharing is rich and broad, while at the tactical level, systems interoperability problems often reduced information sharing to only about constraints.

## Consequences of C2 Approach during Air War

Broad, Deep, Tailored and Dynamic	Broad, Deep, Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic Planning	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic Interdependence	Tailored and Dynamic Actions	Tailored and Dynamic Synergies	Agile	Maturity of C2 Approach
Broad and Deep <b>Operational</b>	Broad and Deep	Collective Planning	Organic and Non-Organic Assets	Interdependent	Collective Action	Extensive Synergies	Collaborative	
Limited	Limited <b>Operational</b>	Limited Collective Planning	Non-Organic Assets	Very Limited Interdependence	Limited Collective Action	Limited Synergies <b>Operational</b>	Coordinated	
Only About Boundaries <b>Tactical</b>	None <b>Tactical</b>	Independent with Agreed Constraints	None	No Interdependence	Independent with Constraints	Sub-optimised Performance <b>Tactical</b>	De-Conflicted	
None	None	Independent	None	No Interdependence	Independent	Negative Cross-Impacts	Conflicted	
Shared Awareness	Shared Understanding	Planning	Resource Sharing	Interdependence	Actions / Execution	Effectiveness and Efficiency		

As indicated above, the activities at the tactical level, and some at the operational occurred at the lower end of the maturity levels. The effort was effective enough to reach the objectives however. The Serbs were not able to mount a defence against the bombings from the 15,000 ft altitude and higher—their integrated air defences couldn’t effectively engage aircraft operating at that height. At the operational level, the questions revolve around would a different type of targeting strategy caused Serbia to capitulate earlier – or would it of caused a rift so large that it would of caused NATO to disengage as an entity in the conflict. On the tactical level, one has to ask if NATO would have fared so well at the lower levels of the maturity model against an enemy that had more capabilities than the Serbs possessed at the time.

The Consequences of the C2 Approach during the Air Campaign are indicated below, the differences displayed where applicable between the operational level and tactical level.

**Shared Awareness:** At the operational level, Shared Awareness was Broad and Deep. Persistent interactions at the CAOC and at NATO Headquarters enabled this to happen. At the tactical level, Shared Awareness was often only de-conflicted because of system interoperability disconnects.

**Shared Understanding:** At the operational level, because of the need to factor the strategies of the various nations into the planning, Limited Shared Understanding was pre-dominantly achieved. At the tactical level, system interoperability disconnects prevented achieving a level of shared understanding during the mission.

**Planning:** Plans for specific coordinated functions were integrated, however nations did not give up carte blanche planning authority over to NATO, requiring consensus in many of the plans which resulted in Limited Collective Planning.

**Resource Sharing:** During the Air Campaign, there was sharing of resources to include ISTAR products, airfields, and aerial refuelling platforms.



**Interdependence:** There was Very Limited Interdependence in executing the air campaign. While events were coordinated, they were relatively sequential and did not try to take advantage of dynamic re-planning during an event.

**Actions / Execution:** The entities were mutually supportive within the Air Plan, but the actions were pretty much scripted and communication interoperability issues would make it hard for forces from the various nations to work together on ad hoc response to opportunities.

**Effectiveness and Efficiency:** At the operational level, Limited Synergies were achieved by the nature of the coordinated planning and activities. At the tactical level, there was sub-optimised performance due to system interoperability disconnects with communication equipment between the aircraft of various nations.

## **KFOR**

The Kosovo Force (KFOR) was the NATO force that entered Kosovo at the end of the Air War in June 1999 when Serbia signed the Military Technical Agreement which called for the withdrawal of all Serbian military and security forces, and allowed NATO to enter. United Nations Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1244 was the mandate that allowed the UN Secretary General to establish in Kosovo an interim international civilian administration under which the citizens of Kosovo could enjoy substantial autonomy (Wentz, 2002, p. 33). NATO was the entity chosen to establish security, and through UNSCR 1244 the mission of KFOR included:

- Establish and maintain a secure environment in Kosovo, including public safety and order;
- Monitor, verify, and when necessary, enforce compliance with the conditions of the Military Technical Agreement and the United Nations Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) undertaking;
- Provide assistance to UNMIK, including core civil functions until they are transferred to UNMIK.

As to be expanded on later in this paper, NATO forces being purposely charged with general overall security responsibilities until the UN could assume those duties was a significant difference from the Bosnia experience. In Bosnia, there was initially a divide between military and policing duties, with NATO being responsible for military functions while the UN was responsible for police and law enforcement duties.

## **Deliberate Planning**

One of the reasons that KFOR is of interest as a C2 Maturity Model case study is that it involved significant deliberate NATO planning. In 1998 while ongoing diplomatic negotiations were going on in France to resolve the conflict, NATO made preparations for a peacekeeping force with the plans being completed in the Fall of 1998—with the realisation that the plans could only be finalised once the terms of any peace agreement or ceasefire were known (MOD UK Lessons Learned, 2000, para 8.6).

In May 1998, SACEUR (US) held a meeting with Dep SACEUR (UK) and SHAPE COS (GE) to discuss putting NATO troops to sit along the border in Northern Albania. It was to be the start of a full summer and autumn of non-stop planning as the Military Committee was driven by almost unending questions and suggestions from the nations (Clark, 2001, p. 115).

## **Staged Ground Forces De-confliction during Air War**

During the Air War phase, ground commanders did have to plan for Serbian ground incursions into Macedonia or Albania. After the air war started, the NATO ground commander in Macedonia redeployed his forces to establish a screen line in case Yugoslav forces crossed the border to attack in response. The Commander (LTGEN Jackson, UK) was concerned that he had not received operational control of all the forces in the area. The UN preventative force, some 700 soldiers from Scandinavian countries were generally intermingled among NATO units. Jackson reported they were cooperating and coordinating, but it was still a major issue because it meant that passing of orders and coordination of actions were essentially done on a cooperative basis, with various national contingents checking back with their capitals before complying. If Yugoslav forces attacked across the border, the response was likely to be fragmented, and that would mean increased risk for friendly forces (Clark, 2001, p. 197).

Peacekeeping forces staged in Macedonia became the front line providers of urgently needed humanitarian aid when refugees began fleeing Kosovo in mass as a result of Serbian atrocities (MOD UK Lessons Learned, 2000, para 8.9).

## **De-Conflicted C2 by space/geography**

Pre-peacekeeping planning required sectors to be assigned. The British had first choice since they committed the largest force and they wanted the capital Pristina. The Italians and French were flexible; the Germans wanted the southwest sector while the U.S. wanted the southeast sector which controlled the road to Macedonia. The French volunteered for the Northern sector, the most sensitive and tough one since it bordered directly on Serbia proper, while the Italians took the Northwest sector (Clark, 2001, p. 163).

## **Executing the Peacekeeping Plan: Coordination and some Confliction**

Following the negotiation of the Military Technical Agreement, KFOR deployed into Kosovo quickly to mitigate a security vacuum. 20,000 troops (8,000 UK) entered Kosovo on 12 June (MOD UK Lessons Learned, para 8.13).

Russian forces unexpectedly redeployed from Bosnia to Pristina airfield in Kosovo. SACEUR ordered KFOR to block airfield runways to preclude further Russian reinforcements and resupply—KFOR CDR declined to follow the order citing orders from UK national command authority (Clark, 2001, p. 398).

## **KFOR – UNMIK INTERACTIONS**

The U.N. Security Council had learned about coordination issues from the operations in Bosnia, and directed the Secretary General in paragraph six of UNSCR 1244 “to instruct his Special Representative to coordinate closely with the international security presence to ensure that both presences operate towards the same goals and in a mutually supportive manner” (Wentz, 2002, p. 213).

## **Example of Conflicted Operations Lessons Learned from Bosnia**

In Bosnia the Dayton agreement delineated the military role with exquisite specificity; the role of the civilian custodian was little more than a sketchy afterthought. More important, one finds in the

Dayton peace agreement only a single mention of coordination between the civilian and military components. Moreover the coordination was not mandatory – effectively the military could decide whether it wished to attempt any coordination at all. As a result, senior civilian and military leaders rarely shared information or plans, let alone coordinated their operations. This obvious gap was intentional, designed by the Pentagon to ensure the success of the military mission would not in any important way depend on the performance of the civilian mission. Success for the U.S. military was initially defined as the exit of U.S. forces within one year. By insulating itself so effectively from the civilian component, however, the military ensured the failure of both (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 81).

In Bosnia for 18 months no IFOR/SFOR organisation tried to control the Serb Ministerial Special Police (an entity which had been at the center of Serbian ethnic cleansing efforts). NATO military leaders insisted they were police (and therefore not the military's responsibility), while the international civilians insisting it was beyond their means to monitor them (Clark, 2001, p. 79).

### **Pre-disposition for UN / NATO Coordination and Collaboration in Kosovo**

By the time of the Kosovo mission, the Security Council recognised the consequences of disconnected military and civilian operations. As a result, the council directed that these components coordinate closely in Kosovo and work toward shared goals in a mutually supportive manner. The good personal chemistry between SRSG Bernard Kouchner and Gen Michael Jackson was a major asset, but it was even more important that the two approached their work with similar visions of this critical relationship (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 81).

The British Military was adept at joint military-police operations. UN police planners had a different model in mind, but they quickly agreed to the British approach, both as a practical matter and to bolster confidence in the joint approach to secure Kosovo's environment. The climate of recrimination that was such a burden in Bosnia never developed in Kosovo. From the custodian's perspective, this tight UNMIK-KFOR partnership formed at the outset gave the mission substantially more power to influence Kosovo's transformation (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 87).

In short, the senior-level civil-military relationships started off much stronger in Kosovo than those relationships at the beginning of the Bosnian operations (Wentz, 2002, p. 695).

### **Collaborative Planning**

Senior Representative of the U.N. Secretary General and COMKFOR worked very closely together and met daily. Their staffs worked together very closely, enabled by the co-location of some KFOR CIMIC staff at UNMIK HQ in Pristina. UNMIK liaisons were placed at MNB HQs to facilitate exchange of information (Wentz, 2002, p. 695).

Meeting daily, the Senior Representative of the U.N. Secretary General (SRSG) and COMKFOR built an atmosphere of trust and friendship that smoothed over many of the coordination issues that emerged during the air campaign and the initial intervention on the ground (Wentz, 2002, p. 225).

UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1244 authorised an international security presence (KFOR) and an international civil presence (UNMIK) within Kosovo. Specifically enumerated

within UNSCR 1244 was KFOR's responsibility for "ensuring public safety and order until the international civil presence could take responsibility for this task (Wentz, 2002, p. 237).

Initially, KFOR had to impose order, as it took UNMIK a better part of a year for UNMIK to deploy an international police force to carry out its executive policing functions (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 248). The order to enforce basic law and order resulted in KFOR soldiers becoming the police force of KFOR in order to fill the existing law enforcement gap (Wentz, 2002, p. 248).

The primacy of the peace process should be the overarching guidance for all civilian and military peace implementation efforts. In Kosovo, this guidance was expressed as a paramount mission directive: "we support those who support the peace process and actively oppose those who obstruct it" (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 16).

SRSG Kouchner and KFOR CDR Jackson instituted a "joint planning structure" that proved to be critical for "weaving the strands of the rope" and melding civilian and military activities for the common purpose of advancing the peace process. UNMIKs political directors relied on KFORs time-driven and sequenced operational strategy development process. Some of the joint planning served to cement better civil-military integration in planning for UNMIKs broader priorities. On specific security operations, the joint planning structure became completely fused. In these cases UNMIK civilian planners worked side by side with KFOR military planners as part of the operational planning cycle (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 260).

To promote the integration of military and police activities, KFOR and UNMIK established the Joint Security Executive Committee (JSEC), normally chaired by the principal deputy SRSG and KFOR Chief of Staff, or when warranted by the SRSG and KFOR Commander. By May 2000, the JSEC had agreed on a series of core principals:

- Joint Operations rooms
- Joint Planning groups
- Joint Patrols
- Intelligence sharing (this was slow to develop and a challenge within KFOR due to its multinational composition—sensitivity to intelligence) (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 262).

### **Coordinated and Collaborative Operations**

KFOR and UNMIK officials conducted joint military and police planning to strike judiciously as militant extremists as conditions permitted. Over time, striking included a range of operations, including "cordon and search" to seize arms and illegal materials, targeted arrests, confiscation of illicit financial resources, interdiction of smuggling, disruption of training bases, and dislocation of communications. These strike operations were carefully focused, using the most appropriate security element available. In several situations, the Multinational Specialised Unit (MSU), which belonged to KFOR, and the Special Police Units (SPUs), which belonged to UNMIK, were employed to leverage their unique capabilities for these types of operations (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 144).

Effective integrated planning was essential to the successful seizure of a dangerously polluting Serb-operated lead smelter in Aug 2000. Belgrade effectively controlled the smelter and its operations subsidised hard-line Serbs while enraging the ethnic Albanian population. UNMIK and KFOR planners met to clarify the issues at stake, beginning with interests and aims. For various legal and political reasons, the French, who commanded that sector, built their rationale on the pollution issue. Nominally, the French aim was to shut down the lead smelter because its continued operation posed an unacceptable health risk. At the same time, UNMIK envisioned a larger strategy of asserting UN authority over territory north of Mitrovica. The differing aims converged in an integrated civilian-military plan that would close the plant in the short run, eliminating further pollution, while in the longer run also offering inducements to the Serb workforce in the plant cooperate with UNMIK in cleaning up the toxic environment. In addition, to ensure Belgrade could not retaliate for seizure of the plant, the integrated plan called for extensive security operations that would effectively assert a far greater degree of international authority throughout the North (of Kosovo). Every aspect of the joint UNMIK-KFOR plan was tested against a simple standard: *Does it support the larger strategy?* (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 83).

### ***The KFOR Press Statement of 14 August 2000***

COMKFOR's Zvecan Smelter Plant Closure Statement:

At 04:00 am today, KFOR troops assisted UNMIK and UNMIK-Police in taking responsibility of the Zvecan Smelter Plant.

The plant management disregarded the acute health problems stemming from the factory, they disregarded the best interests of the workers and they refused to co-operate with UNMIK. UNMIK therefore asked KFOR to assist it to assume responsibility for the plant. I have deployed the necessary assets to help UNMIK by providing security for this and to minimise any possibility of confrontation.

These assets, drawn from across KFOR, represent both the multi-national nature of my command and our determination on this issue. They are working under General Sublet's command to provide security in Zvecan.

As Dr Kouchner just explained, the Plant has been producing unacceptable levels of pollution and presents a serious threat to public health.

Six weeks after the smelting operations resumed in June, blood testing of KFOR soldiers revealed dramatically increased lead levels. Although KFOR troops return home after their tour of duty, and may therefore suffer less from the long-term affects of the pollution than the workforce and the local communities, it is clear to me that the levels of lead in the air and soil are a clear hazard to the health of everybody exposed to them.

This threat to my soldiers and to your communities is unacceptable. The Zvecan Plant cannot be allowed to continue to risk the health of people working in it or living around it.

Let me stress what Dr Kouchner said, UNMIK assumed responsibility for the smelter in order to rehabilitate it. That, of necessity, requires that it be temporarily closed down in order to allow a detailed technical assessment to be carried out. KFOR will ensure that this process can be carried out safely.

The International Community is well aware of the value of the Trepca complex for the people of Kosovo. UNMIK's intention is to revive the whole Trepca Complex, including the Zvecan Smelter Plant, once health and safety concerns have been addressed. This will allow the workforce and their families and the local communities to enjoy better working conditions and an economically viable future. KFOR will continue to ensure that the work necessary to address the years of neglect and mismanagement can be carried out in safety.

We, the International Community are taking these steps to address years of pollution and lack of environmental control that have already had a direct impact on the local environment - This must stop. Your future and your children's' future depend on our action now.

To support UNMIK's efforts, KFOR has taken and will continue to take all necessary steps to ensure a safe and secure environment. We will ensure the safety of the international and local personnel operating in the Plant. They are working for the benefit of the workforce and the local communities.

KFOR will not tolerate any civil unrest and is prepared to react to any disturbance - This work is vital for the future of Kosovo. I look to all Kosovar-leaders to support us and to work with us in our joint efforts to re-establish a sound economic base and revitalise the Trepca complex.

My message is simple. KFOR will continue to provide a safe and secure environment for all in Kosovo. Our intention is to bring Trepca back to life and back to the people of Kosovo. We will continue to work with all communities for a better future. The future lies in cooperation not confrontation.

NNEC C2 Maturity Model Levels: KFOR – UNMIK Interactions

Collective Purposes, Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Rich, Broad, Tailored and Dynamic	Agile	Maturity of C2 Approach
Collective Purposes	Collective Authority	Continuous or Nearly Continuous	Generalised	Rich and Broad	Collaborative	
Collective Plus Constraints	Selected Collective Authorities	Periodic	Specialised	Constraints Plus	Coordinated	
Collective Constraints Only	Independent with Constraints	Episodic	Narrowly Focused	Only About Constraints	De-Conflicted	
None	Independent	None	No Mechanism	Organic Info Only	Conflicted	
Collective Objectives	Allocation of Authority and Responsibility	Continuity of Interaction	Interaction Mechanism	Information Sharing		
Decision Rights		Patterns of Interaction				

**Collective Objectives:** A close relationship between UNMIK and KFOR was recognised as critical from the start. In fact, the UN Secretary General in paragraph six of UNSCR 1244 was asked “to instruct his Special Representative to coordinate closely with the international security presence to ensure that both presences operate towards the same goals and in a mutually supportive manner” (Lessons from KFOR, p. 213). Senior Representative of the U.N. Secretary General and COMKFOR worked very closely together and met daily. Their staffs worked together very closely, enabled by the co-location of some KFOR CIMIC staff at UNMIK HQ in Pristina. UNMIK liaisons were placed at MNB HQs to facilitate exchange of information (Lessons from KFOR, p. 695). It appeared nearly from the start, KFOR and UNMIK were collaborating at the level of Collective Purposes.

**Allocation of Authority and Responsibility:** While UNMIK was forming and developing the police force, KFOR assumed all security responsibilities to make sure there were no gaps. The indicators are that the level of Collective Authority best describes the level reached here.

**Continuity of Interaction:** As described above, for certain security operations, the joint planning became completely fused. They were able to interact closely whenever required. Indicators are the level of Continuous or Nearly Continuous was reached here.

**Interaction Mechanism:** Indications are that the level of Generalised was reached here. Senior Representative of the U.N. Secretary General and COMKFOR worked very closely together and met daily. Their staffs worked together very closely, enabled by the co-location of some KFOR CIMIC staff at UNMIK HQ in Pristina.

**Information Sharing:** General unclassified information sharing was robust with joint planning and joint operations. Technically there was a problem with Intelligence product sharing which was an

issue (this was slow to develop, was a challenge within KFOR due to its multinational composition—sensitivity to intelligence). All in all, the evidence points to Rich and Broad information sharing. Even if classified documents were not freely shared, the information contained therein was likely shared within the robust joint interactions. Additionally, a lot of the actionable information likely came from manifestations within the area, not from individual national intelligence organisations outside the area.

Consequences of C2 Approach: KFOR – UNMIK Interactions

Broad, Deep, Tailored and Dynamic	Broad, Deep, Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic Planning	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic Interdependence	Tailored and Dynamic Actions	Tailored and Dynamic Synergies	Agile	Maturity of C2 Approach
Broad and Deep	Broad and Deep	Collective Planning	Organic and Non-Organic Assets	Interdependent	Collective Action	Extensive Synergies	Collaborative	
Limited	Limited	Limited Collective Planning	Non-Organic Assets	Very Limited Interdependence	Limited Collective Action	Limited Synergies	Coordinated	
Only About Boundaries	None	Independent with Agreed Constraints	None	No Interdependence	Independent with Constraints	Sub-optimised Performance	De-Conflicted	
None	None	Independent	None	No Interdependence	Independent	Negative Cross-Impacts	Conflicted	
Shared Awareness	Shared Understanding	Planning	Resource Sharing	Interdependence	Actions / Execution	Effectiveness and Efficiency		

The interactions between KFOR and UNMIK were the most intertwined and mature of any of the inter-organisational relationships during the KFOR war. The close relationships started at the very top and continued down through all levels of the organisations. The result was more effective results in the field, much better than what had first been achieved on the ground in Bosnia.

**Shared Awareness:** UNMIKs political directors relied on KFORs time-driven and sequenced operational strategy development process. Indications are that shared awareness reached the Broad and Deep level.

**Shared Understanding:** The close, strong working relationships also enabled a shared understanding that indicated achievement of the Broad and Deep level. To promote the integration of military and police activities, KFOR and UNMIK established the Joint Security Executive Committee (JSEC), normally chaired by the principal deputy SRSG and KFOR Chief of Staff, or when warranted by the SRSG and KFOR Commander.

**Planning:** On specific security operations, the joint planning structure became nearly fused. In these cases UNMIK civilian planners worked side by side with KFOR military planners as part of the operational planning cycle. (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, p. 260). Indications are the level of Collective Planning was achieved.

**Resource Sharing:** KFOR and UNMIK officials conducted joint military and police planning to strike judiciously at militant extremists as conditions permitted. These strike operations were carefully focused, using the most appropriate security element available. In several situations, the



Multinational Specialised Unit (MSU), which belonged to KFOR, and the Special Police Units (SPUs), which belonged to UNMIK, were employed to leverage their unique capabilities for these types of operations (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, p. 144). Indications are the Resource Sharing reached was at the organic and non-organic level.

**Interdependence:** Initially, KFOR had to impose order, as it took UNMIK a better part of a year for UNMIK to deploy an international police force to carry out its executive policing functions (Quest for Viable Peace, p. 248). The order to enforce basic law and order resulted in KFOR soldiers becoming the police force of KFOR in order to fill the existing law enforcement gap (Wentz, 2002, p. 248). Indications are the level of Interdependent was reached.

**Actions / Execution:** These strike operations were carefully focused, using the most appropriate security element available. In several situations, the Multinational Specialised Unit (MSU), which belonged to KFOR, and the Special Police Units (SPUs), which belonged to UNMIK, were employed to leverage their unique capabilities for these types of operations (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, p. 144). Indications are the level of Collective Action was achieved.

**Effectiveness and Efficiency:** Close interactions did promote effectiveness and efficiency. Effective integrated planning was essential to the successful seizure of a dangerously polluting Serb-operated lead smelter in Aug 2000. Belgrade effectively controlled the smelter and its operations subsidised hard-line Serbs while enraging the ethnic Albanian population. UNMIK and KFOR planners met to clarify the issues at stake, beginning with interests and aims. Indications are the level of Extensive Synergies was achieved in resolving the issue.

## **KFOR HQ – SECTOR MULTINATIONAL BRIGADES HQS INTERACTIONS**

While the KFOR HQ and UNMIK were predisposed to coordinate and collaborate from their terms of reference, the KFOR HQ and MNB interactions were primarily designed to be De-Conflicted to Coordinated from the start. Per familiar NATO strategy, the operational area (Kosovo) was segregated into geographic sectors. As previously indicated, the sectors were initially set up as follows:

- MNB Central (collocated with KFOR HQ) – UK lead
- MNB Southwest – German lead
- MNB Southeast – U.S. lead
- MNB North – French lead
- MNB Northwest – Italian lead

Pre-peacekeeping planning required sectors to be assigned. The British had first choice since they committed the largest force, and they wanted the capital Pristina. The Italians and French were flexible; the Germans wanted the southwest sector while the U.S. wanted the southeast sector which controlled the road to Macedonia. The French volunteered for the Northern sector, the most sensitive and tough one since it bordered directly on Serbia proper, while the Italians took the Northwest sector (Wentz, 2002, p. 163).

While there was close coordination between KFOR HQ and UNMIK HQ, there was varying degrees of coordination or not between UNMIK police and Multinational Brigade Commanders in their AOR. Because there were fundamental differences in how the various militaries saw policing

duties and varied fundamentally differently across the five Multinational Brigades, with each military contingent responding to directions from their capitals, UNMIK police had to develop five unique solutions for collaboration with KFOR in the field (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 261).

KFOR HQ was responsible for coordination and synchronisation of MNB activities, but a plan and process for doing this was lacking. KFOR efforts were focused more on collaboration and cooperation with UNMIK. KFOR provided liaisons to UNMIK, and UNMIK provided liaisons to the MNB HQs. There were no liaisons exchanged between the five MNB HQs, and this served to make cross-MNB leveraging that much more difficult (Wentz, 2002, p. 694).

The early COMKFOR leadership established frequent and close direct ties with the MNB commanders, with whom they met weekly. With the transition of KFOR leadership, direct ties seemed to occur less frequently, and were more often at the deputy COMKFOR levels. The COMKFOR focus turned to UNMIK, OSCE, and other political bodies (Wentz, 2002, p. 695).

Initially allowing troop-contributing nations to apply familiar law and procedures served to reduce start-up delays that would have inevitably resulted from any attempt to promulgate a centrally run policing process. Even though detainees in the Italian AOR received Italian Process while detainees in the U.S. sector received American Process, it was KFOR’s belief that dealing with the issue of arrest and detention under the general legal framework of each troop-contributing nation was the only possible way to address the initial law enforcement gap (Wentz, 2002, p. 248).

Maturity of C2 Space: KFOR – Multi-National Brigade Sectors Interactions

Collective Purposes, Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Rich, Broad, Tailored and Dynamic	Agile	Maturity of C2 Approach
Collective Purposes	Collective Authority	Continuous or Nearly Continuous	Generalised	Rich and Broad	Collaborative	
Collective Plus Constraints	Selected Collective Authorities	Periodic	Specialised	Constraints Plus	Coordinated	
Collective Constraints Only	Independent with Constraints	Episodic	Narrowly Focused	Only About Constraints	De-Conflicted	
None	Independent	None	No Mechanism	Organic Info Only	Conflicted	
Collective Objectives	Allocation of Authority and Responsibility	Continuity of Interaction	Interaction Mechanism	Information Sharing		
Decision Rights		Patterns of Interaction				

**Collective Objectives:** The level reached was Collective plus Constraints. There was agreement on broad purposes. The mission space was separated by geography. There was agreement of specific objectives for selected tasks, such as the shutting down of the Smelter plant in the French Sector, but primarily each lead country for the Multi-National Brigade Sectors independently operated within their sector according to their National procedures, which varied from sector to sector.

**Allocation of Authority and Responsibility:** The level was Independent with Constraints. KFOR could not prescribe how operations within each sector would be accomplished. Each MNB Cdr operated largely in accordance with the doctrine of their own country. If a MNB did not concur with a course of action prescribed by KFOR, the MNB Cdr could confer with decision makers back in the home country and decline to carry out a course of action.

**Continuity of Interaction:** KFOR HQ was responsible for coordination and synchronisation of MNB activities, but a plan and process for doing this was lacking. There were no liaisons exchanged between the five MNB HQs, and this served to make cross-MNB leveraging that much more difficult (Wentz, 2002, p. 694). The Patterns of Interaction were Episodic.

**Interaction Mechanism:** The predominant level here was Specialised. The interactions were “pair-wise” rather than multi-connected. KFOR did not place as much emphasis with coordinating with the MNBs, perhaps because of the framework that the nation leads for each MNB was designated and expected to manage the situation in their own area without much outside assistance.

**Information Sharing:** The predominant level reached was only about Constraints. Information shared related to those functions, and the geographic and or temporal constraints accepted.

Consequences of C2 Approach: KFOR – Multi-National Brigade Sectors Interactions

Broad, Deep, Tailored and Dynamic	Broad, Deep, Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic Planning	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic Interdependence	Tailored and Dynamic Actions	Tailored and Dynamic Synergies	Agile	Maturity of C2 Approach
Broad and Deep	Broad and Deep	Collective Planning	Organic and Non-Organic Assets	Interdependent	Collective Action	Extensive Synergies	Collaborative	
Limited	Limited	Limited Collective Planning	Non-Organic Assets	Very Limited Interdependence	Limited Collective Action	Limited Synergies	Coordinated	
Only About Boundaries	None	Independent with Agreed Constraints	None	No Interdependence	Independent with Constraints	Sub-optimised Performance	De-Conflicted	
None	None	Independent	None	No Interdependence	Independent	Negative Cross-Impacts	Conflicted	
Shared Awareness	Shared Understanding	Planning	Resource Sharing	Interdependence	Actions / Execution	Effectiveness and Efficiency		

The five Multi-National Brigade Sectors were established under the premise that the lead nation for each sector would establish security operations primarily using their own doctrines and procedures as that is what they were most familiar with. KFOR was not designed to drive centralised or necessarily standardised Command and Control over the MNBs. In general, the relationship was consultive to de-conflict and occasionally coordinate. As a result, there were significant differences in strategies and actions within the various sectors.

**Shared Awareness:** There were no liaisons exchanged between the five MNB HQs, and this served to make cross-MNB leveraging that much more difficult (Wentz, 2002, p. 694).

Initially there were weekly meetings between KFOR and the MNB Cdrs, but these gradually became less frequent and at lower levels. The Shared Awareness perhaps reached the lower end of the Limited level.

**Shared Understanding:** This would only reach the Limited level. Other than understanding the limited functions where they were working together, they shared awareness of the boundaries and operating environment at those boundaries.

**Planning:** KFOR HQ was responsible for coordination and synchronisation of MNB activities, but a plan and process for doing this was lacking (Wentz, 2002, p. 694). Planning was at Independent with Agreed Constraints level.

**Resource Sharing:** Each sector was separated by geography and the lead Nation in each sector was responsible for the resources required. Resource sharing was at the De-Conflicted level.

**Interdependence:** The level reached was Very Limited Interdependence. Dependencies and interdependencies were created in the limited coordinated endeavours, but absent in other arenas.

**Actions / Execution:** The level reached was Independent with Constraints. Because there were fundamental differences in how the various militaries saw policing duties and varied fundamentally differently across the five Multinational Brigades, with each military contingent responding to directions from their capitals, UNMIK police had to develop five unique solutions for collaboration with KFOR in the field (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 261).

**Effectiveness and Efficiency:** Sub-optimised performance. Each MNB was focused on optimising its own performance, which means that the endeavour as a whole was sub-optimised by definition. No real opportunities exist for synergy.

## **KFOR – HUMANITARIAN / NGO INTERACTIONS**

Not surprisingly, interactions between KFOR and humanitarian agencies and non-government organisations ranged from conflicted up to coordinated. Although there was significant confliction in efforts, unquestionably thousands of lives were saved by efforts of many dedicated and tireless efforts, both of those and uniform and those serving charity organisations. The question in retrospect is how much more efficiently and effectively could it have been accomplished.

Operation Sustain Hope prevented mass starvation and homelessness among the estimated 850,000 Kosovars who fled to Albania and Macedonia after Serbian forces stepped up their “ethnic cleansing” prior to and during air war (DoD report to congress, 2000, p.103).

### **Conflicted Efforts**

During the air war, the UNHCR and the international humanitarian community in general were unprepared and initially overwhelmed by the enormous numbers of refugees generated by Serbian acts during the air war. The UNCHR was troubled during this period because of uncoordinated bilateral efforts carried out by various NATO coalition members and competition by other international agencies ... causing great confusion and considerable waste (Wentz, 2002, p. 215).

During the Kosovo operation, the US CINC designated the JTF commander who in turn designated the deployed Marine Air Ground Task Force to act as Humanitarian Assessment Team and provide an assessment of the humanitarian conditions in Albania in Macedonia. As a result, the team had little familiarity with embassy personnel, the CINC staff, or the Disaster Assistance Response Team. Moreover, the U.S. Ambassador in Albania did not have a good understanding of the assessment team's role. The consequent lack of coordination and cooperation resulted in the departure of the assessment team before it had completed its mission (DoD Report to Congress, 2000, p. 106).

The competition among military units, and between the military and the international humanitarian community to demonstrate their capabilities to bestow largess on the victims of the Kosovo Civil War provided displays of uncoordinated national and organisational chauvinism that has few equals in the history of multilateral humanitarian operations (Wentz, 2002, p. 231).

As mentioned previously, air strikes against Serb forces in Kosovo were further complicated by the continuing humanitarian convoys that were coming in from Greece, initiated by NGOs attempting to alleviate suffering on the ground. These convoys were largely uncoordinated and out of communications. The last thing anyone wanted to do was hit a Greek truck by mistake but they could not be blocked or controlled. They were just another battlefield hazard (Wentz, 2002, p. 277).

Coordination of humanitarian operations was generally good among NATO allies (and Partnership for Peace members). However, coordination between U.S. Government Agencies was somewhat rough at the beginning of the operation. As a result of this initially shaky coordination, things that could have improved the humanitarian operation were sometimes overlooked. For example, DoD humanitarian assessments and those carried out by US AID should be combined or at least more closely coordinated (DoD Report to Congress, 2000, p. 105).

In Kosovo, many agencies, organisations, and NATO in particular, brought with them so many resources that information sharing and coordination was not viewed as an urgent requirement. Much waste could have been eliminated from the outset had there been a functioning information sharing mechanism, especially one that conveyed to the international community which organisations and agencies had competencies in which sectors (Wentz, 2002, p. 652).

Members of the multinational NATO alliance and their partners each responded to the refugee disaster according to their own means and preferences, creating an image of competition within the military and with the international humanitarian specialists. This response was dysfunctional and wasteful, and could have complicated the achievement of the overall humanitarian and military objectives (Wentz, 2002, p. 211).

### **De-confliction to Coordination**

As Operation Allied Force progressed, coordination improved. In Albania, the established of an Emergency Management Group helped effectively harness the resources of international organisations, non-governmental organisations, and donor countries, while preserving overall host nation sovereignty (DoD Report to Congress, 2000, p. 105).

The UNHCR was responsible for coordinating the international response to humanitarian crisis in the region, and good working links were established by both NATO and the UK with the UNHCR

at the HQ level. The UNCHR was initially overwhelmed by the sheer scale of the crisis, but the UK and the Allies and partners did what could be done to assist. The UK seconded military planners to UNCHR to help in their efforts. Contacts with NGOs were conducted in part through UNCHR and partly bilaterally in the UK and in theater (MOD UK Lessons Learned, 2000, para 5.30).

In anticipation of the end of the Air War, the international community began in late spring of 1999 to plan for the eventual repatriation of over 750,000 refugees to the severely damaged province. The Kosovo Repatriation Information Support (KRIS) program commenced and again was largely driven by the State Department in cooperation with UNCHR as well as the NGO community. Goals were threefold:

- To identify sources and availability of US Govt-supplied information relevant for safe repatriation of Kosovo refugees.
- To build information management tools that allow repatriation managers to... use multiple sources of data for strategic planning and tactical operations
- To ensure that as much useful information was shared with NATO, UN and NGO agencies involved in repatriation implementation.

The spontaneous return of refugees at the end of the air war foiled this plan, but the effort was incorporated into the Humanitarian Community Information Center.

Maturity of C2 Space: KFOR – Humanitarian / NGO Interactions

Collective Purposes, Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Rich, Broad, Tailored and Dynamic	Agile	Maturity of C2 Approach
Collective Purposes	Collective Authority	Continuous or Nearly Continuous	Generalised	Rich and Broad	Collaborative	
Collective Plus Constraints	Selected Collective Authorities	Periodic	Specialised	Constraints Plus	Coordinated	
Collective Constraints Only	Independent with Constraints	Episodic	Narrowly Focused	Only About Constraints	De-Conflicted	
None	Independent	None	No Mechanism	Organic Info Only	Conflicted	
Collective Objectives	Allocation of Authority and Responsibility	Continuity of Interaction	Interaction Mechanism			
Decision Rights		Patterns of Interaction		Information Sharing		

**Collective Objectives:** With the exception of each entity wanting to be helpful and relieve suffering, there was no agreed upon framework to achieve that.

**Allocation of Authority and Responsibility:** Decision making by the participating entities was at the Independent level.

**Continuity of Interaction:** The Patterns of Interaction were Episodic at best.

**Interaction Mechanism:** The Interaction Mechanism was narrowly focused. The entities were operating across the same environment and were not hostile to each other; they were able to interact when the opportunity presented itself and they wanted to.

**Information Sharing:** Although there were steps taken to improve information sharing as time went on (not all that successful), the entities generally relied on their own organic information

Consequences of C2 Approach: KFOR – Humanitarian / NGO Interactions

Broad, Deep, Tailored and Dynamic	Broad, Deep, Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic Planning	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic Interdependence	Tailored and Dynamic Actions	Tailored and Dynamic Synergies	Agile	Maturity of C2 Approach
Broad and Deep	Broad and Deep	Collective Planning	Organic and Non-Organic Assets	Interdependent	Collective Action	Extensive Synergies	Collaborative	
Limited	Limited	Limited Collective Planning	Non-Organic Assets	Very Limited Interdependence	Limited Collective Action	Limited Synergies	Coordinated	
Only About Boundaries	None	Independent with Agreed Constraints	None	No Interdependence	Independent with Constraints	Sub-optimised Performance	De-Conflicted	
None	None	Independent	None	No Interdependence	Independent	Negative Cross-Impact	Conflicted	
Shared Awareness	Shared Understanding	Planning	Resource Sharing	Interdependence	Actions / Execution	Effectiveness and Efficiency		

**Shared Awareness:** The level of Shared Awareness was none. Each entity concentrated on relieving suffering without an awareness of what other efforts were going on.

**Shared Understanding:** There was no Shared Understanding of individual entity strategies.

**Planning:** Planning was Independent. Each entity did what they thought was best.

**Resource Sharing:** Resource Sharing was at the Non-organic assets already in the environment such as non-organic assets such as roads and bridges.

**Interdependence:** There was Very Limited Interdependence. The humanitarian organisations did rely on NATO to provide a safe as possible environment to operate in.

**Actions / Execution:** The Independent with Constraints level was reached. The entities generally de-conflicted themselves with regards to geography.

**Effectiveness and Efficiency:** Sub-optimised performance. Each entity was focused on optimising its own performance, which means that the endeavour as a whole was sub-optimised by definition. No real opportunities exist for synergy.

**SUMMARY**

The KFOR experience did indeed provide a rich resource to study Command and Control, or Focus and Convergence per the term coined to more correctly label the realities of interactions within the multi-organisational operational arena (Alberts, 2007). The dynamics involved were well suited to

study the variables that impact the NNEC C2 Maturity Model. Within the complex Kosovo Theater of Operations, there were distinct endeavours that had their own identifiable range and nature of interactions. The four different arenas looked at were:

- Kosovo Air Campaign
- KFOR – UNMIK Interactions
- KFOR – Cdr MNB Sectors Interactions
- KFOR – Humanitarian / NGO Interactions

Clearly the KFOR – UNMIK relationship reached the most mature level of interactions, as well as producing the highest levels of synergies and efficient positive consequences. It is hard to imagine 2 distinct organisations, which had no real authority over each other, working more closely and synergistically than what KFOR and UNMIK did.

The operational level of the Air Campaign was the next most mature level of interactions, reaching the coordination and collaboration levels. However, the tactical coordination between the aircraft was at the lower maturity levels due to equipment interoperability problems. The interactions amongst the MNB Sectors and with KFOR were by design primarily de-conflicted. And finally the relatively uncoordinated Humanitarian / NGO interactions clearly showed that there was plenty of room for improvement in coordinating those efforts.



## **CONTRASTING NATO – UN SECURITY INTERACTIONS IN BOSNIA WITH THOSE IN KOSOVO**

In compiling a case study on the types of interactions between the various actors involved in implementing UNSCR 1244 for Kosovo – one thing became clear, Kosovo started off differently than Bosnia. In particular, there was significant evidence that the interactions in Kosovo between the NATO Headquarters on the ground and the UN Mission on the ground started off in 1999 much more effectively and coherently than between the similar organisations in Bosnia in 1995 and 1996. The following excerpt relates to that:

*The senior-level civil-military relationships started off much stronger in Kosovo than those relationships at the beginning of the Bosnian operations. (Wentz, 2001, p. 695)*

Enclosure (1) documents the general levels and effectiveness of the interactions between KFOR and the UN Mission in Kosovo regarding an integrated military / civil police strategy. What this paper will do is examine references on how the military / civil police were initiated in Bosnia and Herzegovina by the Dayton Peace Agreement to determine why they were recognised as being executed in a less optimal manner.

### **DAYTON AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION IN BOSNIA, DECEMBER 1995**

*In Bosnia the Dayton agreement delineated the military role with exquisite specificity; the role of the civilian custodian was little more than a sketchy afterthought. More important, one finds in the Dayton peace agreement only a single mention of coordination between the civilian and military components. Moreover the coordination was not mandatory – effectively the military could decide whether it wished to attempt any coordination at all. As a result, senior civilian and military leaders rarely shared information or plans, let alone coordinated their operations (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006,, p. 81).*

The authors of the paragraph above went on to surmise that the divide between the military and civilian efforts was intentional, designed by military planners, the U.S. in particular, to ensure the success of the military mission would not in any important way depend on the performance of the civilian mission. The net effect though was to hamper both efforts.

The following excerpt came from a weekly newsletter from the Balkan Institute; it is dated January 9, 1996 which is less than 3 weeks after implementation of the Dayton agreement:

*The Bosnian government announced Friday that Bosnian Serb forces continue to hold at least four civilians seized while travelling through occupied sections of Sarajevo. Sixteen captives were released Thursday. Several had been severely beaten in custody. Some reported that, while they were being beaten on the roadside, IFOR vehicles had passed by without taking action. IFOR had declared routes through Serb-occupied territory to be safe and encouraged their use. IFOR increased patrols through Serb-held Sarajevo Thursday, but NATO officials continued to insist that the protection of civilians was*

*primarily a matter for Bosnian Serb and other police. NATO officials and Secretary of Defence William Perry also said that civilian security would be handled by the U.N. International Police Task Force (IPTF) rather than IFOR. The Dayton Accords, however, authorise the IPTF only to monitor and, on request, train local police forces. The IPTF possesses considerably less authority to protect civilians than IFOR. The force's expected 1500 personnel will not be fully deployed for at least several weeks (Balkan Watch, p.1).*

The reference above confirms that the initial intention of IFOR was not to get involved in anything that they considered to be under the purview of IPTF. One of the many problems that continued because of this self-imposed separation of responsibility was that Serb paramilitaries were not held in check as this reference below indicates:

*For 18 months no IFOR/SFOR organisation tried to control the Serb Ministerial Special Police (an entity which had been at the centre of Serbian ethnic cleansing efforts). NATO military leaders insisted they were police (and therefore not the military's responsibility), while the international civilians insisting it was beyond their means to monitor them (Clark, 2001, p. 79).*

*The IPTF's initial role as a monitor resulted in a reliance on IFOR as a source of military backup in the absence of other sources of international leverage. IFOR's response was to deny that they were the '911' for IPTF emergencies, but after several months the "inevitability of this role was acknowledged" (SFOR Lessons Learned, 2000, p. 37).*

## **DIFFERENT CHAINS OF COMMAND**

It is important to note that that IFOR and IPTF had separate chains of command; IFOR to NATO Headquarters and IPTF to the UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina (In Kosovo there were similar distinct and separate chains of commands, albeit ones that worked together much better):

*IFOR and IPTF were divided from each other organisationally with the IPTF, with the IPTF falling under the UNMIBH. Yet a fourth actor, the Office of High Representative (OHR), was delegated a coordinating role by the General Framework for Peace (GFAP), but without authority over either organisation. The IPT Commissioner was simply directed to consult with the High Representative (HR). Responsibility for organising the pivotal national elections, moreover, was assigned to the Organisation for Security and Co-Operation in Europe (OSCE), which itself regularly spoke with contradictory voices. During the first crucial months, the HR made no effort to promote coordination among the various civilian entities by convening regular meetings of the "principals" or heads of the other key international organisations operating in Bosnia. Only after the mission was well underway was the HR ultimately prodded into conducting weekly "Principal Meetings" to bring coherence to the peace operation (Wentz, 1998, p. 141).*

## **IPTF DEPLOYMENT DISORGANISED**

While IFOR was able to deploy into Bosnia commencing in December 1995 with the expected military efficiency, the deployment of the IPTF was significantly slower and caused them to be always playing catch-up despite significant early milestone responsibilities in the endeavour.

*On December 24, 1995 UN SECGEN invited UN member states to contribute to IPTF. 40 countries responded and first contingent began to deploy a month later. IPTF was authorised 1,721 monitors, did not approach full strength until August 96. Although speaking English was a requirement, lack of English skills of members in first contingent hampered communication amongst members (Wentz, 1998, p. 142).*

The IPTF leadership itself was slow to be put in place:

Little of IPTF organisation was in place by Feb 96. The IPTF Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner, Chief of Staff, and Chief of Operations had been appointed but not yet in place.

- No C2 Structure
- Phone links scarce between IPTF HQ, Support base in Zagreb, and field stations.
- IPTF was a fragile organisation with limited assets, and communications and logistics shortfalls

## **IPTF FIRST TEST – FEBRUARY 1996 SARAJEVO NEIGHBOURHOODS TRANSFER**

The Dayton Agreement directed that neighbourhoods surrounding Sarajevo be transferred from Serb control to the new legal government federation. The transfer was to take place on 4 February 1996. The scheduled transfer had to be delayed by weeks and even then did not occur as desired:

*The first real test for the IPTF came when neighbourhoods surrounding Sarajevo were transferred from the Serbs to the Federation early in 1996...The transfer of these seven municipalities was scheduled to take place simultaneously on 4 February 1996...As the date approached, the IPTF was not yet functional. None of the senior leadership had yet arrived, fewer than 400 monitors were on hand, and very few field stations had yet been opened...In addition to the unpreparedness of the IPTF, the OHR had not done any detailed planning for the transition...on 4 February the HR and IFOR commander announced that the transfer would be delayed and also be changed to a phased process occurring over a 6-week period ending in mid-March... Serb authorities in Pale took advantage of the delay, however to prepare for a sweeping evacuation of the suburbs and to more thoroughly ransack fixed property so that incoming Federation citizens would inherit little more than a wasteland (Wentz, 1998, p. 149).*

The unintended message sent was:

*The message derived from this experience was that even under the cognisance and apparent protection of international and apparent protection of international military and police, it was not safe for Serbs to remain in Moslem neighbourhoods. The international community could not dissuade the Serbs from fleeing en masse. Nor could*

*they prevent significant destruction of property and intimidation aimed at compelling others to flee when they might not otherwise. This event also revealed a serious enforcement gap that would persist throughout the operations. IFOR would not engage in law enforcement and the disruptions did not constitute an imminent threat to life, and therefore, did not trigger an IFOR response. The IPTF, on the other hand, had neither the authority nor the resources to act (Wentz, 1998, p. 151).*

## **DISPARATE LOGISTICAL SUPPORT**

Noted earlier was the fact that IFOR and IPTF had distinctly separate chains of command. This resulted in stove-piped and disparate logistical support even though both entities were there for the same over-all cause of implementing the Dayton Peace Agreement:

*Shortage of mission-essential items such as communications equipment, vehicles, and medical care plagued the IPTF from the earliest days of its deployment. A memo in July 1996 from IPTF Deputy Chief Logistician to IPTF Commissioner:*

*“Based upon the IPTF subordinate relationship to the UNMIBH, the IPTF has not organic assets. All logistical support is to be provided by UNMIBH. The general level of support by UNMIBH has been inadequate. As of 29 July, the required communications, vehicles, reasonable fuel supply, Electronic Data Processing, and medical support has not been completed...The current IPTF logistical status to support the mandate is unacceptable, and unless rectified prior to 15 August 1996, may cause the IPTF to fail in all or part of the critical mission requirements” (Wentz, 1998, p. 145).*

There were some mechanisms put in place to share resources between IFOR and IPTF:

*IFOR provided fuel on a cash reimbursable basis to IPTF. British forces later refused to refuel IPTF vehicles because IPTF failed to provide reimbursement. In mid-July, IFOR agreed to formalise a “Logistics Support Package” involving collocation of communications antennas and diesel fuel storage sites, and, in emergency cases only, to provide fuel, medical care, water, rations, shower facilities, and maps (Wentz, 1998, p. 147).*

## **CRITICAL CONTRASTS BETWEEN IFOR AND KFOR AND THEIR U.N. CIVIL POLICE COUNTERPARTS**

In researching this paper, it has become clear why the literature on Kosovo and KFOR refer to the IFOR / UN relationship as being a less optimal one than its own. In the following we will recount why the Dayton Peace Accords started off in a much more ineffective manner in Bosnia than did UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1244 in Kosovo:

**Framework Document:** The Dayton Peace Agreement laid out specific military roles but did not discuss civil-military interactions with regard to law enforcement. In Kosovo, UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) 1244 authorised an international security presence (KFOR) and an international civil presence (UNMIK) within Kosovo. Specifically enumerated within UNSCR 1244 was KFOR’s responsibility for “ensuring public safety and order until the international civil presence could take responsibility for this task (Wentz, 2002, p. 237).

**Military and Civilian Policing Responsibilities:** During the IFOR year, and also into the SFOR period, NATO with the U.S. in the lead made a clear distinction that IFOR would only as a very last resort get involved in what it considered civilian law enforcement duties.

As a result of lessons learned from Bosnia, clear civil security responsibilities in the framework document, and a British General familiar with civil / military policing duties in Northern Ireland as KFOR commander, KFOR right from the start was pre-disposed and expected to not only support but undertake civil security requirements as required.

**Nature of Civil – Military relationships:** The implementation of the Dayton Peace Agreement on the ground in Bosnia was notable for its lack of coordination meetings between the main organisations. There was also visible friction between IFOR leadership and the IPTF. In Kosovo, the working relationship was much closer. The climate of recrimination that was such a burden in Bosnia never developed in Kosovo. From the custodian's perspective, this tight UNMIK-KFOR partnership formed at the outset gave the mission substantially more power to influence Kosovo's transformation (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 87).

**Deployment of UN Civilian Police Force:** In both Bosnia and Kosovo it took many months to deploy the required number of personnel to fulfill these positions. In Bosnia they also had to learn the lesson to pre-screen the candidates from contributing nations for English speaking ability and law-enforcement experience. In Bosnia the void created by the delay of deploying IPTF personnel occurred at the same time that IFOR was most insistent that it would not participate in civil policing missions and also when critical and contentious implementation milestones were occurring. In Kosovo, Initially, KFOR had to impose order, as it took UNMIK a better part of a year to deploy an international police force to carry out its executive policing functions (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 248). The order to enforce basic law and order resulted in KFOR soldiers becoming the police force of KFOR in order to fill the existing law enforcement gap (Wentz, 2002, p. 248).

## COMPARING NNEC C2 MATURITY MODEL LEVELS AND THEIR CONSEQUENCES

Based on the research described in the prior sections of this paper and also from the information found in the enclosure, (1) the tables below chart the NNEC C2 Maturity Model levels, and the Consequences of Maturity C2 Approach between the NATO and UN Civil Police organisations during the initial year of IFOR and KFOR:

Maturity of C2 Space

Collective Purposes, Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic	Rich, Broad, Tailored and Dynamic	Agile	Maturity of C2 Approach
Collective Purposes	Collective Authority	Continuous or Nearly Continuous	Generalised	Rich and Broad	Collaborative	
Collective Plus Constraints	Selected Collective Authorities	Periodic	Specialised	Constraints Plus	Coordinated	
Collective Constraints Only	Independent with Constraints	Episodic	Narrowly Focused	Only About Constraints	De-Conflicted	
None	Independent	None	No Mechanism	Organic Info Only	Conflicted	
Collective Objectives	Allocation of Authority and Responsibility	Continuity of Interaction	Interaction Mechanism	Information Sharing		
Decision Rights		Patterns of Interaction				



IFOR – UN IPTF



KFOR – UN Civ Police

Consequences of C2 Approach

Broad, Deep, Tailored and Dynamic	Broad, Deep, Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic Planning	Tailored and Dynamic	Tailored and Dynamic Interdependence	Tailored and Dynamic Actions	Tailored and Dynamic Synergies	Agile	Maturity of C2 Approach
Broad and Deep	Broad and Deep	Collective Planning	Organic and Non-Organic Assets	Interdependent	Collective Action	Extensive Synergies	Collaborative	
Limited	Limited	Limited Collective Planning	Non-Organic Assets	Very Limited Interdependence	Limited Collective Action	Limited Synergies	Coordinated	
Only About Boundaries	None	Independent with Agreed Constraints	None	No Interdependence	Independent with Constraints	Sub-optimised Performance	De-Conflicted	
None	None	Independent	None	No Interdependence	Independent	Negative Cross-Impacts	Conflicted	
Shared Awareness	Shared Understanding	Planning	Resource Sharing	Interdependence	Actions / Execution	Effectiveness and Efficiency		



IFOR – UN IPTF



KFOR – UN Civ Police

## **SUMMARY: CONTRASTING NATO – UN SECURITY INTERACTIONS IN BOSNIA WITH THOSE IN KOSOVO**

There were significant differences in the approach and the initial results of implementing the Dayton Peace Agreement in Bosnia and UNSCR 1244 in Kosovo. In Bosnia, NATO saw the military functions and civil police functions as two separate missions. The difficulties that were exasperated because of this did generate lessons learned that did appear to be applied in Kosovo. A fundamental change in thinking in Bosnia occurred in 1997 and 1998 within NATO with an effort led by the United States regarding a deliberate change in strategy to implement a more holistic approach yet a more simple and clear standard, “Support the peace process and oppose those who seek to obstruct it” (Covey, Dziedzic, and Hawley, 2006, p. 78). Clearly lessons were learned from Bosnia when UNSCR 1244 was implemented in Kosovo. A more holistic approach focusing on an over-arching goal as opposed to individual organisational missions was instituted from the start. The pre-disposition of the key individual leaders within Kosovo operations to coordinate and collaborate transcended down into more effective actions and results.





## REFERENCES

- Alberts, David S. "Agility, focus, and convergence: The future of command and control." *International C2 Journal* (1) 1, Washington, DC: CCRP, 2007.
- Balkan Watch. *The Balkan Institute*. January 9, 1996.  
<http://www.publicinternationallaw.org/programs/balkans/archives/1996/BW3-02.DOC>
- Clark, W. K. *Waging modern war: Bosnia, Kosovo and the future of combat*. PublicAffairs: New York, 2001.
- Covey, J., Dziedzic, M. J.; and Hawley, L. R. *The quest for viable peace*. United States Institute of Peace Press: Washington, 2006.
- DoD Report to Congress: *Kosovo/Operation Allied Force After Action Report*, 2000.
- Kosovo: Lessons from the Crisis, 2000. MOD UK Report
- SFOR Lessons Learned, 2000, p. 37, [http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/army-usawc/sfor\\_rule\\_of\\_law.doc](http://www.au.af.mil/au/awc/awcgate/army-usawc/sfor_rule_of_law.doc)
- Wentz, L. (Editor). *Lessons from Bosnia: The IFOR experience*. Department of Defense, Command and Control Research Program: Washington, DC. 1998.
- Wentz, L. (Editor). *Lessons from Kosovo: The KFOR experience*. Department of Defense, Command and Control Research Program: Washington, DC. 2002