



Digital Toolkit

DEPLOYMENT REVIEW



Guidance
Note

**LESSONS LEARNED
PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS**



Welcome to the Deployment Review Digital Toolkit

The second of the two Guidance Notes in this toolkit, this Guidance Note provides a comprehensive overview of the planning considerations necessary for developing and implementing a Lessons Learned process. It is structured in terms of the seven functions of the Lessons Learned process outlined in the first Guidance Note. This Guidance Note is aimed primarily at national institutions, training centres and academies, and contingent commanders, but may also be beneficial for other users.

Table of Contents

04-05

Preface

06-07

Purpose and Scope

08-21

Collect

1.1 Information Sources	09
1.2 Collecting Information	11
1.3 Administrative Information & Metadata	14
1.4 A Less Formal Approach to Observation Collection and Lesson Development	16
1.5 Assigning Responsibilities	16
1.6 Collection Proposal	17
1.7 Collection Plan	20

22-27

Analyse

2.1 Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)	23
2.2 Filtering	24
2.3 Remedial Action Development	25

28-34

Record and Archive

3.1 Lessons Learned Log	29
3.2 Information Entry	30
3.3 Classification Considerations	31
3.4 Assigning Responsibilities	32
3.5 Archiving	32

35-41

Share

4.1 Who do we Share Information With?	36
4.2 Information Sharing	37
4.3 What to Share	39
4.4 Assigning Responsibilities	40

42-47

Implement and Verify

5.1 Remedial Action Implementation	43
5.2 Lesson Verification	45



PREFACE & ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Deployment Review Digital Toolkit was produced by the Light Coordination Mechanism (LCM) of the United Nations Department of Peace Operations (DPO), and the development of the mobile application and graphic design of the PDF documents was completed by the Capacity Development and Operational Training Service (CDOTS) of the United Nations Department of Operational Support (DOS).

The Toolkit was developed in response to the need for lessons learned guidance expressed at the 2019 LCM meeting, held in Uganda, by Member States in their capacity as Troop- and Police-Contributing Countries, as well as training and capacity-building providers and recipients.

The LCM would like to take this opportunity to thank the Governments of the Kingdom of Denmark and of the Kingdom of the Netherlands for their financial support in the development of this toolkit.

Furthermore, the LCM would also like to thank the Member States who shared their lessons learning guidance material to inform the drafting of the toolkit, as well as their feedback throughout the process. These Member States included Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, France, Germany, Ghana, India, Ireland, Japan, Morocco, the Netherlands, Togo, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America.

The LCM would like to express its thanks and gratitude to all of its partners who have provided their invaluable insight, feedback and support throughout the development process, including the Integrated Training Service (ITS), the Office of Military Affairs (OMA), the Police Division (PD), and the Policy and Best Practices Service (PBPS).

As the Deployment Review Digital Toolkit serves as a living document which will be updated and expanded based on feedback provided by its users, the LCM will continue to work closely with all T/PCCs and capacity-building providers to ensure that it reflects their needs and ambitions.



PURPOSE & SCOPE

In order to effectively respond to the complex and rapidly evolving operational environment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation, the tactics, techniques and procedures of future military contingent and formed police unit (FPU) personnel and their training and preparation must be based on the good practices and lessons developed by those previously deployed to these situations.

This requires uniformed personnel deploying to peacekeeping operations to identify, collect and develop lessons to be shared with those responsible for the uniformed preparation process. As a result, the various stakeholders involved (including national institutions responsible for operational programming, planning and support, as well as training centres and academies) can then adjust their planning, training and support of future contingents and individual uniformed personnel in order to improve operational readiness and performance.

This Toolkit aims to guide the various national military and FPU stakeholders involved in United Nations peacekeeping operations to review their pre-deployment, deployment and post-deployment experiences. Such efforts will support the identification of lessons which can be shared with other Member States to help their fellow peacekeepers to work smarter; more efficiently; more effectively, and more safely. The Toolkit is made up of a series of guidance notes, practical templates, and summary sheets:

Item	Purpose	Audience
1. Guidance Note on Lessons Learned	An introduction to lessons learned (what are they; why do we need them) and their use in the UN context.	National institutions and training centres and academies.
2. Guidance Note on Lessons Learned Planning Considerations	An overview of the necessary planning considerations for developing and implementing a lessons learned process.	National institutions, training centres and academies and contingent commanders.
3. Observation Collection Template	A template to facilitate observation collection, lesson development and remedial action proposal.	Contingent commanders and deploying peacekeepers.
4. Lessons Learned Log Template	A template for storing lessons learned information to facilitate later referencing and reviewing.	Contingent commanders and deploying peacekeepers.
5. Deployment Report Template	A template to support a methodical review of the deployment process by the contingent commander.	Contingent commanders and deploying peacekeepers.
6. Lessons Learned Summary Sheet	A condensed version of Guidance Note 1 that outlines the key points.	National institutions, training centres and academies and contingent commanders.
7. Lessons Learned Planning Considerations Summary Sheet	A condensed version of Guidance Note 2 that outlines the key points.	National institutions, training centres and academies and contingent commanders.



COLLECT

Main Effort: Collect sufficient information about the observed event and the situation in which it occurred in order to put the event into context.

Any organization looking to implement a lessons learned programme should have the ability to collect information about its ongoing activities. This information should be collected from the very beginning of the planning phase of any new operation right through until the end. Additionally, in the context of a United Nations peacekeeping operation, all information should be collected in line with existing policies (i.e., using a gender lens to reveal the ways in which tactics, techniques and procedures are informed by, shaped by, or biased toward the perspectives and experiences of men or women).

Information about observed good and bad experiences will: a) highlight whether the contingent's training and preparation adequately prepared it for its deployment and b) indicate whether these experiences can subsequently be used to develop lessons and propose remedial actions. This section will highlight the necessary planning considerations related to the Collect function. This includes where this information comes from; who is responsible for its collection; how it is collected; establishing a Collection Proposal, and developing a Collection Plan.

1.1 Information Sources

While at work, we are constantly faced with opportunities to learn, and this holds true for military contingent and FPU personnel deploying to UN peacekeeping operations. By grouping these opportunities into three more concrete phases, we can approach this wealth of information in a more coordinated and effective manner.

1.1.1 Planning and Preparation for Deployment

Preparing a contingent for deployment typically begins well before it is designated for a UN peacekeeping operation. It involves in-depth training and preparation in all operational aspects including personnel, equipment, pre-deployment documentation, doctrine and policy, as well as basic foundation skills training upon which UN functional and job-specific competencies can be added. These personnel should be adequately equipped with standard national equipment as well as specialized UN peacekeeping-specific equipment. Planning, procurement, deployment and self-sustainment procedures should also be established at the national and operational levels. Personnel should be aware of doctrine and policy issues specific to the UN

operational environment, including Mission-specific and functional-level issues, as well as cross-cutting issues such as the full, equal and meaningful participation of women within the contingent. A list of a range of relevant guidance documents can be found in Annex A of the Guidance Note on Lessons Learned provided as part of this Toolkit.

During the preparation phase, opportunities to collect lessons learned information include deployment planning events and exercises, the contingent's pre-deployment training programme, and additional events and exercises in which it is involved.

1.1.2 Deployments and Rotations

The start and end of a deployment can also be valuable sources of lessons for the contingent. At these points, there are many different elements that must be coordinated, including the contingent's movement of its personnel and COE to the Mission area and the establishment of its self-sustainment capabilities. Upon the contingent's rotation, these issues must once again be considered with regards to their drawdown and repatriation. Relaying information collected during these phases to future contingents can prove invaluable to the planning and execution of their administrative, logistic, security and self-sustainment considerations. This ensures contingents are able to efficiently establish, rotate and draw down their respective field presences.

1.1.3 In-Mission Operations

Most lessons are likely to be collected by the contingent while on deployment as it records information about its ongoing activities and provides reports on them. This can include how its preparation and training have prepared it to tackle its mandated tasks and core operational responsibilities and duties, as well as other internal issues. It may also include in-mission 'refresher' and 'on-the-job' training programmes delivered by Mission trainers to support basic foundational skills, as well as for functional and job-specific responsibilities and capabilities. Alternatively, it may also include Member State-led training and capacity-building support (such as Mobile Training Teams or In-Mission Training) or events and exercises conducted for similar purposes.

1.2 Collecting Information

Having identified the various phases during which relevant information can be collected, the next step is to begin collecting observations of good and bad experiences which can be used to develop lessons. However, it must first be noted that the lessons learned process is designed to address issues that have been caused due to inadequate training or preparation, as these issues will reoccur over time and will have an impact on the contingent's ability to carry out its duties. For example:

What was the result?	Was standard procedure followed?	Is there a lesson to be learned here?	Why?
Success	No	Yes	The event was a success because personnel varied from standard procedure and used an innovative approach. As this innovative approach was more successful than standard procedure, there is a lesson to be learned.
Unsuccessful	Yes	Yes	The event was unsuccessful despite standard procedures being followed. This means that these procedures are not effective and should be changed: there is a lesson to be learned.
Success	Yes	No	The event was a success because standard procedure was followed. This means these procedures are effective and do not need to be changed: there is not a lesson to be learned.
Unsuccessful	No	No	The event was unsuccessful because standard procedure was not followed. This does not mean that procedures need to be changed, but that personnel should use these procedures to be successful.

Additionally, it must be noted that observation collection is not intended to replace national routine reporting and debriefing mechanisms, but rather to complement them. Below are two general ways of incorporating such information, followed by an outline of how a combination of these two methods may be used in the context of a UN peacekeeping operation.

1.2.1 Routine Information Collection

Routine information collection is carried out by using existing reporting procedures and mechanisms in support of the lessons learned process. This information is recorded after an event, such as a training exercise or a patrol, allowing for the observation to fully be put into context, as opposed to drawing conclusions from an ongoing event. As this means of information collection complements existing procedures, it can be incorporated into the planning process to help alleviate the need for extra dedicated staff and resources while on deployment.

Examples of routine information collecting techniques include, but are not limited to:

- Incident reports
- Weekly police/military component reports
- End-of-assignment reports
- After-action reports
- Direct observations
- Sitreps (Situation Reports)

1.2.2 Additional Information Collection

Additional information collection efforts are more targeted and more likely to collect detailed information. However, they generally require more time, personnel and resources. Depending on the limitations a lessons learned programme faces, these efforts could be reserved for observations about more urgent issues, or for recorded observations for which further information is required.

Examples of additional information collection techniques include, but are not limited to:

- In-person interviews
- Surveys, questionnaires and other such forms
- Lessons learned studies
- Lessons learned meetings

1.2.3 In the Context of a Deployment to a UN Peacekeeping Operation

Many routine information collection procedures already exist in the form of incident reports, incident logs, and daily/weekly/monthly/quarterly sitreps conducted by the contingent and its sub-units. Such information may also be collected for Mission-led organizational learning efforts for which contingent support is required. These reports and sitreps may not always be written: the relevant information can be obtained through verbal debriefings which may also occur as part of routine. As such, contingent commanders will be able to use this information to understand where and when incidents occur. As a result, this may mean that many contingents are already capable of conducting the Collect function.

Good practices for information collection, whether done through routine procedures or through additional collection efforts, can include, but are not limited to:

- Ensuring lessons learned information is collected throughout the event on an ongoing basis. At this stage, this includes notes and generic observations, as opposed to detailed reports.
- Ensuring sufficient lessons learned information is collected to facilitate informed analysis.
- Ensuring information is collected in a common format throughout the contingent.
- Ensuring information collection is included as part of the planning process prior to the event or activity.

1.2.4 The TODCR Format (Title, Observation, Discussion, Conclusion, Recommendation)

Information regarding observations should be collected in a common format, as this allows for the information to be more easily incorporated into the lessons learned process. While several such formats exist, the key is to discuss the observations in a factual way, with practical examples, while highlighting lessons and proposing remedial actions to be taken to replicate success or avoid repeating mistakes if you have the necessary knowledge and expertise.

A common way of doing this is through the TODCR format, or the Title, Observation, Discussion, Conclusion, Recommendation format. For this Toolkit, the R – Recommendation – has been replaced with Remedial Action. The TODCR format breaks down the necessary information to be collected into distinct sections to

support the lessons learned process. This information can also be incorporated into existing reporting mechanisms to ensure that lessons learned considerations are indeed considered at all levels.

The information to be included in the format includes the following:

Stage	Information to be Included
T - Title	A brief title which indicates what happened during the event.
O - Observation	A short statement which outlines a single issue and how what has happened varied from what was expected.
D - Discussion	<p>We aim to put the event into context here and examine why what has happened differed from what was expected by explaining the conditions under which the event occurred and other important details and factors. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Context: the who/what/where/when/why of the event. • Expected Situation: What was supposed to happen? • Observed Situation: What actually happened? • Impact: What are the consequences of the differences between the expected and observed situations? • Cause: Why did this happen?
C - Conclusion	This is the summary of the lesson to be learned from this experience, namely whether the approach should be repeated or avoided in the future, or what needs to change.
R - Remedial Action	In this section, potential remedial actions to be taken to replicate a success or avoid making the same mistakes are proposed if the observer has the necessary knowledge and expertise to do so. Further information about ways of analysing observations to develop concrete remedial actions will be discussed in the Analyse chapter.

1.3 Administrative Information & Metadata

To further support later referencing and reviewing and to better identify patterns and trends, it is strongly recommended that a number of items of administrative information and additional information, otherwise referred to as metadata, be added to each lesson. Naturally, the more information added the better, but it is understandable that it may not be feasible to record all the recommended metadata.

Examples of administrative information include, but are not limited to:

Information	Details
Name of Peacekeeping Operation	The name of the operation the contingent was deployed to when this incident occurred.
Reporting Unit	Which unit or sub-unit is reporting this incident?
Report Drafter	Who is submitting this report?
Date Event Occurred	What date did this event occur?
Date Report Filed	What date was this report filed?
Location	Where exactly did this event occur? (Region/Province/Exact Location).
Key Words	Any key words which may help with administration and later reference and review.

Examples of useful metadata include, but are not limited to:

Metadata	Details
Point of Contact	Who to contact for further information about this lesson if required.
Time	The time of day the event took place.
Deployment Phase	The phase of deployment during which the incident was observed (as discussed in section 1.1.).
Mission Impact	How much of an impact will not resolving this issue will have on the contingent's ability to conduct its mandated tasks (based on frequency/impact). This may be standardized, such as: 1 – Low, 2 – Medium, 3 – High.
Area of Focus	Which area of focus the lesson falls under (see sections 1.6.1.-1.6.4.).
Line of Capability Development	What capability needs to be developed to respond to the issue (see section 2.3.2.).
Classification	There may be security implications in the storage/sharing of the lesson, depending on its contents (see section 3.3.).

1.4 A Less Formal Approach to Observation Collection and Lesson Development

While the TODCR format is a widely used method to collect observations and develop lessons and remedial actions, the process does not always need to be so formal.

As mentioned in the Guidance Note on Lessons Learned, the Simple Lessons Learned Loop focuses on:

- 1) Identifying an issue.
- 2) Working to understand why the issue occurred.
- 3) Sharing what we have learned with others.
- 4) Adopting a more effective approach.

In this simpler approach, sharing what we have learned and adopting more effective approaches based on this knowledge can be as simple as asking “What have we learned since the last time we met?” at the start of a meeting. By doing so, we can share the work that has gone on to replicate successes and avoid repeating mistakes and share these practices with others who can benefit from them. Such an approach may not necessarily require the development of new training and guidance materials: smarter ways of working that have been identified can be shared in such meetings, and changes can be enacted far quicker.

1.5 Assigning Responsibilities

Having established where lessons may come from, the question remains: who is responsible for their collection? While the principle of collective responsibility (which states that personnel at all levels and in all roles should play an active role in the lessons learned process) still applies, it must also be considered that the best people to collect the relevant information about a potential lesson are those with experience in that field.

For example, consider a logistics director and an interpreter working for the same organization. Indeed, the lessons learned through the logistics director’s experience

may only be relevant to other logistics directors, but they are best positioned to collect and develop lessons about the organization’s logistics issues, in the same way that the interpreter is best placed to do so for the organization’s linguistic issues. In other words, while everyone should be involved, personnel should be tasked to collect and develop lessons in accordance with their roles, responsibilities, skills and experience.

Given the typical breakdown of responsibilities from the initial planning of a deployment through to repatriation, the following could serve as a potential breakdown of whose inputs would be required at any given time:

Period	Inputs Involved
Planning and Preparation for Deployment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Institutions • Training Centres and Academies • Contingent Commanders, Staff Officers and Support Staff
Deployments and Rotations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Institutions • Contingent Commanders, Staff Officers and Support Staff
In-mission Operations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contingent Commanders, Staff Officers and Support Staff • Individual Peacekeepers

The inputs of the above groups could be coordinated by appointing Lessons Learned Focal Points who would manage lessons learned information collection on behalf of their respective groups. For example, at the national level, this could be an additional duty of the national institution responsible for managing peacekeeping operations and of the relevant national training centres and academies. At the operational level, this could consist of a Contingent Lessons Learned Focal Point within the HQ team of a deployed contingent, as well as one per company (within an Infantry Battalion, for example) or per operational platoon (within an FPU). These focal points would typically be the personnel responsible for report writing.

1.6 Collection Proposal

The Collection Proposal is the process of determining which issues should be focused on while collecting information. These may be issues of particular concern;

previously encountered problems; areas where it is known that the contingent needs to improve, or general issues which need to be addressed to enhance performance. It must also be acknowledged that we cannot hope to address every single one of these issues. As such, the aim of the Collection Proposal is to focus efforts on a selection of these issues.

The selection of these issues is often command-led and results-based. National institutions will likely direct collection to focus on a specific issue of interest based on previous experiences. These main issues may also be determined by collaborating with former units and departments or the UN Mission itself in order to determine which issues they regularly encounter/encountered: the more they are reported, the more likely it is that these issues are critical. Alternatively, a more flexible approach may be adopted. Such an approach acknowledges that critical issues, if they exist, are likely to present themselves to the contingent at some point during the deployment process. In this case, the use of focus areas may help guide the collection and development of lessons without restricting efforts to a specific area.

Focus areas allow observers to group observations into categories that will allow the contingent to better:

- Identify areas where the contingent has been successful or has faced many challenges.
- Identify patterns, trends and recurring issues.
- Structure the Record function by adding an extra level of filtering.
- Structure the Share function by having established thematic areas for the deployment review and handover notes.

These focus areas can be divided into four main categories that cover a wide range of issues relevant to the deployment process. Please note that this is not an exhaustive list and should be adapted as necessary.

1.6.1 Technical and Professional Skills & Capabilities

These skills refer to the minimum individual and collective military or police skills required prior to preparation for peacekeeping, based on those outlined in the Guidelines on Operational Readiness Preparation (Military) and the Pre-deployment Training Standards for FPU's (Police). This also includes issues related to Command and Execution; Conduct and Discipline; Administration and Personnel; Logistics, as well as the various Staff Officer functions.

1.6.2 UN Mandatory and Recommended Skills & Capabilities

These skills refer to the responsibilities, tasks and obligations specific to the UN operating environment. These include, but are not limited to, the skills outlined under the Core Pre-Deployment Training Materials (CPTM), Specialized Training Materials (STM), Reinforcement Training Packages (RTP), and various other functional, job-specific and cross-cutting issues training packages.

1.6.3 Mission-specific Skills & Capabilities

Building upon the UN Mandatory and Recommended Skills, these Mission-specific Skills refer to the various operational awareness and tactical planning skills required to effectively operate in the specific operational environment of a particular UN peacekeeping operation. This includes analysis of the Mission and mandated tasks; Threat Analysis; Risk Assessment and Mitigation, etc.

1.6.4 Integration Skills & Capabilities

In the context of a UN peacekeeping operation, the command structure of the uniformed component is likely to be very different to what the contingent may be used to, due to it being: a) comprised of both military and police forces from a range of countries, the SOPs and routines of which may vary, and b) heavily linked to the civilian component of the Mission. As such, these skills refer to the execution of operations and tasks in a multidimensional context, including integrated operations with partner components, as well as integrated reporting and evaluation mechanisms. Additionally, this can refer to broader interaction between the contingent and UN Mission support unrelated to operational skills. For example, this could include ensuring that the appropriate personnel within the contingent are familiar with the UN's administrative procedures for rationing, fuel provision and communication conducted above battalion level.

1.7 Collection Plan

Having made a Collection Proposal, a plan must now be developed which determines how lessons learned considerations are to be incorporated into existing SOPs and processes. It involves determining the following:

1.7.1 Objective

Through the Collection Proposal, issues deemed to be critical by national stakeholders will have already been identified. Thus, the objective of collection efforts is to collect sufficient information about observations related to these issues in order to develop lessons and propose remedial actions from which others can learn. The complexity of the objective will depend on the number of issues that have been deemed to be critical.

1.7.2 When will it be Collected?

Understanding that there are three main phases in which opportunities to collect lessons learned information can arise, it is highly encouraged that all three phases be considered when developing a Collection Plan. However, understanding the limitations that may exist during the collection effort – potentially due to a lack of time or resources – the Collection Plan may choose to focus on a specific area, such as the deployment itself.

1.7.3 Assigning Responsibilities

Considering the key stakeholders in the deployment process – national institutions, training centres and academies, contingent commanders and support staff, and individual peacekeepers – focal points should be appointed by each stakeholder in order to ensure lessons learned considerations are incorporated throughout the entire process.

1.7.4 How will it be Done?

The next step in developing the Collection Plan is to determine what means will be used to collect information to develop lessons. This involves establishing the level of time and resources that can be dedicated to the collection of lessons learned information. If these are limited, an approach focused on a select number of critical issues may be chosen. While this requires less effort, it is naturally limited in scope. If resources and time are available, an approach based on addressing issues as and when they arise may be chosen. This is obviously more complex but can provide greater added value.

As a bridge between the two approaches, it is strongly suggested to focus on incorporating the Toolkit's Observation Collection Template into existing reporting processes. This provides greater flexibility than a more limited approach which focuses on pre-determined critical issues, but still allows the lessons learned process to be command-driven by ensuring the appropriate information is pushed up the chain of command.

This approach can then be complemented by using additional interviews, surveys and questionnaires where necessary to obtain more detailed information about critical issues.



Analyse

Main Effort: Determine the root causes of a good or bad experience in order to be able to develop remedial actions to a) replicate success and b) avoid repeating mistakes.

Once an observation of a good or bad experience or an innovative approach has been collected, the next step is to determine its root causes in order to be able to develop remedial actions to a) replicate successes or b) avoid repeating mistakes. The Analyse function of the lessons learned process is not a form of evaluation and should under no circumstances be used to punish individual or collective underperformance. What is important to understand is why the event happened, and how we can learn from it in the future.

The Collect and Analyse functions are often conducted together. The guidance contained within this section aims to equip military and police personnel with the know-how to do so, as well as to allow more senior experienced personnel to review these findings.

2.1 Subject Matter Experts (SMEs)

Typically, experienced observers who face issues and challenges while conducting their duties are best placed to develop a lesson or propose a remedial action. However, in instances where the response to the observed issue is not immediately obvious, or where support is needed to verify whether a proposed remedial action is appropriate, an SME will likely be required. SMEs are personnel who have experience and expertise in a particular field and are therefore the go-to 'expert' regarding lessons related to their field. For example, a medical SME would likely be a Head Nurse or Doctor.

In terms of assigning responsibilities, appointing SMEs is the main staffing requirement in support of the Analyse function. A senior personnel member within each stakeholder (such as a division lead or a contingent commander) will need to appoint their own SMEs as necessary, but appointees should be coordinated in order to avoid having multiple SMEs with conflicting views. Ideally, SMEs should be identified in accordance with the chosen critical issues or in line with the established areas of focus. SMEs may be senior personnel within the contingent; senior national personnel, or in-mission UN staff (such as Policy and Best Practice Officers and Focal Points and trainers in the Mission's Integrated Mission Training Centre).

It must also be noted that the term SME is not an official label within the UN System. For national personnel to be recognized as a military or police trainer (and experienced in their field), they have to be certified by the UN Integrated Training

Service (ITS). Police trainer certification under the UNPOL Training Architecture is a joint UNPOL-ITS process where trainees are jointly certified as per the Police Strategic Guidance Framework. Military trainer certification is completed directly by ITS.

2.2 Filtering

While we work, we are constantly faced with opportunities to learn. However, no lessons learned process can hope to analyse every single opportunity in detail. As a result, there are three main ways of filtering this information to determine whether time, resources and energy should be devoted to addressing the issue in question.

2.2.1 Checklist for Inclusion

The first stage of filtering is to determine whether we can indeed learn a lesson from the observed issue and whether it is worth addressing. This can be done by asking ourselves the following questions:

- Were we successful because of our training, or did we have to change the way we did things to be successful?
- Is this a problem to do with standard tactics, techniques and procedures themselves, or a one-off mistake made by someone?
- Is this an objective observation, or is it an obvious complaint?
- Is the information presented an adequate or correct description of what happened? Is there another possible – or more likely – explanation?

If the answer to all the above is 'yes', then we can move on.

2.2.2 Do we Have Enough Information?

Secondly, we need to determine whether we have sufficient verified information regarding the observed issue in order to develop a lesson and propose a remedial action, or whether the given explanation of the lesson and remedial action is appropriate based on the information provided. Again, this involves asking ourselves several questions:

2.2.2.1 Does the observation include an explanation of the event/what may have caused it?

If it does, we can move on. If it does not:

- If the issue seems to be a cause for concern, seek further information from the observer.
- If it is not a pressing issue, put aside for later analysis.

2.2.2.2 Does the observation contain a lesson and remedial action?

If it does, we can move on. If it does not:

- Is there an obvious lesson and remedial action or next step?
- Does the appropriate SME need to be contacted?

2.2.3 Mission Impact

Finally, having collected detailed information about our included observations, we must now determine the impact that this issue will have on our ability to conduct our mandated tasks. This is based on both how urgent the resolution of this issue is, and how frequently it is likely to occur.

- Is resolving this issue critical, desirable, or useful?
- Is this event likely to happen frequently, regularly, or occasionally?

If the issue is indeed critical or likely to happen frequently, then the issue is most likely a high-impact issue. The level of impact of an issue on the Mission can also be standardized. For example: 1 – low impact, 2 – medium impact, 3 – high impact.

2.3 Remedial Action Development

While analysing our observations sounds relatively complex, it is often simply based on both a sound understanding of the context of the event itself and its root causes as well as asking ourselves the right questions. That said, it must be noted that a remedial action is not simply a statement of the effect required, but rather what

needs to be done to achieve it.

For example, instead of:

- **Remedial Action:** Improve integrated operations.

We would suggest:

- **Remedial Action:** Ensure planning events and training exercises are conducted in an integrated manner to improve the effectiveness of integrated operations.

Doing so ensures that we remain focused on analysing how the pre-deployment preparation reflects the reality of the deployment itself.

2.3.1 Sound Understanding

The ability to analyse our observations in order to develop a remedial action requires us to understand basic issues, such as the order of events, the relationships between the events, and the various root causes and key factors of the event itself. Such information will likely be noted by the observer in the Discussion section of the Observation Collection Template or may have been collected while filtering the observations. If the provided information does not allow us to immediately develop remedial actions, it can be further expanded upon by asking ourselves the following questions:

- **Who:** Who was involved? Who should/could have been involved? Who should not have been involved?
- **What:** What happened? What should/could have happened instead?
- **Where:** Where did it happen? Where should/could it have happened instead?
- **When:** When did it happen? When should/could it have happened instead?
- **Why:** Why did it happen? Why did it not happen?
- **How:** How did it happen? How did the who/what/where/when/why cause it to happen? What could be changed in the who/what/where/when/why to ensure it happens / does not happen again?

2.3.2 Lines of Capability Development: DOTMLPF-I (Doctrine, Organization, Training, Material, Leadership, Personnel, Facilities, Interoperability)

Just as our areas of focus allow us to group our observations into similar categories to make our lives easier, we can also group our potential remedial actions based on what capability needs to be developed or refined for the remedial action to be implemented. Doing so ensures that we can develop concrete and actionable remedial actions to ensure others can learn from our lessons.

In the uniformed context, the DOTMLPF lines of capability development are typically used. It is also suggested that the 'I' be added for Interoperability; an essential skill for working in an integrated environment. DOTMLPF-I represents the following:

Line of Capability Development	Description
D - Doctrine	Amending existing doctrine, policies and guidance, or developing new ones.
O - Organization	Changing the structure/organization of the relevant stakeholder.
T - Training	Amending existing training materials and programmes or developing new ones.
M - Materiel	Supplying different equipment or using equipment in new ways.
L - Leadership	Changing the tactics, techniques and procedures of the leadership of the relevant stakeholder.
P - Personnel	Changing the personnel involved or not involved in the situation based on their impact (e.g., the impact of improving female participation).
F - Facilities	Amending existing facilities or deploying new facilities.
I - Interoperability	Changing how the contingent operates in an integrated environment (due to the presence of both UN and Host State civilian/police/military forces. Potential issues include differences in nationality, languages, as well as interoperability regarding equipment, training and doctrine).

See section 5.1. for more information about the use of the lines of capability development.



Record and Archive

Main Effort (Record): Ensure information about observations, lessons and remedial actions is continually recorded to support later reference and review.

Main Effort (Archive): Archive lessons learned and best practices for future reference when preparing for new tasks and when facing new challenges.

Having collected and analysed observations in order to develop lessons and propose remedial actions, this information must be recorded so that it can be further reviewed and developed throughout the deployment process. Doing so allows for patterns and trends to be identified, such as issues that improve or deteriorate over time, and to ensure the appropriate information is securely stored. Furthermore, at the end of the lessons learned process, this information must be archived so that it can serve as a reference to guide responses to similar issues in the future. This section includes considerations related to how information will be recorded and later accessed (whether physically or digitally); means of information entry; a description of the relevant responsibilities, as well as an overview of what we mean by archiving information.

3.1 Lessons Learned Log

An effective way of recording lessons is through the development of a Lessons Learned Log. As opposed to an incident log which simply records that an incident occurred, a Lessons Learned Log records, at the very least, the information contained within the TODCR format, along with additional administrative information and metadata to support later review. An Excel Lessons Learned Log Template is provided as part of this Toolkit.

3.1.1 Lessons Learned Log Format

To support the recording and management of developed lessons, it is highly recommended that the Record function is carried out digitally. This will make the process far easier, although it may not be feasible in all cases: for example, when IT equipment or network connections are lacking. In such instances, it may be more practical to develop a written Lessons Learned Log, but it is strongly recommended that this be recorded digitally at the first available opportunity. It is also suggested that Microsoft Office be used for this function because it can be used both online and offline and it gives the option to be stored either locally or online. Two suggested Microsoft Office programmes are:

3.1.2 Microsoft Word

Microsoft Word can be a highly beneficial means of developing a Lessons Learned Log, as it is likely to be familiar to most personnel. When personnel are not familiar with the programme, it is still relatively easy to set up, use and maintain. However, it can become somewhat difficult to manage a number of lessons in such a log because there are no filtering/sorting mechanisms. As such, it may be difficult to use the information in the log to support the development of routine reports that call for lessons to be incorporated.

3.2.2 Microsoft Excel

Microsoft Excel can respond to Microsoft Word's drawbacks since it has filtering/sorting and searching functions built into the programme which can facilitate later review and reference. As a result, although personnel may not be as familiar with Excel as they are with Word, it is still a relatively simple programme to use, making it the ideal programme to develop a Lessons Learned Log.

3.2 Information Entry

Another point to consider is how this information will be recorded, and at what levels.

3.2.1 Direct Information Entry vs. Indirect Information Entry

For greater visibility into contingent-wide trends, a centralized Lessons Learned Log created within the contingent HQ is perhaps the best recommended option. This will allow for the consolidation of lessons from the whole contingent. This may be replicated at lower levels by the respective lessons learned focal points in line with the available staffing, infrastructure and resources while on deployment. For example:

- Direct Entry: Where IT resources are readily available, information can be directly added to the centralized database by the various lessons learned focal points at all levels.

- Indirect Entry: Where IT resources are less readily available, information may need to be recorded independently by lessons learned focal points at various levels and then passed up the chain of command when possible.

3.2.2 Follow-up Details

In addition to the previously mentioned information to be included in the Lessons Learned Log, further follow-up details should also be included where possible in order to show how an individual lesson is progressing through the lessons learned process. Such information includes, but is not limited to:

Information	Details
In-Missions actions taken	A list of the actions taken during the deployment to attempt to address the issue.
Actions to be taken after deployment	Where full in-mission resolution has not been possible, a list of the actions to be taken after deployment to address the issue.
Action Body	The action body best suited to implement the necessary actions to address the issue.
Issue resolved?	Whether the issue has been resolved.
Date of resolution	The date the issue was resolved.
Resolution details	Further information about how the issue was resolved.

Where direct entry is not feasible, it is strongly encouraged that the lessons collected by various sub-units be shared as widely and as regularly as possible so as to promote continuous lessons learning within the contingent.

3.3 Classification Considerations

When recording and sharing lessons learned information, care must be taken to ensure that sensitive information is treated in a secure manner. Naturally, such

protocols will already exist within deploying military and police forces.

The following classification levels are used by the United Nations where the disclosure of such information may be detrimental to the proper functioning of the United Nations or the welfare and safety of its staff or third parties or violate the Organization's legal obligations.

- Sensitive information may be classified as "confidential" or "strictly confidential".
- The designation "confidential" shall apply to information or material whose unauthorized disclosure could reasonably be expected to cause damage to the work of the United Nations.
- The designation "strictly confidential" shall apply to information or material whose unauthorized disclosure could reasonably be expected to cause exceptionally grave damage to or impede the conduct of the work of the United Nations.
- The designation "unclassified" shall apply to information or material whose unauthorized disclosure could reasonably be expected not to cause damage to the work of the United Nations.

More information can be found in the Secretary-General's bulletin on Information sensitivity, classification and handling; ST/SGB/2007/06.

3.4 Assigning Responsibilities

Whether digital or physical, the Lessons Learned Log is a living document, meaning that someone will need to be responsible for its management. This involves adding lessons as they arise, updating lessons where new information becomes available, and sharing this information with the relevant focal points to ensure lessons from sub-units are incorporated into the centralized consolidated lessons learned log. Where a single centralized Lessons Learned Log is used, this responsibility may be assigned to a single member of personnel; where there are multiple logs within the contingent's various sub-units, each log will likely require a dedicated member of personnel.

3.5 Archiving

While this Toolkit makes a distinction between the Record and Archive functions, the Archive function is actually an extension of the Record function. The reason they have been listed as two separate functions is to highlight that although they are similar in terms of practical considerations, they are carried out at different points in the lessons learned process and serve different purposes.

3.5.1 Purpose

Unlike the Record function, which is ongoing throughout the deployment process, the Archive function takes place at the end of the lessons learned life cycle which can be months or years after a deployment. Information is archived for two main reasons. Firstly, it allows us to conduct research in the future. Secondly, it allows us to maintain a historical archive that can guide responses to similar issues that arise in the future.

3.5.2 Similarities Between the Two Functions

The information that the Archive function deals with is typically the same (i.e., TODCR format), with a few additions. This includes how the lesson was implemented and verified, and what the outcome was (i.e., whether it was successful in allowing others to repeat successes and avoid making the same mistakes). Additionally, it also maintains similar metadata, again with a few additions, such as the year in which the lesson was developed/implemented/verified, and which operation the contingent was preparing for/deployed in. Similarly, it is recommended that information be archived in a digital archive for easy access to information in the future to empower deployment planning processes. Finally, the Archive function will also deal with the same security classifications as the Record function. These should be easy to identify so that, if at any point, the archived information is to be shared with external stakeholders (such as the UN), sensitive or classified information can be easily removed from the shared file.

3.5.3 Use of Microsoft Word vs. Microsoft Excel for Archiving

While Microsoft Word can be used for maintaining a Lessons Learned Log at lower levels, it is advised that it not be used for maintaining larger archives, as it does not have strong filtering/searching/sorting mechanisms which can make the file incredibly difficult to manage and navigate. Instead, Microsoft Excel is recommended because it has such mechanisms built in. This is also why the Lessons Learned Log Template provided in this Toolkit is a Microsoft Excel file. The addition of 'key words' to each lesson could also be considered to make its filtering/searching/sorting functions more powerful (i.e., to allow for easier identification of relevant lessons, such as 'community engagement', 'integrated patrols', or dealing with 'UN administration').

3.5.4 Expiration of Lessons Learned

When archiving information, additional metadata may be added to highlight how old the lesson is. This becomes increasingly important when many contingents are rotated to the same Mission: over time, it is entirely possible that approaches may change in response to a change in the operational environment, such as the appearance/disappearance of a threat actor. As a result, lessons developed before this change may no longer be relevant at later stages. As such, we must be careful when using these lessons to guide future approaches, as well as when sharing such information with other stakeholders.



Share

Main Effort: Share the collected lessons and proposed remedial actions with the relevant stakeholders so that the necessary changes in approach can be implemented and verified.

Having established a Lessons Learned Log, the information contained in the log must now be shared with others who can benefit from it and so that changes can be implemented by the appropriate stakeholders. Doing so will allow a military or police force to expand its body of institutional knowledge and better prepare future contingents for their deployments. This section will include planning considerations related to the different means of information sharing; what should be shared; with whom it should be shared, and the various responsibilities involved in carrying out this function.

4.1 Who do we Share Information with?

Collected lessons learned information should naturally be shared as regularly as possible to allow others to benefit from it. When we talk about information sharing, we are referring to three separate channels of information sharing.

4.1.1 Within the Contingent

Firstly, any changes in approach – whether an innovative approach that should be replicated or a mistake that should be avoided – should be widely shared within a military or police contingent by the various sub-units and personnel during the deployment process. Doing so ensures a coherent response across the contingent throughout the deployment.

4.1.2 Action Bodies

All collected lessons learned information should then be shared with the appropriate action bodies. Action bodies are those who will be responsible for implementing the proposed remedial actions. All lessons learned information should go through these bodies because they are responsible for both implementing and verifying lessons learned. Where implementation is not possible by the contingent, these action bodies may typically be national stakeholders. They include:

- National Institutions

- National Training Centres and Academies
- Future Commanders, Staff Officers, and Support Staff
- Future Peacekeepers

4.1.3 Other Beneficiaries

Once verified, the lessons learned should be shared with all other stakeholders who may benefit from them. These are the personnel who will have to change their approaches based on the information contained in the lessons learned, as well as those who will relay this information to other potential beneficiaries. These can be either national or UN stakeholders, and include:

- The UN Secretariat (DPO/DOS)
- Police and/or Military Senior Leadership of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations
- Civilian and Uniformed Policy and Best Practice Officers and Focal Points
- Integrated Mission Training Centre
- Mission Support Elements (such as the Support Centre, Air Operations, etc.)
- Other Member States such as Training and Capacity-building Support Providers
- Deployed Peacekeepers from Other Countries

Note: While deployed to a UN peacekeeping operation, contingents will support all Mission-led organizational learning efforts when necessary. However, with regards to internal contingent lessons, it is advised that lessons only be shared with the United Nations once they have been implemented and verified and are ready for archiving, as opposed to lessons which are still going through the lessons learned process.

4.2 Information Sharing

There are a wide variety of means of sharing information for the above-mentioned channels. This section will detail the various options available; considerations that may limit which means are selected, and a suggested approach to be taken by the deployed contingent.

4.2.1 Means of Information Sharing

Means of information sharing used by sub-units and individual personnel within a contingent include, but are not limited to:

- A centralized/consolidated Lessons Learned Log
- Incident reporting
- Verbal debriefings
- Other internal meetings

Means of information sharing used by the contingent when relaying information to other national stakeholders include, but are not limited to:

- Update emails
- Bulletins
- Daily/weekly/monthly/quarterly sitreps (Situation Reports)
- After-Action Reviews and Reports (AARs)
- End of Assignment Reviews and Reports (EoARs)
- Other Deployment Reviews

The means of information sharing used by national stakeholders when sharing information with other stakeholders may typically be the same as those mentioned above. However, they may also be carried out in more formal ways, such as notes verbales or official letters. Commanders must ensure that, regardless of the means of information sharing selected, their reports are gender responsive and integrate Women, Peace and Security considerations. To do so, they should make reference to the contingent's efforts to promote the full, equal and meaningful participation of women within the contingent and examine the impacts of women participation (or lack thereof) on the contingent's ability to successfully conduct its mandated tasks.

4.2.2 Limitations on Information Sharing

There are various limitations and considerations that may guide how information will be shared both within a contingent and by the contingent with other stakeholders. These include, but are not limited to:

- **Language:** Beyond the specified members of the military contingent/FPU command staff who are required to have a command of English or French, the remaining staff will likely require these resources and any reporting forms/templates in their own 'operational' languages and will therefore require the

translation of such materials.

- **Infrastructure- and resource-related limitations:** These could be to do with available IT equipment; whether a local network connection is available, and whether Internet access is available.
- **Personnel limitations:** Military and police personnel may not be able to regularly develop and share dedicated lessons learned reports and bulletins, perhaps due to time constraints or other responsibilities.
- **Information classification considerations:** Care must be taken to ensure that sensitive information is treated in a secure manner. This may have an impact on how information is shared both within the contingent and with the relevant stakeholders.

4.2.3 Suggested Focus for the Contingent

It is strongly encouraged that lessons learned information be incorporated into existing reporting mechanisms. This includes internal contingent reporting mechanisms, as well as reporting lines with other stakeholders. To this end, it is suggested that the Toolkit's Observation Collection Template could be used for various means of information sharing, as it could be incorporated into a wide range of reporting mechanisms used by the contingent to share information.

It is also possible that, in some cases, regular sharing of lessons learned information may not be feasible. While this information should be included in handover notes for the following contingent, it is strongly encouraged that such information also be included in existing end of assignment reporting procedures. Where such procedures are not standardized, the information could be incorporated into the Deployment Report Template provided as part of this Toolkit. In both cases, the most important lessons can be highlighted within the report itself. A completed Lessons Learned Log of all collected lessons and remedial actions from the deployment can also be attached as an annex.

4.3 What to Share

Understanding how information can be shared both within a contingent and through its external reporting lines, we can now focus on what information should be shared.

While, again, regular and extensive information sharing is strongly encouraged, we must consider whether what we intend to share is useful before doing so.

4.3.1 What Should be Shared?

There are two main categories of information that we should share within a lessons learned system.

Firstly, we should aim to share good practices and lessons identified which have passed the checklist for inclusion and which have sufficient information, with a focus on those issues with a higher Mission impact. These observations should also have been reviewed by an SME in order to confirm that the lesson itself and the proposed remedial action are appropriate.

Secondly, we should also aim to share innovative approaches which have been adopted by the contingent during the deployment process and which have improved an approach. This would not yet constitute a lesson learned as, while it has proven to be effective in this context, it has not yet been proven to be applicable in other situations. Similarly, we should also seek to share lessons which the contingent has not been successful in addressing, with an explanation as to why the implemented remedial actions were not successful. Implementation efforts will be discussed further in the next chapter.

Above all, we should aim to share information about both our successes and our mistakes. We must be honest in acknowledging our errors so that we can learn from them; so that missions can be better accomplished, and so that we can help to avoid injury and loss of life in future deployments.

4.3.2 What Should not be Shared?

On the other hand, we should avoid sharing unfiltered or 'raw' observations. This refers to observations or lessons which have not passed the checklist for inclusion or do not have sufficient information. Alternatively, the SME may have determined that this was a simple mistake, or that the proposed lesson/remedial action is not appropriate. Before this information can be shared, it should go through the appropriate processes, such as filtering and SME approval.

4.4 Assigning Responsibilities

First and foremost, action bodies should be assigned. Typically, the primary action body will likely be a national doctrine or guidance branch/department, as they will be required to approve any potential changes to the force generation, uniformed preparation, and personnel selection processes. Fortunately, it is likely that a report will be sent to this stakeholder at the end of a deployment, meaning that lessons learned considerations could simply be included in such reporting.

Beyond this, the responsibility for writing the reports for sharing information within the contingent should also be assigned. The same incident reporting mechanisms used to collect observations could also be used for the Share function, as using this same reporting chain would avoid the need to develop an additional reporting system.

Finally, the responsibility for writing the final deployment report/end of assignment report to be shared with external stakeholders should also be assigned, whether written or verbal. Typically, this will be the responsibility of the contingent commander, and such reporting mechanisms will already exist. In such a report, the key lessons can be incorporated into the body of the report, with the Lessons Learned Log attached as an annex. Where a standardized reporting format is not used, the Toolkit's Deployment Report Template can be used.



Implement and Verify

Main Effort (Implement): Implement the proposed remedial actions in order to ensure that successes are replicated and mistakes avoided in the future.

Main Effort (Verify): Verify whether the change in approach has allowed others to successfully replicate a success or avoid repeating a mistake to finalize the lesson learned or best practice.

Having shared lessons with the appropriate action bodies, the remedial actions should be implemented and their results verified to ensure that they have addressed the issue, meaning that the lessons can be considered 'learned'. Given how closely linked these two functions are, this section will discuss the planning considerations related to both functions, including: how implementation works; the challenges it faces, and how we verify these implemented lessons.

5.1 Remedial Action Implementation

Remedial actions are the key components which ensure lessons can be learned by others. They are a step or a series of steps to be taken to adjust the current institutional approach so that others can replicate a more successful approach; avoid an unsuccessful approach, or improve existing approaches when faced with the same situation in the future. The Implement function consists of applying the proposed remedial actions; the Verify function consists of making sure whether the implemented remedial actions have had the intended effect.

5.1.1 Who is Responsible for Implementation?

Not all lessons and remedial actions will require a formal process to be carried out. As explained by the principle of low-level implementation and resolution of the lessons learned process, issues should ideally be addressed at the lowest level possible: if the contingent has the capacity and the resources to address the issue internally, it should make every effort to do so. Where the contingent is not capable of doing so, it can then progressively pass the issue up the chain of command for resolution. However, even where issues are addressed at lower levels, this information should still be passed up the chain of command for replication at higher levels as discussed in the Share section.

Naturally, there will likely be many issues that the contingent will be unable to address on their own. In such cases, they will need to turn to external stakeholders. These stakeholders are the action bodies referred to in the Share section. Given that their approval will be required to make changes to national processes, they may typically be a national doctrine or guidance branch/department. Additionally, more specific action bodies can be appointed as per the lines of capability development used for

our remedial actions. By doing so, instead of expecting a single stakeholder to be responsible for addressing every single lesson, we can ensure that the appropriate action body is responsible for implementing and verifying lessons related to its area of expertise.

5.1.2 Implementation Considerations

These selected action bodies will be responsible for developing an action plan to implement the remedial action. This highlights the importance of ensuring that proposed remedial actions are not simply a statement of the effect required, but rather a clear description of what needs to be done to achieve it. In more detail, it should allow the action bodies to develop a clear outline of the way forward, including what resources will be required to implement the necessary changes and a timeline for its implementation.

There are three main considerations that may affect how the Implement function is conducted. These are:

- a. The length of time required to implement remedial actions,
- b. The use of dedicated personnel and resources, and
- c. The prioritization of issues.

5.1.2.1 Time Required to Implement

Addressing lessons can be time consuming. It is highly likely that, in the context of a military or police deployment, the personnel observing the issue will have completed their tour and returned to their home unit before their lessons can be fully learned by the rest of the organization. Furthermore, a country's commitment to a peacekeeping operation will often involve multiple contingents being rotated in, one after the other. As the second contingent will begin training during the first contingent's deployment, there may not be enough time to make the necessary changes to the second contingent's preparation prior to their deployment. As a result, it is possible that the first contingent's lessons will not be 'learned' until the third or even the fourth contingent begins its pre-deployment training, highlighting how lengthy the process can be.

5.1.2.2 Personnel and Resources

The personnel best suited to address an issue are those who initially observed it since they have the most insight into the issue. However, it is highly likely that the initial observer may not be involved in the implementation process due to the time it

can take for lessons to be learned. Furthermore, implementation is not as simple as stating that more training is required: training programmes will need to be developed; training plans will need to be devised; trainers contracted; classes planned, etc. Combined, these two elements further highlight the importance of ensuring national institutions support the lessons learned process, as they must be willing to invest both time and resources and enable the application and learning of collected and developed lessons. If this is not done, efforts made by the contingent to collect, develop, manage and share lessons will have been a waste of time and resources as others will not be able to benefit from them.

5.1.2.3 Prioritization

Implementing remedial actions is time consuming and requires the support of a wide range of stakeholders. This again highlights the importance of prioritizing issues. Whereas the filtering processes described in the Analyse section focused on ensuring that the collected observations and lessons have sufficient information, prioritizing is about ensuring that we dedicate our time, resources and energy to resolving the important issues. For example:

1. How **likely** is it that this issue will **reoccur** and how **often** will it do so?
2. What is the **impact** of this issue on the contingent's ability to conduct its **mandated tasks**?
3. What is the **risk** to those involved if this issue is **not resolved**?
4. Is it **worth** spending **time** on resolving this issue?
5. Is it **worth** spending **money** on resolving this issue?

Considering what is involved in implementing a remedial action, it is likely that implementation efforts may be limited to only a handful of key issues (typically 3-5 issues maximum).

5.2 Lesson Verification

At this point, we have implemented our remedial actions, which means that both the way we operate and the way we train, plan, prepare and support new deployments have changed. All that remains (excluding archiving) is to verify that the implemented changes have indeed allowed our lessons to be 'learned'. In other words, we now

need to ensure that this change does indeed allow us to replicate a more successful approach; avoid an unsuccessful approach, or respond with an improved approach when faced with the same situation. There are two main ways of doing this:

5.2.1 Returning to the Collect Function

The length of time it takes to implement the proposed remedial actions can affect the verification process. Indeed, to verify whether the lessons collected by a previous deployment have indeed been learned, we must look at the observations, lessons and remedial actions that future deployments develop. Considering the definition of a lesson learned, which states that the information that has been shared with others must be proven to be applicable in other situations:

If future deployments struggle to replicate past successes and continue to repeat past mistakes despite the changes made to their training and preparation, this would suggest that the implemented remedial actions have not been fully successful. In this case, the information shared with others has been proven not to be applicable in other situations. As a result, the process will need to begin again, and new remedial actions will need to be developed.

If future deployments are able to replicate past successes and do not repeat past mistakes, then this would suggest that the changes made to the training and preparation of future contingents based on what has been learned by previous deployments have been successful. In this case, the information shared with others has been proven to be applicable in other situations. This implies that the lesson has indeed been converted into a lesson learned.

Naturally, there will be a grey area between the two above examples in which the implemented remedial actions have been somewhat effective, but only to a certain point. In this case, this may still constitute a lesson learned, but the approach will need continued fine-tuning in the future. This leads us to the argument that, from an operational point of view, a lesson can never truly be 'learned' because the operating environment of a peacekeeping operation will continually evolve. This means that our approaches will also need to evolve with them. However, so long as we continually work to improve our training and preparation based on the up-to-date lessons provided by those in the field, our approaches will continue to improve, meaning that we will – by definition – be continually learning lessons and using the best practices available at the time.

5.2.2 Contingent Evaluations: National and In-Mission

During the deployment process, contingents will be subject to several evaluations, conducted both by their national chain of command and by the United Nations. In these evaluations, the contingent will be graded on a wide range of skills and capabilities. On the completion of its deployment, it will be evaluated on how these skills translated into successful delivery of its mandated tasks and support for mandate implementation.

By comparing the results from previous evaluations to current evaluations, it may be possible to verify the extent to which the implemented changes in approach have resulted in an improvement in performance in a specific evaluated area. By doing so, we can confirm whether the implemented change in approach has been successfully 'learned'.

LESSONS LEARNED PLANNING CONSIDERATIONS



DEPLOYMENT REVIEW

Guidance
Note



Digital Toolkit