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Abstract

The problems requiring managerial decisions are common for all countries in the Euro-Atlantic community regardless of the status of each individual country. Regardless the involved state is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) or its partner. Some of these problems have already existed for decades but have become particularly acute over the last twenty years. These problems include the reduction of troops and spending on post-Cold War peace dividends as well as the need of an increase in the number of mobile armed forces capable of operating far beyond the borders of their countries and whose actions have to be supported for a very long periods of time.
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1. INTRODUCTION

From a historical standpoint the defense management has emerged as a topic of interest to the defense sector fairly recently. Western countries introduce a defense management concept in the process of solving problems like allocating financial or human resources, solving strategic and operational tasks as part of an integrated approach or using business-specific defense management tools. Such an approach requires highly professional and dedicated efforts at all levels and in all divisions of the state military organization. One of the proven ways of achieving this goal is the use of planning management functions, organization, leadership and control in all areas of the defense organization, which can contribute to maximizing the effectiveness of the armed forces’ operational activities. The problems requiring managerial decisions are the same for all countries in the Euro-Atlantic community, regardless of the status of each country, whether it is a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) or its partner. Some of these problems have existed for decades, but have become increasingly acute over the last twenty years. These problems include the reduction of troops and spending on post-Cold War peace dividends as well as the need of an increase in the number of mobile armed forces capable of operating far beyond the borders of their countries and whose actions have to be supported for a very long periods of time. In order for the implementation of managerial approaches to be considered they must address these and other similar problems while also be placed in the general context of the public interest according to the state of defense. Furthermore, in requests related to the actions and the results from these actions of the defense sector as a whole in particular the defense forces and resources. The fulfillment of this condition is of particular importance given the fact that in the absence of incentives or pressure from above any publicly funded organization, including the defense organization, is unlikely to undertake its own initiatives for the increase of the effectiveness of its activities. Thus every theoretical approach towards defense management must be closely linked to the sphere of democratic control over the defense sector and the armed forces (Antonov, Tsonev, 2016; Stoev, Zaharieva, Mutkov, 2019). There is no single commonly accepted definition of the term "defense
management”. The term simply covers the idea that defense organizations need to implement defense policies into practice and that they must create reliable and effective planning mechanisms, security systems and infrastructure. The modernization of the defense sector is a critical issue that has been addressed to the governments of the Euro-Atlantic community for at least the last fifteen years. Some states are focused on transforming their armed forces in order for them to better respond to 21st century security threats. Other states undertake a more ambitious restructurining of the entire defense sphere in order to create new defense institutions. This process is especially true for post-communist states that are on the path of democratic transformation as well as for states that are currently in the last stage of these transformations.

All of these states expect strategic results from the reform of their defense and security sectors, correctly considering the success of these transformations as a factor contributing to their integration into the Euro-Atlantic community as well as a factor in strengthening their own security and the prosperity of their people. Achieving these strategic goals requires a more rational allocation of scarce public resources, a more efficient use of such resources and a more visible and controlled outcome of government programs, including the defense oriented ones (Antonov, Hristozov, 2017; Terziev, Bankov, Georgiev, 2018). In many countries public administration is replacing its rather rigorous and rather bureaucratic form of activity on behalf of society with more flexible and distinct public sector governance with the number of these countries steadily increasing. But in this case a question arises: how can the government “build defense” more effectively? Part of this answer lies in the level of implementation of the optimal management practices in the defense sector that are accepted in the business sector, where the achievement of the intended results is of paramount importance for the survival of each organization in the competitive environment.

The cooperation initiative NATO/EAPC called “Partnership Action Plan on Defense Institution Building” (PAP-DIB) provides several examples of how domestic incentives to reform a country’s defense sector through its more effective institutionalization are matched by international interest in supporting relevant programs. Part of this initiative is directly related to the concept of defense management.

Management planning is different from military operation planning, but it has a direct impact on the development of the armed forces structure or on the purchase of basic military equipment. What defense management can provide is to connect people in defense organizations who are prepared to accomplish their assigned tasks, with equipment and weaponry, and with comprehensive support to more effectively achieve their defense goals and objectives.

2. DEFENSE PLANNING AND DEFENSE MANAGEMENT

Parliaments and defense organizations of many partner countries as well as some of the new NATO members still face certain problems related to the concept of defense policy, the link between policy and planning, the concept of defense potential, the relationship between plans and budgets, the link between structural changes and technical modernization and other important and costly activities. This is not surprising given that unlike in NATO, the decision-making and planning processes in the former Warsaw Pact countries have been fully centralized. The countries of the former Warsaw Pact with the exception of Russia little to no knowledge and experience about defense policy and planning. Moreover, in the last decade of the 20th century the defense organizations of the former Warsaw Pact and post-Soviet republics constituted only a small fraction of immature and generally weak democratic institutions. As a result of this approach very few of its new members are able to make a significant contribution to the Alliance’s potential during NATO accession.

This study examines the importance of the defense policy and the transparency of long-term and structural reform plans for democratic governance in the defense sector. It also discusses the characteristics of short, medium and long-term planning as well as the relationships between the respective processes, which indicate why defense planning is one of the key processes in defense management (Antonov, 2017a; Terziev, Petkova - Georgieva, 2019b).

A framework model for ensuring coherence between military policy objectives and structural change is presented and the importance and role of risk planning is explained. A brief description of the context of the defense planning process at a national level is presented and the importance of transparency of decision-making processes in terms of democratic accountability and the effectiveness of the actions of the defense department are highlighted. I will try to help the civilian and military experts of each country involved in the creation of democratic governance in the field of defense to better understand the link between security challenges and the political goals of defense planning and on the other hand the mechanisms for defense planning and resource management.

Regardless of how “perfect” the system implemented in the Ministry of Defense, accounting and how transparent financial procedures are they must ensure the development of an organizational structure
appropriate to the situation, political goals and strategy of the country (Stoev, Zaharieva, Borodzhieva, 2019a; Terziev, Bankov, Georgiev, 2018a).

3. ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES FOR LONG-TERM DEFENSE PLANNING

The two most credible defense planning sources provide similar definitions about the defense planning approaches. In the 2004 edition, Bartlett, Holman and Soames offered nine options (Terziev, Petkova - Georgieva, 2019c).

In a top-down approach interests, goals and strategies determine the decision directions according to the structure of the armed forces. In the bottom-up version the focus is based on enhancing existing defense capabilities and improving their respective weapon systems: first, the ability to meet the requirements for ongoing operations and operational plans is improved. In the case of scenario based approaches in which planners model several typical situations with each situation providing specific conditions for the use of the armed forces. These scenarios are then used to identify tasks that are aimed at achieving the goal and providing suitable opportunities.

In two closely related and complementary approaches respectively based on threat and vulnerability assessment, plan developers are looking for ways to address the problems associated with identified threats and the potential weaknesses of the potential adversary. Then the requirements for military capabilities are determined in comparison to the capabilities of the potential adversary (Terziev, Arabska, Dzhumalieva, 2016a; Terziev, Dzhumalieva, 2015; Nichev, 2009).

The approach - "key responsibilities and tasks" - is functional. In this approach the capability requirements for the Armed Forces and Allied Forces are determined independently of the scenarios, threats or identified weaknesses of the potential adversary. Instead they are defined as key responsibilities for example, to ensure air supremacy at all costs. Then depending on these key responsibilities, requirements are created to create the required set of capabilities as well as separate groups of requirements in the event of peace, crisis or conflict. The capability-based approach also provides for functional analysis. The functions and tasks that must be performed during the envisaged operations are transformed into requirements for capabilities. On this basis, planners develop force grouping options to provide these capabilities as efficiently and cost-effectively as possible. By reinsurace, planners try to minimize the risks associated with the preparation of troops for every current objective as well as objectives that may occur after thirty or more years. At the same time, the requirements approved will be sufficient to provide the necessary balance and flexibility to deal with a variety of challenges and threats although the cost of these measures will be extremely high (Terziev, Dzhumalieva, 2016b-e).

Using the following approach planners are trying to achieve strategic and operational superiority based on technology. This approach is based on the belief that knowledge, creativity and innovation will provide the best systems and therefore a significant military advantage. Finally, in the fiscal approach to defense planning, decisions on the structure of the armed forces are determined by budget constraints.

Another authoritative source is the Handbook on Long Term Defence Planning issued by the NATO Research and Technology Organization. It offers a slightly different set of possible approaches to long-term planning. It is presented in the form of a three-component structure depending on the main purpose of the defense analysis. When the planning process is paramount, analysts distinguish top-down planning and limited resource planning (Stoykov, 2011-a; Stoykov, 2002; Stoykov, 2003; Stoykov, 2005).

In accordance on the level of optimism about the capabilities of new technologies or, on the other hand, the desire to adhere to historically proven facts, experienced designers apply four possible approaches:

- Technological optimism;
- Risk avoidance;
- Planning through gradual construction;
- Accounting for historical experience.

The last three approaches are based on proven concepts, the existing organizational structure, the capabilities of the Armed Forces and also adhere to the method of gradually improving efficiency and profitability. Under certain conditions they may be similar to the bottom-up variants described above. The following three approaches differ when the focus is on the features or specific scenarios that determine the level of effectiveness of the future structure of the armed forces. These approaches include capability-based planning, scenario-based planning and threat-based planning. Each of these approaches has its advantages and disadvantages which are rarely implemented in their ‘pure’ form. Virtually a defense planning approach
may have the characteristics of two or more different possibilities. According to the Handbook, mature defense planning systems are today dominated by two approaches. This is resource-oriented planning (a softer form of resource-limited planning) and scenario-based. Since the publication of the Handbook in 2003 major defense planning efforts have been focused on enhancing the focus on capabilities and introducing the latest operational concepts. In particular an “impact-oriented” approach to operations. They goal to increase the flexibility of mechanisms for strategy development and planning and the response speed to changes in the security situation (Terziev, Bogdanov, Kanev, Georgiev, 2019b-d; Petrov, Georgiev, 2019e; Terziev, Georgiev, 2017b).

4. CONCLUSION

The conducted comparative analysis of the EU defense planning methodology compared to US and NATO defense planning shows that this methodology is largely similar. This applies in particular to the structure and logic of planning, its geographical coverage and the significant publicity component of public documents. Like the US and NATO the EU makes little use of strategic forecasting in its security and defense planning and places the principle of ‘strategic uncertainty’ at the forefront. Dynamic forecasting elements are widely used in EU planning especially in the short term. The EU has gone even further in this field applying a technique that can be arbitrarily called “dynamic planning”. The EU methodology for planning in the field of defense has some major characteristics related to the fact that the EU is mainly a civic organization where military matters occupy only a small, albeit rather important place. Therefore, priority in planning is given to the support of civilian efforts to ensure security and last but not least the use of armed force. This predetermines the fact that the main focus of EU policy is on instruments such as crisis management, political stability, peacekeeping operations and the participation of other countries in various forms of partnership and cooperation (Terziev, Nichev, 2017c-i; Terziev, Nichev, Bogdanov, 2017-j-k; Terziev, Madanski, Georgiev, 2017l-m).
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