



2nd International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations Concluding Remarks of Day One

Robert Gordon

I. Introduction

1. Concluding is a very subjective and difficult process after such a rich and varied day. So these notes are caveated by their focus, which was driven by the issues that personally interested me on behalf of the Partnership. Accordingly, I will try to identify those issues where the Partners may usefully support the challenges identified by our many speakers. The day has been modular in its approach, and the presentations and subsequent interventions need to be read in conjunction with the excellent papers developed for the Forum. Transcripts or copies of presentations will be posted in due course on the Challenges web site. The context was set by Ben Tortolani of CIC who identified for us a rising liability for peacekeeping concomitant with a global dearth of qualified resources. So doing what we do, better, has to be a key requirement, but if this is to be effective the political will of the member states must be in support.

II. A New Partnership for UN Peace Operations - What are the Next Steps?

2. The starting point for this Next Steps session was the DPKO/DFS non-paper, A New Horizon. Fatemah Ziai's thoughtful accompanying paper for the Forum identified the opportunities where the Partners could make a useful contribution in taking forward some of the initiatives and recommendations of the non-paper. The USGs of DPKO and DFS outlined to us their four priorities over the next year: (1) Policy Development, to include more clarity on the requirements and guidance needed for complex and controversial subjects such as protection of civilians and robust peacekeeping; (2) Capability Development to identify the gaps and remedial actions needed to allow UN peacekeeping to do its business in the field better; (3) A Field Support Strategy, which will improve the balance between the management of resources and the delivery of the mandate in face of the higher tempo and demands of contemporary peacekeeping operations; and (4) a communications strategy to improve the triangular dialogue between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the T/PCCs.

3. The substance of the work in support of these priorities would be presented in the SG's report to the C34 in February. The message to Partners from the USGs was clear and was reinforced by the Canadian Permanent Representative, Mr Normandin who moderated the Session. If the Secretariat is to respond to the challenges identified in the New Horizon non-paper, then it needs to have the support and active engagement of the

member states, in order to garner the resources needed to manage some of the changes. In this, Challenges Partners have a key role in their own countries in educating and sensitizing opinion in support of debate and needed reforms.

4. Unsurprisingly much of the session was focused upon the physical and conceptual components of contemporary peacekeeping. Certainly they need attention. However, we heard less on the moral component, particularly that associated with ensuring good leadership and staff management in the field. All agree that these issues are both mission essential and fragile and yet few are confident that the UN has got this right, as significant weaknesses do exist. These are issues that deserve the Partners close focus and attention in the future, to ensure that good people are encouraged, managed and retained and that the right leadership is selected, trained and supported.

III. Multi-Dimensional Peace Operations – Early Peacebuilding and the Need for New Strategies and Partners.

5. This session spoke to the core functions of peacekeeping as articulated in the Capstone Doctrine: secure and stabilize the environment; facilitate the political process while strengthening institutions of governance; and provide the framework for all in country activities to ensure coherence and coordination. It was apparent in the session that there is not a universal consensus that some of the early peacebuilding activities, including strengthening the rule of law, were the business and responsibility of a peacekeeping Mission. It was also apparent that the “Capstone Doctrine”, the Secretariat’s strategic articulation of multi-dimensional peacekeeping, was unfamiliar to many participants. Partners, who did so much to help the development of these Guidelines and Principles, probably need to do more to communicate them.

6. A strong message came from the ASG of OROLSI, Mr Titov that Rule of Law issues lay at the heart of a peacekeeping mission mandated to consolidate a peace. Furthermore they provided the exit strategy. However, the nexus between such early peacebuilding measures and the more security-focused activities of peacekeeping was still developing. Illustrative of this immaturity was the leanness of staff within OROLSI to provide guidance and management of these issues in the field. Clearly, therefore, an important role for Partners lay in supporting the development of concepts and strategies focused upon this emerging but central area of peace consolidation activities. Additionally, the need for a rapidly deployable civilian capability to support rule of law issues was urgently needed. This was particularly important in the areas of justice and corrections reform in order to complement the new and successful standing police capacity.

7. The Acting Police Advisor, Ms Anne-Marie Orler indicated that Partners and donor member states were active in measures to support and improve the quality of police training and capacity, although much more needed doing. A stronger focus, however, was still needed on building local capacity within mentoring partnerships between the UN, donor states and the host nation. Partners would wish to remain engaged in this field. Additionally in the area of law enforcement the alarming issue of the prevalence and

pervasiveness of organised crime within fragile states was identified and supported by a helpful paper by James Cockayne of IPI. More attention is clearly needed on this issue, which needs to be factored into mission planning and considerations.

IV. Mandate –Making and Implementation

8. Mr Sherman in support of his Forum paper, identified an increasing concern of the Security Council to tackle and mandate state-building tasks and not limit themselves to security issues alone. In discussion it was clear that there was not universal support for this trend, which served to highlight the need for a better dialogue between the Security Council and member states. Best practice has shown that unless the root causes of conflict are addressed, a fragile peace cannot be consolidated. Security measures, which tend to deal with the symptoms of conflict alone, are insufficient and thus the trend to include state building tasks. However, this can lead to an unresourced profusion of tasks, with little indication of priorities. Panellists spoke of the work, now going ahead, following the Anglo-French Security Council initiative, to put more rigour, prioritisation and clarity into mandate articulation, central to which was the recurring theme of better dialogue between the Secretariat, the Council and member states, and a better analysis of the problem leading to more informed decision-making.

9. In terms of implementation, again the issue of the evolved principles of peacekeeping as identified by the Capstone Doctrine, proved central to the implementation of mandates. Ambassador Klein offered further clarity on this issue from a practitioners view when he emphasised the need for 5 prerequisites for successful implementation: the mandate (which should serve as a floor not a ceiling); a properly resourced and structured mission; an integrated planning process; good leadership able to garner political support and inspire and protect mission personnel; and a well articulated and measurable exit strategy.

10. The ensuing discussions served to emphasise the complexity of implementing complex mandates in contemporary peacekeeping missions, which conflate security and peacebuilding. In this regard, very apparent was the value of the work being undertaken by the Partners in support of the needed guidance at the operational level for mission leadership. If Partners were uncertain about the value of this conceptual guidance project, today's excellent discussions clearly underlined the requirement. Overall, it was an excellent and stimulating day and our thanks to all those who made such positive contributions.