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The *Global Peace Operations Review* is an interactive web-portal presenting in-depth analysis and detailed data on military peacekeeping operations and civilian-led political missions by the United Nations, regional organizations, and ad-hoc coalitions. The web-portal is a product of the New York University Center on International Cooperation (CIC) and a continuation of its long-standing print publications the *Annual Review of Global Peace Operations* and the *Review of Political Missions*.

Providing the most comprehensive overview of multilateral contributions to peacekeeping, conflict prevention, and post-conflict peacebuilding, the Review aims to initiate and inform discussions on the comparative advantages and appropriateness of different missions, and through constructive analysis to further strengthen existing partnerships necessary for them to succeed.

Through the *Country & Regional Profile pages*, the Review provides background information and regularly updated key developments on peace operations and the contexts in which they operate. The analysis is further enhanced by the provision of detailed data on each of the UN's peace operations, and headline data on missions fielded by regional organizations and ad hoc missions, which can be accessed in full through the *Data & Trends* section. Data on non-UN peace operations was compiled by the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). For more details, please see our *Data guide*. The *Strategic Summary* provides an overview of main developments in mission settings over the past year and presents analysis on trends and the impact these may have on shaping peace operations of the future. Thematic essays presented in the In Focus section unpack issues critical to peace operations, providing analysis and guidance on possible approaches.

The Library section enables readers to download full text .pdf files of past editions of the *Annual Review of Global Peace Operations* (2006-2012) and the *Review of Political Missions* (2010-2012). For those interested in conducting their own analysis using the data generated for these publications, we have provided spreadsheets of all the *statistics* used to compile these reports.

**Scope of the Global Peace Operations Review**

The Review covers more than one hundred multilateral peace operations active in the previous year including missions fielded by the UN, AU, EU, Ecowas, OSCE, OAS and coalitions. It uses a *broad definition of peace operations* that includes multilateral and ad hoc military and police missions, as well as civilian led political missions. Neither type of mission has a simple definition. Alongside more straightforward peacekeeping missions, the Review, mindful of the need for peace operations to adjust to the changing nature of conflict, also includes peace enforcement operations that employ the use of force and engage in active combat.

Under political missions, we include multilateral civilian-led missions that have political engagement in the form of launching and supporting political processes at their core. This includes, for example, the EU's Special Representatives and the African Union Liaison Offices that support the implementation of peace agreements and accompany political processes. We have excluded missions, such as EU delegations and other liaison offices that may engage in political activities, but as their core function serve more as regular diplomatic or developmental presences. Along the same reasoning, we have also excluded election observer and human rights monitoring missions.

**Disclaimer**

The Center on International Cooperation is solely responsible for the content of this publication. Any errors of fact or analysis, and any and all judgments and interpretations about missions and operations discussed herein, are those of CIC alone.
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BETWEEN BUREAUCRACY AND ADHOCRACY: CRAFTING A SPECTRUM OF UN PEACE OPERATIONS

Ian Johnstone

The array of tools the UN has developed to prevent, manage and resolve conflict has expanded in recent years. They are being deployed in new formats, from political missions and small peacebuilding teams, to large observer missions and multidimensional peace operations with offensive capabilities. But the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) and other recent reports question whether the tools are being used as effectively as they could be.

The HIPPO recommended, “the full spectrum of peace operations must be employed more flexibly to respond to changing needs on the ground”. It said the UN must deliver more “right fit” missions, a “continuum of response and smoother transitions between different phases of missions.” This message was echoed in the Secretary-General’s follow up report, the Advisory Group of Experts (AGE) on the Peacebuilding Architecture Review, and the Global Study on the implementation of resolution 1325. It is also implicit in the Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, which calls for creativity in how to respond to that threat.

A central message of the reports is the need to get away from supply-driven interventions in mandating and designing missions. They call for a more flexible, demand-driven approach that is context-appropriate and harnessed to an overarching political strategy. They critique the tendency to fall back on peace operation templates, and to allow budgets and bureaucratic structures to drive the planning process, rather than what the circumstances require.

There is a need to re-focus attention on those circumstances. The practical challenge is not to envision some ideal end state and design a mission to achieve that, but rather to determine what is achievable in light of conditions on the ground. That in turn requires an assessment of what conditions lend themselves to the successful use of one instrument in the peace operations toolkit as opposed to another.

The term peace operations as used in the reports encompasses peacekeeping, political missions and other instruments the UN deploys to maintain peace and security. As such, it enables a more substantive discussion of the spectrum without getting distracted by the traditional dichotomy UN intergovernmental bodies draw between peacekeeping and political missions for budgetary reasons.
WHAT IS DRIVING THIS INQUIRY?

At one level, it is a need to conceptualize an approach to mandate design and mission planning that mitigates the distorting effects of budget and bureaucratic categories. At a deeper level, it is to mitigate the effects of a design and planning process that is driven more by Security Council dynamics and Fifth Committee negotiations than careful analysis of what the circumstances require. This is a tall order. Security Council politics, budgets and bureaucratic rivalry are powerful forces that won’t be overcome simply through better analysis. The goal is less ambitious. It is to reinstitute a mode of mandate design and mission planning that starts with conditions on the ground and then turns to these other factors, rather than the other way around.

Beyond that, three other considerations are driving this inquiry. First, the environments into which peace operations are being deployed are fluid and do not lend themselves to easy application of the existing templates. These include places where the host government is obstructive or outright hostile to the presence of a peace operation, where state authority is weak or perceived by the population to be illegitimate, or where there is substantial intervention by outside actors in an internal conflict.

Of particular note are places where the threat of violent extremism is high. The HIPPO report expresses the widely shared view that a UN peacekeeping mission should not engage in military counter-terrorism operations and offers suggestions as to what it should do when asymmetric threats are present in the operating environment. The Plan of Action on Preventing Violent Extremism provides further insight. But many questions are left unanswered, including what do to do when a protection of civilians mandate seems to call for forceful measures against threats emanating from extremists groups.

THE PRACTICAL CHALLENGE IS NOT TO ENVISION SOME IDEAL ENDSTATE AND DESIGN A MISSION TO ACHIEVE THAT, BUT TO DETERMINE WHAT IS ACHIEVABLE IN LIGHT OF CONDITIONS ON THE GROUND.

These complicated dynamics rarely resolve into a clear picture of what form a UN presence should take. They create a risk that the UN may get drawn into situations where it does not belong. This may happen because the organization is called on when all other options are politically unviable, or because deploying a UN operation can be an excuse for not taking other actions the situation may require. These concerns have stimulated a good deal of thought about the appropriate parameters for peacekeeping, going back to the three traditional principles set out in the UNEF I guidelines (1956), through Agenda for Peace (1992), Supplement to an Agenda for Peace (1995), the Brahimi Report (2000), Capstone Doctrine (2008) and now the HIPPO report (2015).

But there has been less thought about conditions that lend themselves to the effective use of other instruments, such as UN country teams, political missions, peacebuilding support offices, or regional offices. It is tempting to assume that, when a peacekeeping mission with a large military component is not the answer, a smaller purely civilian presence necessarily is. Yet even the decision to appoint a special envoy needs to be examined in each case. Beyond flying the UN flag, what value does he or she add? Too many envoys, after all, can complicate a peace process.

Because these environments are so fluid, peace operations have to be adaptable and able to change shape quickly in order to be effective. That is a second factor driving the inquiry into the spectrum operations. Their configuration and mandate will vary at
different phases of the conflict cycle: from escalating violence and all-out war, to peace negotiations, peace process implementation, or post-conflict recovery. Hopefully the conditions will improve over time; but sometimes they degrade. Whether the situation moves in a positive or negative direction, there has to be a regular process of assessment and reassessment to ascertain whether and how the conditions are changing. The notion of “adhocracy” is an organizational form that lends itself to innovation in a fluid environment. It is flexible and responsive, unencumbered by rigid structures or procedures. Such an approach can facilitate transitions from one kind of operation to another, for example when a large peacekeeping operation is succeeded by smaller political or peacebuilding mission, which in turn hands over to a reinforced UN country team. But this pattern is not inevitable. The more agile the UN is in reconfiguring a mission, scaling down when appropriate, or adding components when necessary, the more likely it is to succeed in its goals.

Third, a thread that runs through the HIPPO and other recent reports is “the primacy of politics.” While the idea is not new, consensus around it opens space for innovation in how the various tools at the UN’s disposal can be harnessed to a political strategy. The reports call for a renewed emphasis on conflict prevention, a goal that has been notoriously difficult to operationalize because it is hard to mobilize political will for something that has not happened. The emphasis on politics and prevention is an invitation to think creatively about how all UN instruments can serve to prevent the lapse into conflict, to prevent violence from getting worse, or to prevent a relapse once the violence has subsided. Not only mediators and envoys, but everything from small human rights offices to robust military operations can have a preventative effect, ideally by deterring would-be spoilers.

**IDEAL END STATES V. ACHIEVABLE GOALS**

There has been no shortage of thinking about the desirable end state of a peace process, articulated in numerous UN reports. In 2001, “No exit without strategy” defines “sustainable peace” to exist “not when all conflicts are removed from society, but when the natural conflicts of society can be resolved peacefully through the exercise of state Sovereignty and generally, participatory governance.”

In 2008, the Capstone Doctrine identifies four elements of sustainable peace and therefore a focus for early peacebuilding: a) restoring the state’s ability to provide security and maintain public order; b) strengthening the rule of law and respect for human rights; c) supporting the emergence of legitimate political institutions and participatory processes; d) promoting social and economic recovery and development, including the safe return of refugees and IDPs.

In June 2009, the Secretary-General wrote that the most “urgent and important peacebuilding objectives [are] establishing security, building confidence in a political process, delivering initial peace dividends, and expanding core national capacity.” These and national frameworks were synthesized in a volume on *Guiding Principles for Stabilization and Reconstruction* produced by the United States Institute for Peace. It identifies five end states: a safe and secure environment; rule of law; sustainable governance; a sustainable economy; and social well-being.

There is no need to endorse let alone come up with a new list of desirable end states for a peace process. It is both risky and counter-productive to assume there is a formula for sustainable peace – as the extensive debate on liberal peacebuilding makes clear. Ultimately, desirable outcomes depend on context and can only be determined through a process of dialogue and consultation with internal actors. The real challenge is not to articulate some ideal of peace and fashion new templates for how to get there, but to grasp what is achievable in the particular circumstances of a crisis and to design a mission accordingly. The
prospects of achieving any outcome will depend heavily on the geo-political and local conditions. In some circumstances, negative peace (the absence of all-out war) may be all that is achievable; in others, elements of positive peace are possible; in still others, the peace operation can get at the root causes and help to build institutions and governing practices that will prevent a relapse into conflict.

What then can be done to facilitate the design of context-appropriate and adaptable missions? The concern is not with planning processes but rather content. The starting point is to ask the right questions about the conditions on the ground. These can be derived from the practice of contemporary operations and the most significant challenges they are facing. They provide a framework for conflict management analysis (a counter-part to conflict analysis). “Conflict management” as used here is shorthand for conflict prevention, mitigation and resolution. An indicative list of such questions that is neither exhaustive nor random could be:

**WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE POLITICAL PROCESS?**

Is it viable, nascent or non-existent? After the failures of Bosnia, Somalia and Rwanda in the early 1990s, a mantra in UN circles was that peacekeeping operations should not be deployed when there is no peace to keep. This may have been a useful check on the tendency to imagine that peacekeeping was the solution to all problems, but as a threshold for deciding when to deploy an operation, it is not helpful. Rarely is there a perfectly reliable peace to keep; the question is how much peace is enough. A more helpful rule of thumb is articulated in the Capstone Doctrine: “a United Nations peacekeeping operation can only succeed if the parties on the ground are genuinely committed to resolving the conflict through a political process”. In other words, peacekeeping missions should only be deployed to support a viable political process. But that raises a host of second order questions: how do we know when the commitment of the parties is genuine, that the political process is viable? Can a UN presence help to create the conditions for such a process? Will a military presence with a protection mandate create space for political dialogue, or undermine it? If there are other external actors involved in the political process, what value does the UN add?

**WHAT IS THE GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF CONFLICT?**

Is it local, national, regional, or global? Most conflicts in which the UN gets involved today are intra-state wars that pit two or more national actors against each other. Yet they almost invariably have transnational, regional and/or global dimensions, often because outsiders are intervening in the internal conflict. At the other end of the spectrum, the roots of conflict and triggering events for violence are often at the sub-national and community levels. Different approaches and different tools are needed depending on the level of the conflict.

**WHO ARE THE TARGETS OF VIOLENCE?**

Is it against other combatants, political opponents or civilians? A mission whose security focus is primarily to protect civilians will look different from one that is trying to deter violence between combatants, or from one that is trying to help a new government to consolidate its authority against spoilers. If the threat of violence against civilians is high, then a strong military and police presence may be needed to provide physical protection. If the threat is less acute, other civilian protection measures like human rights monitoring, humanitarian action and community engagement may suffice. If women and
children are facing particular risks – for example if rape is being used as a weapon of war – then the inclusion of gender and child protection advisers in missions is particularly important.

**WHAT ARE THE REASONS FOR THE VIOLENCE?**

Is it to take over the government, control territory and resources, secure a seat at the negotiation table, or to terrorize a population? The answer to those questions will have an impact on how large a security presence is required, with whom mediators should be negotiating, and how the incentives for spoilers can be altered. Moreover, beyond measures to address the immediate threats, understanding the reasons for the violence can shape the types of institutional reform that may be needed to channel conflict away from the battlefield. Building more inclusive political machinery may be the priority in some places; a more independent justice system could be more important in others.

**WHAT IS THE CAPACITY AND PERCEIVED LEGITIMACY OF THE STATE?**

Are the national government and institutions strong or weak? Are they legitimate in the eyes of the local population? Are there local authorities and non-state actors that have greater capacity to fulfill governance functions? Are those other sources of authority perceived to be more legitimate than the central government? Extension of state authority is a prominent feature of Security Council mandates, and capacity building is a big part of that. But how authority is extended and how capacity is built have an important impact on legitimacy. Helping to extend the authority of a state that is perceived to be illegitimate by its population is not likely to contribute to sustainable peace. Conversely, political engagement with other sources of authority – including non-state actors – may be both necessary and useful.

**WHAT IS THE SCOPE OF CONSENT TO AND COOPERATION WITH A UN PRESENCE?**

What type of UN presence with what mandate will the host government accept? What will the other parties to the conflict accept? What is the attitude or the broader population? The answers may be reflected in a peace agreement, but the agreement does not tell the whole story because a) commitment to the agreement may not be genuine; b) how the parties interpret it may differ; and c) circumstances change. Nor do peace agreements tell us what political elites expect to gain (or lose) from an external presence, or what the broader population wants. The Advisory Group of Experts on the peacebuilding architecture calls for inclusive national ownership of a peace process, while taking care to stress that the role of the UN is to work with – not against – the host government. The extent to which the UN has the space to reach out to political parties, local levels of government, community groups, women’s groups, youth, the private sector and civil society organizations will affect the shape of a mission.

**WHAT ROLE DO NEIGHBORS, REGIONAL ACTORS AND GLOBAL POWERS PLAY?**

Outside actors are always involved in internal conflicts, whether in the form of military assistance from friends and neighbors, development assistance from international financial institutions and bilateral donors, or in any number of other ways. Sometimes these interventions contribute to the cause of peace; sometimes not. If they are constructive, what sort of UN presence – if any – can add value vis-à-vis other external actors? If destructive, what UN instruments are most useful for engaging with those interveners? If the UN is deployed to support a regional organization, what form should that support take? How can it best contribute to diplomatic efforts that involve a multitude of external actors?
The answers to these and similar questions can provide valuable insight into the design of a peace operation. However, it is important to understand that the conditions are not necessarily immutable. For example, what sort of presence the parties will accept is obviously an important determinant of the shape of a peace operation, but the attitude of those parties is susceptible to change through negotiation or pressure. Even geo-political “realities” are not immutable. The political will of great powers can change; a well-designed and well-timed peace operation can be an agent of that change.

**TASKS AND INSTRUMENTS**

The range of functions UN peace operations serve spans five areas: political/governance, security, humanitarian, human rights and socio-economic – although not every mission operates in all five areas. To fulfill these functions, the UN performs a range of tasks including political engagement, protection, capacity-building, monitoring, service delivery, and coordination.

Which instruments can best be used to perform what tasks? The answer depends on the conditions on the ground. Unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) could be used for monitoring communal violence, but if community groups are suspicious of drones, then relying on civil affairs officers may be more appropriate. If sustaining a political process requires engagement with a number of neighboring countries, then a regional envoy may be a more appropriate instrument than one assigned to a single country. Matching instruments with tasks to meet strategic objectives in light of prevailing conditions is the challenge.

**WHAT, MORE PRECISELY ARE THE TASKS?**

*Political engagement* includes activities such as political advice to governments, mediation and good offices, engaging with political parties and parliamentarians, electoral and constitution-making assistance, local reconciliation efforts, the promotion of political inclusion, and reaching out to community leaders, women’s groups and civil society. It occurs at the national, subnational and local levels. As many conflicts have transnational dimensions, peace operations must often engage with regional and global actors as well. Political engagement also includes supporting governance functions and, on occasion, performing those functions (like conducting elections or running transitional administrations).

*Protection* may entail robust military or police action to create a secure environment or to physically protect civilians facing imminent threats of violence. It also means insisting on compliance with humanitarian and human rights law, and demanding humanitarian access to people in need. Protection may occur through dialogue and political pressure on national actors, or as DPKO’s policy states by “establishing a protective environment” by creating conditions for the return of refugees and internally displaced persons, and the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants. In a recent report, the particular challenges of DDR in the context of violent extremism was highlighted. Protection tasks overlap with political engagement, capacity-building and monitoring.

*Capacity-building*, a core feature of peacebuilding, means helping to create, reform or strengthen governance institutions. These could be in the political sector, such as electoral management bodies and parliaments. They could be in public administration, including institutions that manage natural resources and other aspects of the economy. They could be in the security sector, both military and police. Or they could be in the justice sector – justice ministries, courts, corrections facilities, and indigenous dispute settlement bodies. Helping to “extend state authority” is tied to capacity-building, an increasingly problematic mandate if the state authorities have less legitimacy in the eyes of a local population than the informal governance actors they may displace.
**Monitoring** mandates go back to the earliest days of peacekeeping when monitoring ceasefires, troop withdrawals and buffer zones was the main task of a peace operation. These remain common tasks, but other forms of monitoring are also prevalent. In the security field, missions now monitor the disarmament and demobilization of ex-combatants, communal violence and, on occasion, arms embargoes. Human rights monitoring is a regular feature of mandates, as is keeping track of humanitarian conditions. In addition to providing electoral assistance (a task listed under ‘political engagement’ above), peace operations often monitor elections and referenda.

**Service delivery** refers mainly to the provision of humanitarian aid in the form of food and shelter. Quick-impact projects to deliver peace dividends also fall in this cluster. UN peace operations must be attentive to the challenges of delivering health, education and other social services in conflict zones – including in zones controlled by extremist groups. While they are rarely involved in delivering health directly, the Ebola crisis raises questions about whether they could play a greater role.

**Coordination** refers to a diverse mix of tasks. The coordination of economic and social recovery programs is an example, as is the coordination of humanitarian assistance. It may also mean the coordination of envoys and other external actors, for example, through “friends” groups. The UN sometimes coordinates security sector reform efforts, where the military and police training may be done by bilateral actors, but governance issues fall within a UN mandate.

The table below listing the instruments deliberately avoids the words “missions,” “operations,” or “offices” to connote the fact that they can be deployed in many different combinations. A large multidimensional, robust UN peace operation will include most of these tools; an observer mission will have fewer. A political mission may be restricted to providing advice and good offices; or it may perform peacebuilding functions, in which case it would need more components. The same is true of regional offices. A UN country team lacks most of these tools, but it could be enhanced to take on prevention or residual peace-building tasks. Characterizing them as modular units in this way helps to conceive how they can be mixed and matched to craft a context-appropriate mission that can be reconfigured as circumstances change.

For some of the six tasks listed above, UN instruments may need to be strengthened, for others, new tools may be necessary. While the UN has well-developed capacities for political engagement to support implementation of a peace agreement, it has fewer tools for conflict prevention. Instruments for capacity-building are much more well-developed in peace operations than for non-mission settings. Monitoring by human beings has long been the norm for the UN; it has only recently begun to experiment with the use of drones for that purpose. While UN operations have substantial experience trying to protect civilians against known spoilers, they have less experience dealing with asymmetric threats. Should preventing violent extremism advisers be added to the UN toolkit?

**IMPLICATIONS**

A number of implications for peace operations reform can be identified.

*First, to avoid the twin evils of an “imported peace” and an “elite peace”, engage in inclusive consultations with local actors at every stage.* The main determinant of constructive external intervention is the relationship with internal actors. Consultations about the mandate of a peace operation or other presence must begin at the earliest stages of planning, and must continue throughout the life of a peace process. The challenge is to identify the appropriate local interlocutors. This has to include the main parties in a conflict or peace process, but – to the extent possible – should reach beyond them to other stakeholders: opposition groups, local authorities, community leaders, and representatives of civil society, especially...
from the most conflict-affected segments of the population. Phased mandates can help with that by giving the UN the time and space to consult a broad cross-section of local actors before committing to a particular response. A peace agreement or political settlement, if it exists, ought be treated as a “relational contract” - not a simple bargain or transaction, but a rather a framework for managing a long-term relationship that implicates multiple actors and evolves over time.

**Second, in surveying the conditions that determine what sort of UN presence is likely to be most effective, consider whether multiple mandates reinforce or undermine each other.** Protecting civilians and supporting the extension of state authority may be compatible in one context but not another. Prioritized mandates can help with that by assigning missions tasks that are achievable in light of conditions at a particular moment, but that may change, grow or shrink as the conditions change.

**Third, peace mission design must account for the impact of other measures the UN can take for the maintenance of international peace and security.** Other measures include Security Council-authorized no-fly zones, sanctions regimes, international criminal trials, arbitration proceedings, and commissions of inquiry. These can either reinforce or constrain the work of a peace operation. Criminal justice mechanisms may sideline actors who can get in the way of a political process; or they may make it impossible to engage with actors who are needed for that process. How to leverage those other tools should factor in the design, planning and transition of a peace operation.

**Fourth, UN analysis and planning must include an assessment of how its instruments can best be used in relation to those of other actors.** Regional and sub-regional organizations are active players in peace operations, coalitions of the willing are sometimes authorized, and bilateral actors often dispatch envoys and experts to conflict-affected states. Some of these actors have a similar list of tools at their disposal, if less capacity, like the African Union. Others have greater resources but fewer tools, like NATO and the World Bank. Partnering with other actors expands the range of instruments the international community can bring to bear in a peace process: regional mediation teams, over-the-horizon security guarantees, and donor compacts.

**Fifth, ensure missions, financing arrangements, and headquarters structures are able to adapt quickly to changing conditions.** The notion of “adhocracy” nicely captures how peace operations must be able to adapt and transform. It is an organizational form that exhibits fluidity in response to a changing environment, collaboration on a particular task, and the ability to reconfigure to perform new tasks as a peace process unfolds. In order to provide “tailored and flexible” responses, the UN has to be able to innovate, and to innovate it must avoid the trappings of rigid bureaucratic structures, with sharp divisions of labor and hidebound operating procedures. Bureaucratic silos, cumbersome hiring practices and outdated budgeting processes must give way to more fluid arrangements, both at headquarters and in the field.

*Ian Johnstone* is a Professor of International Law at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University. He also holds an appointment as non-resident senior fellow at the Center on International Cooperation, New York University. His most recent books are with Simon Chesterman, Ian Johnstone and David Malone, *Law and Practice of the United Nations* (2016), and with Jacob Cogan, Ian Hurd and Ian Johnstone eds. *Oxford Handbook of International Organizations* (forthcoming 2016)

The author would like to thank participants in CIC workshops held in November 2015 and March 2016 for the many useful comments provided on drafts of this essay.
### WHICH INSTRUMENTS CAN BEST BE USED TO PERFORM WHAT TASKS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Civilian</th>
<th>Military</th>
<th>Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special envoys and advisers</td>
<td>Military staff officers</td>
<td>Civilian police divisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special and executive representatives</td>
<td>Infantry battalions and companies</td>
<td>Formed police units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation teams</td>
<td>Rapid reaction or reserve forces</td>
<td>Police sector reform teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political affairs officers</td>
<td>Special forces</td>
<td>Specialized police training teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil affairs officers</td>
<td>Guard units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights officers</td>
<td>Attack helicopters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial and corrections advisors</td>
<td>Transport helicopters and fixed-wing aircraft</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electoral assistance teams</td>
<td>Maritime and riverine units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal affairs units</td>
<td>Intelligence units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration units</td>
<td>Unmanned aerial systems</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine action teams</td>
<td>Engineering units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and analysis cells</td>
<td>Medical/medevac units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanitarian liaison and coordination units</td>
<td>Military observers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recovery, return and reintegration units</td>
<td>Military advisers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development coordination units</td>
<td>Military sector reform teams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace and development advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of civilian advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women protection advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child protection advisers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct and discipline units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications and public information units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanctions monitoring teams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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LA PROFESSIONNALISATION DU MAINTIEN DE LA PAIX DES NATIONS UNIES OU LE TRAVAIL DE SISYPHE

Alexandra Novosseloff

Les critiques à l’égard du maintien de la paix des Nations Unies, de ses Casques bleus, sont nombreuses et font souvent, plus que ses succès, les gros titres de la presse nationale ou internationale ; le maintien de la paix subit les railleries d’opinions publiques, de classes politiques et de militaires qui comprennent mal comment fonctionnent les Nations Unies, où se situent, dans cette structure, l’ONU, les responsabilités des uns et des autres.

Chaque fois qu’une nouvelle crise surgit dans un pays où ils sont déployés, souvent en dernier recours faute d’autres candidats, et qu’ils ont du mal à y faire face, avec leurs moyens toujours limités, le ton des uns et des autres à leur égard oscille alors souvent entre la moquerie et la condescendance. Et cette image a la vie dure. 20 ans après, les commentateurs de tous poils parlent encore des échecs des Casques bleus en Bosnie-Herzégovine, en Somalie et au Rwanda. Mais cela fait aujourd’hui plus de 20 ans : deux décennies que l’ONU a utilisé pour faire son autocritique dans plusieurs rapports majeurs (rapport sur Srebrenica, rapport sur le Rwanda et rapport Brahimi, HIPPO). D’ailleurs, les véritables responsables de ces échecs ne sont souvent pas ceux auxquels on pense de prime abord. Ces opérations sont des actions collectives et si échec il y a, il ne peut alors qu’être collectif, celui des donneurs d’ordre comme celui des contributeurs de tous ordres. De plus, l’ONU est la seule organisation de sécurité où ceux qui décident ne sont pas les mêmes que ceux qui contribuent et que ceux qui financent. Cette dilution des responsabilités amène souvent à des dérives que les Casques bleus ne peuvent que tenter de contenir.

Il n’en reste pas moins que le maintien de la paix de 2016 ne ressemble plus guère à celui des années 90. Il s’est affirmé, structuré et professionnalisé. Beaucoup reste encore à faire (notamment dans la qualité du recrutement des personnels, la formation et l’organisation du soutien des opérations), mais il s’est amélioré dans ses structures et dans ses procédures. Ceci est mal connu, surtout par les plus critiques. Il est vrai que l’ONU a souvent pêché par l’absence de stratégie de communication offensive qui combatte les idées reçues. Ceci est bien dommage dans un contexte où l’ONU a une véritable valeur ajoutée dans la gestion des conflits par son approche (multidimensionnelle et politico-militaire où le politique guide toujours le militaire).

UNE AMÉLIORATION DES STRUCTURES

Le Département des opérations de maintien de la paix (DOMP) est une jeune organisation de 24 ans qui a émergé du Département des Affaires politiques spéciales en charge de ces opérations depuis 1956. Au moment de leur augmentation exponentielle au début des années 90, le Secrétaire général a très vite compris qu’il ne pourrait suivre la conduite de ses opérations en bricolant ici et là, en sous-effectif constant et sans réelle expertise militaire. Il a donc, en la personne de Boutros Boutros-Ghali, entamé une « remise à niveau » progressive de ses structures en charge du suivi des opérations, avec les moyens (notamment financiers) qu’ont bien voulu lui accorder les Etats membres. En 1993, le DOMP ne comprenait que 46 personnes ; il en comprend aujourd’hui...
environ 450, avec à ses côtés, depuis 2007, un Département de l'appui aux missions (DAM), aux effectifs similaires, en charge de toute la logistique des opérations. Ces réformes se sont faites par à-coups, après de multiples crises donnant lieu à de nombreux rapports, souvent avec la réticence de certains États. On peut le déplorer, mais la réalité est que toute réforme au sein d'une organisation intergouvernementale de 193 États membres ne peut qu'être incrémentale.

Dans les années 90, la professionnalisation passe par la création d'une série de nouvelles structures : un Centre de situation de 20 personnes, fonctionnant 24 heures sur 24 qui doit recueillir les informations provenant des différentes missions et pouvoir présenter à tout moment la situation existant sur les théâtres d'opération (celui-ci sera intégré en 2013 au Centre d'opérations et de crises de l'ONU) ; une équipe de gestion des forces en attente (Standby Forces Management Team) qui s'est transformée en 2016 en une unité pour la génération de force stratégique et la planification des capacités (Strategic Force Generation and Capability Planning Cell) ; une Unité des leçons apprises (devenue Unité des pratique optimales en 2010). Le Bureau du conseiller militaire est renforcé grâce notamment à la mise à disposition de militaires par leurs États (pratique à laquelle il sera mis fin en 1999) et devient une Division militaire puis un Bureau des Affaires militaires.

Dans les années 2000, un autre train de réformes est engagé, notamment suite aux recommandations du rapport Brahimi. Les effectifs du DOMP sont à nouveau augmentés (de 93 personnes) ; des cellules politico-militaires d'analyse de l'information (JMAC) voient le jour sur le terrain à partir de 2004 ; des réseaux de communication et d'information standardisés sont développés ; le Bureau des Affaires militaires est renforcé (planification, missions en cours, génération de forces, formation et évaluation) et comprend depuis une centaine d'officiers qui couvrent pour les opérations de l'ONU les compétences gérées dans l'OTAN par Shape, SACT (Commandant suprême allié Transformation) et l'Etat-major militaire international (avec plus de 2 000 personnes !) ; un Bureau chargé des institutions de sécurité et de l'état de droit est créé en 2007 pour prendre en compte les aspects transversaux des crises ; une Division de police est créée puis renforcée ; le poste d'une sorte d'Inspecteur général des personnels en uniforme (Office of Peacekeeping Strategic Partnerships) a été mis en place en 2011 ; un Bureau en charge de la formation, de la doctrine et de l'élaboration de directives est créé ; une base de stocks en réserve est mise sur pied au sein de la base logistique des Nations Unies de Brindisi, afin d'accroître le volume et la disponibilité d'équipements et de matériaux stockés, et de limiter alors les délais qu'occasionne la passation de contrats de fournitures lors du lancement de chaque opération.

**UNE PROFESSIONNALISATION DES MANIÈRES DE TRAVAILLER**

Cette professionnalisation des structures était indispensable pour une organisation qui est progressivement devenue le premier déployeur de troupes au monde, de personnels déployés dans des environnements de plus en plus dangereux, où le bricolage et le manque d'expertise militaire ont un impact direct sur la vie des gens déployés. Au-delà des structures, il fallait donc améliorer les procédures et les manières de travailler entre toutes les composantes d'une mission. Le DOMP, et en particulier le Bureau des affaires militaires, ont ainsi conduit un travail sans précédent d'amélioration des standards et d'élaboration d'une série de documents de doctrine et de lignes directrices permettant de mieux encadrer les manières de travailler et de donner du sens à ces différentes activités.

En 2008, le DOMP publie pour la première fois une « Doctrine fondamentale » (Capstone Doctrine) pour asseoir la spécificité comme les limites d'une pratique qui s'est développée au fil des opérations et mieux définir les conditions de leur succès. Elle constitue un premier pas vers une compréhension commune de ces opérations, mais elle reste malheureusement méconnue.
faute de n'avoir pas été formellement endossée par l'ensemble des Etats membres. Elle existe pourtant et devrait être à la base de toutes les formations données dans le monde sur le maintien de la paix.

Cette doctrine a permis l'élaboration progressive d'un certain nombre de directives et de standards permettant de définir un langage commun entre le Secrétariat, les missions sur le terrain et les contributeurs de troupes. Ces standards militaires fondent aussi les processus de planification et d'expression des besoins. En 2014, une série de « manuels » a été rédigée, en coopération avec les Etats membres, pour standardiser les concepts d'emploi, les organisations, les capacités, l'entraînement et l'évaluation des différents types d'unités engagées dans les opérations de maintien de la paix : le génie, l'état-major de force, la logistique, la composante maritime, la police militaire, les unités de reconnaissance, les unités fluviales, les forces spéciales, les unités de transport, l'aviation. En 2014-2016, le DOMP a élaboré une directive sur « l'amélioration de la performance et l'assurance d'une préparation opérationnelle » qui définit le cycle de préparation opérationnelle et d'emploi des contributions des Etats membres. Cette directive est complétée de deux documents permettant formellement l'évaluation opérationnelle des unités et états-majors déployés.

Ce corpus réglementaire fondamental oblige désormais les Etats membres à certifier, avant déploiement, que leurs unités soient véritablement opérationnelles. Cette certification doit se faire sur les compétences de base du soldat, sur la formation de pré-déploiement reçue et sur les questions de conduite et de discipline. L'évaluation opérationnelle exige que les commandants de force et les commandants de secteur inspectent les unités qui leur sont subordonnées et rapportent leurs évaluations au Secrétariat en précisant si ces critères ont bien été respectés par le contributeur de troupe. Les troupes de celui-ci peuvent être immédiatement rapatriés en cas de manquements – ceci a été fait pour la première fois à la MINUSCA à l'encontre des contingents ayant commis des abus sexuels. Le DOMP a rédigé un manuel d'état-major de force (Force Headquarters Handbook) comme référence pour la constitution de cet élément clé d'une opération. Enfin, un système de préparation des capacités été mis en place en remplacement du système des forces en attente. Ce système se veut plus dynamique au sens où il permet l'enregistrement des promesses de contribution des Etats membres en plusieurs étapes : la déclaration d'intention stratégique, une évaluation par le Bureau des Affaires militaires de l'état de préparation des unités, la négociation d'un accord d'entente (Memorandum of Understanding) générique pour l'engagement de telle ou telle unité à être déployée en 30, 60 ou 90 jours. Ceci doit permettre d'améliorer les échanges entre les besoins de l'Organisation et les capacités de ses Etats membres.

Le troisième chantier en cours est celui du développement capacitaire. Dans ce cadre, une structure de coordination générale a été mise en place (Uniformed Capability Steering Group) qui travaille directement pour les deux Secrétaires généraux adjoints. Dans ce cadre, huit projets ont été lancés pour répondre aux besoins capacitaires des Nations Unies dans les domaines suivants : la mobilité des troupes sur le théâtre d'opérations, la lutte anti-IED (Improvised Explosive Device, pour « engins explosifs improvisés »), les capacités en attente, le soutien médical, la planification, le renseignement et les menaces transversales. Cette définition doit permettre aux Etats de mieux calibrer leur contribution et ainsi d'améliorer la performance des contingents, non d'apporter des capacités qui ne seraient pas adaptées aux façons de travailler des Casques bleus. Un travail est également conduit par le DOMP pour réviser ses directives concernant les structures d'autorité, de commandement et de contrôle pour qu'elles soient mieux adaptées au contexte opérationnel actuel et mieux comprises par tous. Un autre travail est conduit sur l'amélioration des capacités de collecte et d'analyse de l'information (autrement dit, le renseignement), capacités indispensables pour assurer une meilleure protection de la mission et une meilleure connaissance de son environnement.
L’ensemble de ces documents fait l’objet d’un programme de mise en œuvre ambitieux avec des présentations organisées dans chaque région du monde. Des modules de formation sont également systématiquement développés et mis à disposition de l’ensemble des écoles de formation au maintien de la paix de par le monde. De fait, il ne tient qu’à l’ensemble des États membres, et tout particulièrement aux États contributeurs de troupes et de policiers, d’utiliser ces différents outils dans la formation de leurs personnels en uniforme et dans l’élaboration de leur contribution (planification, processus décisionnel, projection sur le terrain).

**DE NOUVEAUX CHANTIERS À LANCER**

Les structures du Secrétariat ont ainsi fait leur part du travail vers une plus grande professionnalisation de la pratique du maintien de la paix et une tentative d’interopérationnalisation des unités mises à disposition par les États. Une base de travail commune est désormais disponible : aux États de l’utiliser. C’est là le prochain chantier, le bon qualitatif que les États contributeurs doivent accomplir pour appliquer toutes ces mesures qui donnent une plus grande cohérence à ces opérations.

Les autres chantiers de réforme à venir concernent le soutien des opérations de maintien de la paix, les procédures de recrutement et une meilleure coordination interne. Le soutien d’opérations déployées dans des contextes sécuritaires fluides ne peut plus reposer sur des modes d’action reposant sur le temps long. Le déploiement d’une opération de maintien de la paix ne peut se faire sur le même mode que l’organisation d’une conférence internationale ou le fonctionnement des structures du Secrétariat. Il y a un tempo, des outils et des procédures qui doivent forcément être différents. De plus, le soutien d’opérations militaires ne peut plus exclusivement s’appuyer sur des procédures d’achat ou des contrats civils ; la professionnalisation du soutien de ces opérations doit sans doute passer par une certaine militarisation de ce soutien. Ces opérations doivent aussi pouvoir bénéficier de procédures de recrutement plus rapides que les 213 jours actuels. Ces recrutements doivent davantage privilégier l’expertise. Enfin, ces opérations doivent s’éloigner d’une approche en silos qui conduit chacun à rendre compte dans son domaine particulier mais qui empêche le partage d’information et la coordination indispensable à toute action multidimensionnelle. Pour cela, le leadership de chaque mission doit aussi pouvoir exercer une autorité plus grande sur les différents piliers de la mission dans le respect des spécificités de chacun.

Quels que soient leurs défauts, les opérations de maintien de la paix sont un outil à préserver ; il est le seul, le moins cher, dont la « communauté internationale » dispose pour gérer les crises de relative basse intensité. Avec plus de 126 000 hommes et femmes déployés par le monde (si l’on compte les missions politiques spéciales), l’ONU est aujourd’hui le premier « déployeur » de troupes au monde pour un coût extrêmement bas (8,2 milliards de dollars, soit 0,5% des dépenses militaires mondiales). L’efficacité de ces opérations est l’affaire de tous, décideurs comme contributeurs. Il faut que les États qui composent ces opérations ou qui les décident les prennent plus au sérieux, politiquement et militairement.

Politiquement, une opération de maintien de la paix doit être soutenue, sur le long terme et presque au quotidien (pas simplement au moment du vote de la résolution la créant ou renouvelant son mandat), par les États (notamment ceux qui ont un poids sur les autorités locales en question) qui l’ont voulu et l’ont décidé. On ne peut que saluer à cet égard la volonté du DOMP de vouloir signer des « compacts » avec l’État-hôte et les autres institutions du système des Nations Unies (tel que l’avait recommandé le rapport du HIPPO) afin de guider la mise en œuvre des mandats des opérations de maintien de la paix et de rappeler à l’ensemble des parties leurs obligations. Une opération de maintien de la paix équivaut, en effet, à un contrat passé par un pays pour le remettre sur pied et le sortir de la crise : il reviendrait même au Conseil de sécurité de signer un tel « compact » et pas seulement au Secrétariat. Au-
delà une série d’analyses devra sans doute aussi être menée sur les facteurs d’appropriation et de désappropriation des processus proposés par la « communauté internationale », comme sur les mesures additionnelles possibles pour faire plier certaines parties au conflit voire l’Etat-hôte (sanctions ciblées, pressions politiques, conditionnement de l’aide internationale).

Militairement, on ne peut que redire ici qu’une opération de maintien de la paix solide au plan militaire donne une plus grande autorité à son équipe dirigeante et permet de mieux faire avancer le processus politique qui la sous-tend. Ainsi, la robustesse politique accompagne la robustesse militaire et vice-versa. Et la robustesse militaire n’a rien à voir avec l’usage inconsideré des armes : elle est question de posture, d’adaptation et de connaissance de son environnement, et de volonté. Les deux dépendent de la définition d’une stratégie cohérente au service de l’application impartiale du mandat.

La professionnalisation du maintien de la paix est une œuvre de longue haleine, un travail de Sisyphe, en raison du nombre d’acteurs impliqués, mais elle progresse. Le maintien de la paix, comme toute autre entreprise collective, a besoin d’investissement, de sérieux et de volonté d’agir. Dans cette entreprise, les pays occidentaux doivent reprendre toute leur place en apportant des capacités rares (nouvelles technologies, moyens de collecte du renseignement) tout en respectant les spécificités de ces opérations pour éviter de créer un maintien de la paix à deux vitesses. La cohésion de ces opérations est certainement un autre défi de leur quotidien.

Dr. Alexandra Novosseloff is a Senior Visiting Fellow at the Center on International Cooperation of New York University. | Twitter: @DeSachenka
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WHO ARE THE KILLERS OF BENI?

Jason Stearns

Since October 2014, the region around the town of Beni in north eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DR Congo) has been the site of some of the worst massacres in the country's recent history. Over five hundred people have been killed and tens of thousands have fled their homes. The UN mission and the Congolese government have publicly stated that the massacres are the work of Ugandan rebels from the Allied Democratic Forces (ADF).

Research by the Congo Research Group (CRG) based on interviews conducted with over a hundred witnesses and local leaders indicates that the definition of the ADF needs to be revised. Rather than a foreign Islamist group driven by revenge, our research points to a group that has forged strong ties with local interest groups and militias over the course of twenty years of insurrection around Beni. Moreover, our preliminary findings indicate that responsibility does not lie with the ADF alone. In addition to commanders directly tied to the ADF, members of the Forces armées de la République démocratique du Congo (FARDC), the national army; former members of the Rassemblement congolais pour la démocratie—Kisangani/Mouvement de libération (RCD–K/ML); as well as members of communal militias have also been involved in attacks on the civilian population.

We cannot comment on the chain of command or motivation driving these groups, but it is clear that the Congolese government and the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) have not put sufficient effort into addressing this crisis and have incorrectly identified the enemy. Despite losing hundreds of soldiers in operations conducted against the ADF prior to July 2014, the FARDC have frequently failed to react in time to protect the population during and after events—and MONUSCO has demonstrated a similar lack of initiative. Our researchers have documented cases in which FARDC officers discouraged their units from intervening during massacres and there is extensive evidence that members of the FARDC have actively participated in massacres.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

• The government should quickly appoint a special investigation led by a high-ranking military prosecutor to investigate the acts of violence committed around Beni since October 2014. The commission's findings should be made public;

• MONUSCO should conduct an investigation to determine who is responsible for the Beni massacres. The Department of Peacekeeping Operations should also review the performance of the mission with regard to these massacres;

• The Senate and National Assembly should create a joint investigative committee to identify political responsibility, in particular the role that leaders from within the security forces may have played in the massacres committed around Beni;

• The Congolese government should introduce a stabilization and security plan for the Beni region that involves the FARDC,
local communities and MONUSCO. This plan should be implemented in the context of the provincial stabilization plan, in coordination with the Stabilization and Reconstruction Plan for Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (STAREC) and in accordance with the recommendations of the International Security and Stabilization Support Strategy (I4S).

NEW YORK/KINSHASA, MARCH 21, 2016

Congo Research Group (CRG) is an independent and non-profit research project dedicated to the understanding of the violence affecting millions of Congolese. We carry out rigorous research on various aspects of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Our work draws on a deep understanding of the social and historical dynamics at hand.

We are based at the Center on International Cooperation at New York University and work in collaboration with the Centre d’études politiques at the University of Kinshasa. All of our publications, blogs, and podcasts can be found at www.congoresearchgroup.org. We can be reached at congoresearchgroup@gmail.com. | Twitter: @CEG_CRG
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IS THE UN REALLY MOVING TOWARD GENDER EQUALITY?

Ourania S. Yancopoulos

NEW RESEARCH RAISES THE QUESTION OF WHETHER THE UN IS BURYING STATISTICS ON GENDER REPRESENTATION IN ORDER TO COVER UP LACK OF PROGRESS.

The United Nation’s founding charter highlights not only the mission “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war,” but “to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights” - specifically, “in the equal rights of men and women.” Moreover, the organization claims that a female perspective should have greater influence in its humanitarian and peace-promoting efforts, insisting that women are central to economic development and conflict prevention. To this end, much has been made of improving female representation at the most senior levels of UN leadership, especially under current Secretary General Ban Ki-moon.

In a speech given just last month, before 2,000 people and thousands more via web-cam, Secretary General Ban, claimed to have appointed “50 or 60 women” at the UN’s most senior level - “all Assistant-Secretary-Generals and Under-Secretary - Generals” and thereby claimed to have single-handedly “changed the whole landscape for women.” This month he claimed to “have signed nearly 150 letters of appointment to women” in these high positions. Such discrepancies raise questions about the UN’s rate of progress toward gender balance in its senior ranks.

So, has progress really been made? And why is it so hard to tell?

The UN’s convoluted data practices mean there is no single, consistent way of knowing the gender composition of its senior staff. There are serious inconsistencies in official data about senior staff numbers. Sex-differentiated tables were only introduced in 1971. Periodically, methods for recording staff numbers change to include, variously, those appointed to an internal formula for
ensuring fair shares of positions to all geographic regions, or those appointed under specific types of contracts. An investigation I conducted using UN published and publicly available data attempts to piece together the proportion of women in UN leadership since its founding.

Table 1 shows the percentage of women holding USG/ASG level posts by year, broken down by each Secretary General’s tenure. The graph on the left shows the percentage of women USG/ASG over time. The graph on the right shows both the percentage of women and men USG/ASG over time to visualize the UN’s progress toward gender balance in the Secretariat’s leadership from 1976 – 2015. Relevant definitions are also explained.

**TABLE 1: TRACKING THE UN’S GENDER IMBALANCE OVER TIME (1976 - 2015)**

My analysis is limited to the UN’s Secretariat, and does not include its many funds and agencies. Headed by the Secretary-General, the Secretariat serves as the U.N.’s diplomatic face and contains the organization’s core entities for addressing political affairs, peace and security, as well as communications. This main organ comprises over 41,000 international staff members and is led by “Under-Secretaries-General” (USG) and “Assistant-Secretaries-General” (ASG). In 2015, the Secretariat’s leadership was concentrated in 166 individuals of USG/ASG status. According to UN reports, these senior staff members - heads of important U.N. departments and offices, directly appointed by the Secretary-General - make up over 50% of the entire UN system’s senior leadership.
The Secretary General's report on the Composition of the Secretariat, released annually since 1946, presents demographic data on staff. In the report, many of the data are buried in tables, and public claims, such as those made by Mr. Ban, refer to subsets of the U.N.'s total population, which are difficult to understand and sometimes seem only to obscure the broader picture. Only since 2006 has the Composition of the Secretariat reports included all staff, regardless of their contract type, term, or source of funding. Indeed, most would consider the overall numbers of the combined USG and ASG population — not the subsets — to be most relevant and reflective of gender representation in senior leadership of the Secretariat, and these percentages are the most disappointing.

As of June 30, 2015, just 37 of the 166 total USG/ASG Secretariat population were women, or about 22 percent. As visualized in Table 2, changes over time are even more troubling.

**Table 2: The UN’s “Progress” Toward Gender Balance in the Last Decade (2006 - 2015)**

Despite optimistic rhetoric, the overall expansion of USG and ASG numbers has diminished the impact of new female appointments:
Representation of women has actually dropped from an unimpressive, though record high, of 24 percent in 2012 (35 women, 108 men) to 22 percent in 2015 (37 women, 129 men). At the current rate of increase during the current Secretary General’s tenure—from 20 percent in 2007 to 22 percent in 2015—it would take another 112 years to reach 50/50 gender parity in the UN's senior leadership.

Today, on the 107th International Women's Day, marked by the #PledgeForParity campaign slogan, we are reminded of just how difficult it is for any organization to reach true gender parity. If it is this hard for an international organization overtly dedicated to achieving it, how can we expect national governments and corporations to live up to it?

Take the United States: according to a McKinsey/Lean-In study, women in corporate America “are underrepresented at every level in the corporate pipeline.” In the Senate, of the 31 women who have ever been elected, 20 are serving now (compared to 80 current male counterparts). Of the 112 Supreme Court Justices in history, four have been women, and three of them are currently serving. And the most obvious: of 44 U.S. Presidents, not one has been a woman.

The truth is that Mr. Ban’s track record is better than his predecessors’. But “better” is relative. If we focus on absolute numbers, 37 women in the UN’s most senior posts might seem impressive. However, as has been recently pointed out, the overall number of total senior staff has markedly increased overall. And so, while there are now 37 women in 166 senior posts (compared to 20 out of 110 in 2006), the overall expansion of the UN’s senior leadership - and consistent hiring of men over women - has diluted the impact of new female appointments. While the absolute number of women in the UN’s senior leadership has grown, the proportion of women leaders has not increased so dramatically.

Additionally, in the UN’s most high-level body, chaired by the Secretary General - the Senior Management Group - only 12 of the team’s 39 members are women. That’s 30 percent - far short of the 50/50 goal.

Considering the confusing, even misleading rhetoric of the UN system that papers over the glacially slow progress in women’s share of senior staff positions at the UN Secretariat, it is important to check these findings against another source. A visualization of the comparison of these data with the Chief Executive Board’s list of “regular budget staff” shown in Table 3 below, show how this analysis is in fact correct.
The CEB's reports provide annual statistical tables on UN staff, employed by the regular budget, with appointments for a period of one year or more. In contrast to the Composition of the Secretariat reports that cover data from the end of the fiscal year (June 30), CEB reports cover data from the end of the calendar year (December 31). In spite of these definitional and time-line differences, the CEB reports confirm our previous findings - women hold about 22 percent of senior leadership positions in the Secretariat, and there is a recent trend of even further privileging men over women in the U.N.'s most senior leadership. But we must recognize that the United Nations is making some progress. As Mr. Ban prepares to step down at the end of 2016, the election process for his successor, which has traditionally been cloaked in mystery, is becoming more transparent. For the first time, member states will not only nominate but also interview official candidates. And for the first time, these official nominees include women.

Still, the disappointing statistics on gender representation are not addressed to any serious degree in the most recent UN annual reports; they are instead presented as raw numbers in tables, absent any analysis. It takes hours and hours to sift through thousands and thousands of pages to find these numbers, suggesting the UN is interested in burying them.

Now, with these data published and publicly available, everyone will be watching. Now, it is up to the United Nations to a better job at meeting its commitments.

This article was originally published by OpenDemocracy.net on March 8, 2016

Ourania S. Yancopoulos, was a United Nations intern in 2015, and will earn her Bachelor of Arts in Political Science and Statistics from Columbia College at Columbia University in May 2016.
WOMEN IN PEACE OPERATIONS: THE UNSUNG CHAMPIONS OF HUMAN RIGHTS

March 29, 2016

Liezelle Kumalo and Riana Paneras

On 21 March 2016, South Africa celebrates Human Rights Day, commemorating the 1960 shooting of police upon peaceful protestors, which killed 69 people. This year, reflecting on the role of police in relation to human rights seems more relevant than ever given that the African Union (AU) dedicated 2016 to human rights, with a specific focus on the rights of women.

As South Africans reflect on the events of 1960, it would be useful to consider the broader responsibility of police in Africa.

Discussions around the role of police should include questions regarding the role of police in promoting human rights, particularly in conflict and post-conflict environments.

Considering that women are disproportionately affected by conflict, police peacekeepers must be mindful of ensuring that women’s rights, in particular, remain protected. This is especially true for conflict situations where sexual violence against women has become an accepted norm that does not receive due attention. Cases in countries such as Somalia, Sudan (Darfur) and South Sudan are but some examples where these abuses are often not investigated or prosecuted.

Women remain more vulnerable in conflict and post-conflict environments than men. In the Democratic Republic of the Congo, an estimated 25,000 cases of sexual violence against women and children are committed each year. It is in these spaces where police peacekeepers are mandated provide public safety and promote the rule of law.

In conflict and post-conflict environments, security and justice mechanisms are often non-existent or partially operational. In Mali, for example, the police fled from certain areas when fighting broke out in 2013. Police presence is non-existent in Darfur and South Sudan localities such as Korma, Tawilla and Kutum.

Police officers in peace operations offer international legitimacy. They also have an important role in re-establishing the confidence of local communities in the police and the security system. But this needs to happen in a way that takes into account the realities and challenges facing many women. Women are blamed for crimes and have little recourse, which is often compounded by a lack of local female law enforcers.
The vital role of female police officers in peace operations and the promotion of human rights should not be underestimated. Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka, the Executive Director of United Nations-Women, said that the most under-used tool for building peace was the meaningful inclusion of women; and that more women in the police and military forces are needed. The United Nations (UN) Police Division, under its Global Effort Plan, aimed to have 20% female officers among police components of global peace operations by 2014. However, female police officers are still underrepresented and make up only 9.6% of those forces.

**FEMALE POLICE OFFICERS SERVE AS ROLE MODELS BY ENSURING THAT WOMEN ARE NOT JUST SEEN AS VICTIMS**

There is clearly a need to have more women peacekeepers. The importance of women in peace operations has been dealt with in UN Security Council resolutions 1325 (2000), 1888 (2009) and 1889 (2009). In Africa, the AU’s Solemn Declaration on Gender Equality in Africa also calls on member states to increase the participation of women and gender perspectives in peace support operations. These mechanisms all speak to the powerful and influential role of women in creating sustainable peace and highlight that when it comes to conflict resolution, women are an untapped resource.

In addition, UNSC resolutions 1820 (2008) and 2242 (2015) specifically task peacekeepers with preventing and responding to sexual violence and crimes against women and children. UNSC resolution urges for better integration of gender perspectives into peace operations and to double the numbers of women in peace operations by 2019. The High-Level Independent Panel on UN Peace Operations also noted that female personnel play an important role in gaining the trust of women and girls in local communities.

Having more female police officers means communities are better represented and served by the police, and encourages people to report crimes committed against women. Female police officers in peace operations ensure that interaction with the local female population takes place. They also help women and communities gain self-respect and develop livelihood projects, and this establishes a relationship of trust, which assists the implementation of the mission mandate.

The presence of female peacekeepers also empowers local women to enjoy improved access to justice and relevant support. Female police officers serve as role models by ensuring that women are not just seen as victims, but also as providers of safety and security who bring a diverse set of skills and competencies. The presence of women officers can also have a positive impact in supporting gender sensitivity among their male counterparts.

**FEMALE POLICE ARE A CRITICAL RESOURCE FOR ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE PEACE**

The AU and UN need to make a more concerted effort to provide enabling environments for women to join security services, especially the police force. Various UNSC resolutions have focused on increasing participation of women, but strategies to change perceptions or entrenched discriminatory patriarchal attitudes are more elusive.

The call for more women to be involved in peace processes is also complex because it depends on the availability of member state contributions to AU and UN missions. In many instances, women are underrepresented in security sectors in police-contributing countries or are relegated to administrative or support roles. This negatively impacts on their availability for senior positions.
Ensuring female police are represented in peace operations requires member states to recruit more women into domestic police forces.

Female police are a critical resource for achieving sustainable peace and ensuring the protection of human rights in local communities. They are the champions for many women in conflict and post-conflict settings to better protect themselves and work towards a more just and peaceful Africa.

Liezelle Kumalo is a Junior Researcher, and Riana Paneras, is a Senior Researcher, within the Peace Operations and Peacebuilding Division of ISS (Institute for Security Studies) Africa

This article was originally published by ISS on March 21, 2016
The first time I heard the German word “zwangsoptimist” was in a meeting to discuss ways to improve how the international system functions. Meaning “someone who feels compelled to be an optimist,” the word not only succinctly sums up my work for and alongside the U.N. over the past 27 years, but could also be a one-word job description for the organization’s next secretary-general.

Not everyone sees the world, or the U.N., this way. In his recent op-ed in The New York Times, titled “I Love the U.N., but It Is Failing,” outgoing senior U.N. official Anthony Banbury saw the glass as more than half-empty. The U.N. Secretariat that the next secretary-general will administer, he wrote, has a sclerotic personnel system. He described a dysfunctional organization with minimal accountability, where political expediency trumps universal values and facts on the ground, and whose peacekeeping operations apply antiquated tools to 21st-century conflicts.

It was quite an indictment, and an uncomfortable one for someone like me, whose day job involves reflecting on how to make peace operations more effective. A close relative, upon reading the Banbury op-ed, sent me a message asking, “Are you ready to give up?”

I am not, nor should any of us be.

The most surprising thing about Banbury’s op-ed is not its content, but that it even made the pages of The New York Times. It reads like a revelation, but anyone who was in the U.N. system for as long as Banbury was should already have been well familiar with the problems he enumerated.

Most people involved with the organization already are. The 16 members of the U.N.’s High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, for instance, pre-empted Banbury’s critique of U.N. peacekeeping last June:

“The messages the Panel has received from the field have been resounding: UN administrative procedures are failing missions and their mandates. Force commanders and troop contributors are exasperated by bureaucratic constraints that fail to meet reasonable demands in difficult settings. Senior managers complain of deep dysfunction and are frustrated by the inability to recruit rapidly on one hand and the obstacles to removing poor performers on the other.”

It recommended that the secretary-general allow the Department of Field Support to develop policies to expedite recruitment, empower managers in the field, and make them accountable. In emergencies, they needed leeway to do things quickly outside the normal rules.
What may not be evident to outsiders is that Banbury’s former role, and the target of his post-parting remarks, concerns the U.N. Secretariat, and not the organization’s myriad agencies, funds and programs—such as UNHCR, UNICEF and the World Food Programme—which manage their own operations, budgets and personnel systems, often far more effectively than the Secretariat’s peace operations.

But even in the area of peace and security, the U.N. has made many important and broad contributions to resolving conflict, restoring stability and ending disorder. I’ve seen it firsthand in East Timor, Liberia and Southeast Asia.

Presumably, Banbury has too. His first U.N. posting was as a human rights officer in a Cambodian refugee camp along the Thai-Cambodian border; his first peacekeeping mission was the U.N. Transitional Administration in Cambodia (UNTAC). Deployed in February 1992 after the fall of the Khmer Rouge and Cambodia’s subsequent civil war, UNTAC played a small part in resolving one of the great humanitarian tragedies of the Cold War. The operation was far from perfect: It was where sexual exploitation and abuse by peacekeepers first came to widespread public attention. But the Cambodian conflict was a complex problem that took years to resolve, in which the U.N. and its agencies were central and a U.N. peace operation was a key part of the solution.

WE ARE ONCE AGAIN IN AN ERA WHEN THE U.N. IS DIVIDED BETWEEN EAST AND WEST, NORTH AND SOUTH.

Of course, resolving conflict is never neat and tidy. Peace agreements are often made with people who have done much killing. But as the U.N. panel’s report on peace operations underlines, peace is all about getting the politics right. Resolving decades of conflict often requires the global and regional dynamics to change first. Only then are regional players and the representatives who exercise the secretary-general’s “good offices” able to negotiate peace agreements and plans of action, not only to resolve conflicts but also to deal with the massive displacement that often accompanies them. It becomes a team effort when the Secretariat and member states play on the same side.

Such behavior at the end of the Cold War made many believe again in the U.N.; some even saw the organization as an integral part of a New World Order. UNTAC ushered in a decade of active peace operations that ended with the U.N. and then-Secretary-General Kofi Annan being awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2001. Not all were immediate success stories. But painstaking recoveries often followed even some of the worst bloodlettings.

Preventing conflict is a complex quest, one that, from the first word of the U.N. Charter, is the U.N. Secretariat’s main job. But just as we project our aspirations onto politicians, we are now doing the same for the next secretary-general. Banbury ends his op-ed with a call for the U.N. to be led by people for whom “doing the right thing” is normal. The “zwangsoptimists” in the system are looking for leadership.

But with the post-Cold War period now in the past, we are once again in an era when the intergovernmental organization is divided between East and West, North and South. The Secretariat, its missions and its internal governance are all proxy battlefields for interstate competition, not cooperation. In such a time, the 193 member states should take responsibility for fixing the U.N.’s dysfunction, rather than tasking one Secretary-General to do so. Managing the organization’s internal conflicts will be as much of a struggle for whoever seeks Ban Ki-moon’s job as resolving global crises. Only optimists need apply.
This article was originally published by the *World Politics Review* on March 28, 2016

*Jim Della-Giacoma* is the deputy director at the *Center on International Cooperation* at New York University, the editor-in-chief of the *Global Peace Operations Review*, and a visiting fellow in the department of social and political change at the Australian National University's College of Asia and the Pacific.
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U.N. SECURITY COUNCIL SHOULD MAKE BETTER USE OF ‘ROAD-TRIP DIPLOMACY’

Jim Della-Giacoma

A United Nations Security Council debate can feel like traveling in an airplane at cruising altitude: a quick continental overflight in a rarefied atmosphere, far above the dirty reality of the conflict below. The debate can be driven by factors that may have little to do with what may be happening on the ground.

But from time to time, council members come back to earth and get dust on their shoes when they engage in road-trip diplomacy. In January members went to Burundi; this month they were in West Africa.

Firsthand fact-finding has not always been the body’s first instinct. As the Security Council Report (SCR) noted in its March monthly forecast, the council’s first visit to the field was to Vietnam and Cambodia in 1964. But only after the Cold War ended did Security Council missions take off, with some 51 visits to 45 countries and territories in the period since. Through January 2016, the Democratic Republic of the Congo held the record with 12 visits; Burundi was second with nine.

Some think this is a habit that should be encouraged. Last year’s reports on U.N. peace operations and peacebuilding urged the council to change its ways. The High-Level Independent Panel on Peace Operations lamented that the council was too aloof, leaving early engagement to the Secretariat. It urged its members to visit “turbulent areas” and consult regional stakeholders on emerging conflicts.

While talk of Security Council “reform” often focuses on who sits at the top table in its meetings and the use of the veto by its five permanent members, altering its working methods are what Liechtenstein’s U.N. Ambassador Christian Wenaweser has called the “ugly duckling of Security Council reform.” Support for such incremental adjustments is a realist argument for behavioral and not institutional change.

But if improving council initiatives like field visits is a near-term objective, it is worth looking more closely at how such visits work. Dispatches from the field by SCR’s correspondents describe crowded agendas full of meetings with local political leaders past and present, U.N. envoys, mission chiefs, regional offices heads and country teams. The schedule includes checking in with opposition figures and NGO representatives.

In Burundi in January, the delegation traveled to a presidential facility in the town of Gitega to meet with President Pierre Nkurunziza. Nkurunziza’s decision to run for a disputed third term last year in an election he went on to win had triggered a constitutional crisis and subsequent violence, leading the African Union to mandate the African Prevention and Protection Mission in Burundi.
Nkurunziza’s reaction was to shoot the messenger: He told council members the situation in Burundi was much better than reported in the media. Standing next to the president, U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Samantha Power looked forlorn. The Financial Times reported her as saying that “we did not achieve as much, frankly, as I think we would have liked.”

Despite the frustrations and modest return, Congo Research Group’s director, Jason Stearns, who follows the region closely, told me he believed such visits are important, even if only for symbolic reasons. They refocus the international spotlight on forgotten countries and conflicts; they put pressure on reluctant authorities to move toward some sort of peace process.

“To have the author of ‘A Problem from Hell’ in your country makes news,” he said, referring to Power’s Pulitzer Prize-winning book about America’s response to genocides, written while she was still a professor at Harvard University.

But Stearns admits that local analysts find it hard to discern any lasting impact once the wheels have gone up on the council’s plane. In Burundi, South Africa is still disengaged, and the permanent members of the Security Council remain divided on a common approach; the African Union leadership is still reluctant to make a forced intervention.

IF IMPROVING COUNCIL INITIATIVES LIKE FIELD VISITS IS A NEAR-TERM OBJECTIVE, IT IS WORTH LOOKING MORE CLOSELY AT HOW SUCH VISITS WORK.

One criticism of council visits is that they take too long to arrange. They become bound in protocol, and less effective as a result. They are also getting shorter. The U.N. Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) is as complex as its name suggests, but the council visitors only spent two days in Mali.

The council has not always been so hesitant. In September 1999, proxies for the Indonesian military in East Timor went on a violent rampage after voters in a U.N.-sponsored referendum rejected an offer of autonomy in favor of independence. The council made the decision to go to Jakarta, and then departed on the same day.

The field mission, and in particular the delegation’s willingness to challenge the Indonesian military’s narrative of events on East Timor, was an integral part of a broad international effort to address the crisis. Importantly, the five permanent members were on the same page. So was then-U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan, who, while the delegation met with the head of the Indonesian military, declared, “The time has clearly come for Indonesia to seek help from the international community in fulfilling its responsibility to bring order and security to the people of East Timor.”

The visiting mission cabled back their analysis before the Security Council met in open session. Member states then lined up to condemn Indonesia for failing to keep the peace and called on Jakarta to accept an international mission. The country was caught by surprise.

“Nobody, including myself, had ever imagined that the problem of East Timor would eventually develop in such a way so as to become part of a global issue and portrayed to the international community as a tragic humanitarian drama,” the head of the Indonesian military at the time, Wiranto, wrote in his autobiography “Witness in the Storm.” “And as such, it was necessary to bring in some kind of multinational force in order to stop it.”
The Security Council’s mission played a pivotal role in bearing witness to the tragedy. Its members were back in New York on Sept. 15, where they mandated and deployed a multinational force to restore order. Five days later it had deployed, in record time.

Wiranto now has to be careful where he flies. His 2003 indictment for crimes against humanity by a U.N.-backed tribunal for his role in the East Timor violence in 1999 still stands, as does a warrant for his arrest.

Security Council members have no such travel restrictions. They are free to roam. And when they visit trouble spots like Burundi, they should remember the 1999 mission to East Timor and the dramatic diplomatic impact it had. They should be encouraged to fly more frequently, so that their traveler’s tales can improve the quality and weight of their deliberations.

Editor’s note: Guest columnist Jim Della-Giacoma is filling in for Richard Gowan, who is on leave until early April.

This article was originally published by World Politics Review on March 21, 2016
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PUTTING PREVENTION BACK IN THE U.N.’S VOCABULARY

Jim Della-Giacoma

Prevention has long been a dirty word at the United Nations: Some member states equate it with interference, and the need for early warning that accompanies it with spying. But in a time of crisis, some think the time has come to reconsider what role the world body should play in stopping conflict before it happens.

It is hard to argue against the idea that preventing conflicts from breaking out is better than dealing with their tragic consequences. Take those currently enveloping the Middle East in Libya, Syria and Yemen, where the counterfactual is strong, if hard to prove. If they had been prevented, hundreds of thousands of deaths could have been avoided. And the international system would not now be paying such a high and unsustainable price to address the plight of the millions that have been displaced.

Prevention would require more interference, as some member states fear. It would force states to trespass on each other’s sovereignty, often held as sacred, or have the U.N. to do it on their behalf. But being more intrusive should not be equated with the increased use of internationally sanctioned violence. Prevention does not necessarily mean bombing more often, just paying attention sooner. As former U.N. Secretary-General Boutros Boutros Ghali put it almost 25 years ago, in his landmark 1992 document “Agenda for Peace,” the U.N. must aim “to identify at the earliest possible stage situations that could produce conflict, and to try through diplomacy to remove the sources of danger before violence results.”

Prevention has now come back onto the agenda thanks to three big reports that U.N. expert panels prepared in 2015 on U.N. peace operations and peacebuilding, as well as on women, peace and security. Published between June and October last year, the reports are now coming up for sustained debate in various U.N. fora, including resolutions before the U.N. Security Council and General Assembly, and a High-Level Thematic Debate on Peace and Security in the General Assembly on May 10-11. The way they are discussed will tell us if the big shifts the expert panels argued for are finding constituents among the U.N.’s membership.

PREVENTION DOES NOT NECESSARILY MEAN BOMBING MORE OFTEN, JUST PAYING ATTENTION SOONER.

Few busy diplomats have thoroughly read all three reports, but there is help in understanding them. A global process of civil society groups is digesting them ahead of the upcoming high-level debate. Eli Stamnes and Kari Osland from the Norwegian Institute for International Affairs (NUPI) have also provided a great service with their very readable synthesis. All three reports make the same point: We cannot have peace without prevention.

There is some hope that a new agenda for prevention might be emerging. The world of high policy is not as static as a cynic might suggest, and one hopeful development is the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), which were adopted last year after a lengthy negotiation process in New York. Though more generally focused on development, the SDGs are an important fulcrum for change.
on conflict prevention, as well. Their universal commitments include, as part of SDG 16, the goal to achieve peaceful societies. Prevention is not a new idea. The first lines of the U.N. Charter invoke it. The body was founded to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war. But the SDGs now make prevention everyone's responsibility. It is a small, but important step in the right direction.

But what exactly might prevention look like? What might the U.N. do differently to pursue it? There are some old elements, as well as some new ones still emerging, that are worth noting.

First, Boutros Boutros Ghali’s “Agenda for Peace” would be a good place to start. It recognized the primacy of peacemaking, and underlined the importance of understanding conflict, or fact-finding; getting into the habit of looking ahead, or early warning; acting sooner, or preventative deployment; using existing tribunals, such as the World Court; and using development assistance to avoid fragility, or amelioration through assistance, before resorting to sanctions or the use of military force.

Second, the U.N. General Assembly high-level debate on peace and security should include frank discussions of why we have failed to prevent today’s headline-grabbing conflicts. That will require member states to reflect on their own failings. Last year’s three reports, for instance, noted the changing nature of conflict. While interstate conflict is still with us, the reports highlight how in this century international bodies are increasingly grappling with conflict between different groups within a society or between the society and the state itself.

It is no mystery why some groups are often going to war against their own states: The dirty secret is that those states’ governments—that is, U.N. member states—are often the problem, through their abusive practices. Open conflict is often the visible proof that they have failed at prevention. But rather than write the U.N. off as rotten from the inside, because it is composed of imperfect states, this is a moment to acknowledge its strengths. While far from perfect, the Security Council and General Assembly are still good places to put pressure on underperforming governments.

Third, member states need to see the component parts of the U.N., with its many different departments, agencies and funds, as primary tools of prevention. In the forthcoming debates, they should tone down their opposition to using the good offices of the secretary-general to head off conflict, and instead task and resource the Secretariat to do a better job of it. They should support the principle that the U.N.’s peacemakers should be allowed to speak to all sides. This is what political solutions require.

Fourth, member states need to recommit to multilateral and regional diplomacy. Conflicts are spilling across borders and bedeviling whole regions. As the displaced people from these conflicts travel the globe, the stakeholders in any one conflict are increasingly numerous and dispersed. U.N. diplomacy is better able to intervene in such settings due to its reach across borders, and it should be encouraged and better-resourced.

Finally, drawing on the universality of the SDGs, member states should recognize the global challenge that prevention presents. Working with regional organizations is not the solution to every problem, but having a presence in each region is a start. In the field of peace and security, the U.N. has struggled to see all regions as needing attention. Its peace operations are overwhelmingly focused on Africa, and it only has regional centers from which to conduct preventative diplomacy in Central Asia, Central Africa and West Africa. The pushback from stronger sovereign states maintains the fiction that there is no need for these tools in Asia or Latin America. This blinkered vision on prevention needs to be lifted.
In an era when war has proved to be a poor option for achieving end goals and coercive tools have been shown not to be working, the time may have come to more firmly embrace prevention. Listen closely to the coming debates. If member states reflect thoughtfully more than they rant reflexively, it may be a subtle sign that last year’s reports are shifting the debate. A change of tone may be the first indication that prevention is back in the everyday vocabulary of international diplomacy.

This article was originally published by World Politics Review on March 14, 2016
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THE UN HAS A PLAN TO RESTORE INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY - WILL IT WORK?

Robert Muggah

It's official. Global instability is the new normal. Political and economic uncertainties, combined with climate change and the so-called Fourth Industrial Revolution, are all contributing to create unparalleled volatility. Diplomats and defence specialists have fretted over these interlocking threats at major conferences in Davos and Munich over the past two months.

The potential for catastrophic outbreaks of violence between the US, Russia, and China is more apparent now than at any time since the Cold War came to an end. Proxy conflicts in Syria and Yemen, Russian aggression over Ukraine and its neighbours, and tensions in the South China Sea are in some ways a “correction” after two decades of relative stability.

And the problems don't end there. Many of the world's 40-odd armed conflicts are becoming more vicious and fragmented. Civil wars and factional fighting in Syria, Libya and Yemen are generating record levels of population displacement. More people were killed as a result of “terrorist” acts in the past few years – especially in Africa and the Middle East – than ever before. These latest trends are in stark contrast to a half century decline in organized violence.

A UN SYSTEM STRETCHED TO ITS LIMITS

The strain of these transnational challenges on the UN system is stretching the organization to its breaking point. There are currently 16 peacekeeping operations deployed around the world – nine of them in Africa, three in the Middle East, two in Europe and one in the Americas. There are currently more blue helmets on the ground than at any time in history. The cost of keeping over 125,000 personnel in the field hovers at roughly $8 billion a year.

The mounting sense of disorder is shaping how the world's political and military leaders are thinking about international peace and security. Some of them are calling for a return to isolationism: focus on humanitarian relief to global hot spots and little else. Others are clamouring for more muscular forms of intervention, especially to snuff out radical extremism in North Africa and the Middle East. The space for moderation and balance is shrinking.

Faced with this ominous state of affairs, what is the UN to do?

The organization started by doing what it knows best – commissioning reports. UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon did not just ask for one report, but several. In 2014, he requested that the UN set up high-level panels to deliberate on the future of peace operations, the peacebuilding architecture, and the relationships between women, peace and security.
All of this soul searching is intended to have a real-world application. Everyone knows that the UN has to repurpose itself in order to better engage with a turbulent global system. After a few years of reflection and consultation, the results are in. Not surprisingly, the three panels concluded that a credible, legitimate and well-resourced UN is part of the solution.

At least six recommendations stand out from the three high-level reviews.

**REFORMING THE UN**

First, conflict prevention is the order of the day. The best way the UN can save lives and reduce spiralling costs is by preventing war from breaking out in the first place. This means the UN needs to adopt a culture of prevention across the organization. And the UN cannot go it alone. **There needs to be more burden-sharing by member states, including both traditional donors and emerging powers.**

Second, the form and function of peacekeeping should be shaped by the situation on the ground, not the (often competing) political interests at the UN headquarters in New York. The UN also has to abandon cookie-cutter approaches to peace support missions. To do this, the UN Security Council has to be more flexible about determining when troops should enter, how long to stay, and when to exit.

Third, strategic and inclusive partnerships are essential. UN agencies have to stop navel gazing and fighting petty turf wars and get better at reaching out to regional bodies, non-governmental organizations and civil society groups that have a stake in peace. Moreover, UN-resourced activities need to be **people-oriented, field-focused** and much better targeted at actual and potential hot spots.

Fourth, the focus cannot be limited to “building” peace, but rather making peace “sustainable”. This rhetorical shift is important. Rather than confining activities to post-conflict settings, the UN and its partners need to double down on peace before wars break out. This recommendation dovetails with the freshly minted Sustainable Development Goals, particularly goal 16, which calls for promoting just, peaceful and inclusive societies.

Fifth, national ownership of “peace”, while difficult, is fundamental. Ownership cannot be limited to national government institutions alone, but must be extended to political parties, labour unions, chambers of commerce, women’s organizations, veteran’s associations, minority groups and more. When key players are excluded from peace processes, wars are much more likely to restart.

Finally, and perhaps most important, there must be a much more proactive engagement with **women’s participation** in peace at all stages of the process. This includes involving women at multiple levels of the peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding process, together with support and protection services for women and girls. Investment in women peacebuilders and respecting gender rights can also help undermine extremism.
A NEW UN FOR A NEW GLOBAL ORDER

All of these recommendations are eminently sensible. UN member states would do well to act on them immediately. It is worth recalling that we’ve seen some of them before. Back in 2000, the *Brahimi Report on peace operations* made some of the same points, not least the importance of political solutions over military ones, matching peacekeeping needs with resources, increased coherence in UN responses to emergencies, and *stronger partnerships* to deliver results.

So why do these new proposals matter?

Well, for one, they reflect a world that has qualitatively transformed. As the global scenario continues changing, so too must the UN. The three reviews – together with a new plan of action to counter extremism – acknowledge the evolving interconnected threats facing the international system, including transnational organized crime, cybercrime and *terrorism*. They also note how the UN is a target in ways it never was before.

On a more positive note, there are also many *new regional organizations* with which the UN can partner. These groups are distributed (unevenly) across the Americas, Africa, and Asia. Some of them – including the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Union of South American Nations (UNASUR) – are assuming a more proactive role in brokering peace deals and supporting recovery. While still too state-centric, regional organizations have a key role to play when it comes to preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention and supporting peace more generally.

Finally, the UN is building a peace architecture that – while needing more robust financing from member states – should help implement the recommendations set out by the three panels. Today, the peace architecture consists of a more proactive and multi-mandate UN Department of Peacekeeping, a Peacebuilding Support Office, a Peacebuilding Commission and a Peacebuilding Fund. A stronger Department of Political Affairs and Office for South-South Cooperation is also advisable.

The UN is finally starting to get its act together to confront the most intractable threats to international peace and security. While silent on the UN’s most systemic problems – not least the unrepresentative nature of its Security Council and the veto powers of its permanent members – the panels offer some hope. Many of their recommendations deserve financial backing, including a meaningful expansion in the UN’s assessed budgets for peacekeeping and peacebuilding institutions. The big question is whether these proposals are sufficient to make the world safer.

This article was originally published by the *World Economic Forum* on March 1, 2016
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On 16 February, the world bid farewell to former United Nation’s (UN) secretary-general Boutros Boutros-Ghali when he passed away at a Cairo hospital. Boutros-Ghali is often remembered for his tumultuous term at the helm of the UN, being the only UN secretary-general to have served only one term.

However, Boutros-Ghali is also remembered for his seminal 1992 policy document, the Agenda for Peace. This document shaped the way in which conflict-resolution responses are defined, underscoring the importance of peacebuilding not only at the UN, but also globally. His passing is therefore an opportunity to reflect on what has been learnt in terms of peacebuilding responses, and how these could be improved.

The Agenda for Peace guided the UN and the broader field of conflict resolution on the types of activities that could be conducted before, during and after conflict. Although many of the ideas on preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping and peacebuilding weren’t new, it assembled these in a policy-friendly framework and offered a coherent understanding of the tools available for resolving conflict.

Boutros-Ghali showed that peacebuilding could be an important tool to help countries in their processes of sustaining peace. He defined peacebuilding as the ‘action to identify and support structures, which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict.’

He also noted that peacebuilding responses should form a crucial part of a well-considered and integrated process within a wider and clear political strategy that aims at responding to conflicts. As he said, ‘Peacebuilding is not a therapy that the UN can attempt to impose to an unwilling patient.’

At the time, the definition and scope of peacebuilding was often limited to the range of tasks that would be conducted after conflict had ended, and following a peacekeeping operation. Today, all of these concepts and responses seem far less linear and the idea of post-conflict peacebuilding is becoming outdated. Peacebuilding is increasingly seen to be part of an overarching approach to sustain peace, which means it becomes embedded in other types of responses, including preventive actions and peacekeeping.
Today, 20 years later, Boutros-Ghali’s ideas continue to influence responses and structures at the UN, the African Union (AU) and elsewhere. Ten years ago, the UN created an entire peacebuilding architecture after the release of the Agenda for Peace. The AU, since its establishment in 2002, has increasingly evolved in creating its own frameworks for peace operations and has a promising – albeit underused – post-conflict reconstruction and development framework.

Although the concept of peacebuilding has evolved, the international community has not yet identified how to do it well; nor does it yet seem able to pinpoint what exactly constitutes successful peacebuilding. The field still seems hamstrung by its inability to effectively plan and execute, measure and use results, generate institutional learning, and identify better ways of engaging in highly complex environments.

Peacebuilding is a long-term process, constrained by short-term realities. Progress in peacebuilding processes has to be sustained, even when particular gains are seen. Mozambique and Burundi, for instance, are good examples of how plans have to be supported in the longer term to avoid relapsing into conflict. More fractured peacebuilding processes in countries like the Central African Republic and the Democratic Republic of the Congo show that there is still a lot to learn about engaging in effective peacebuilding.

PEACEBUILDING IS A LONG-TERM PROCESS, CONSTRAINED BY SHORT-TERM REALITIES

It is widely accepted that monitoring and evaluation is no longer optional, but rather a critical component in identifying better ways to conduct peacebuilding: particularly in a conflict-sensitive context. Current research on the challenges of monitoring and evaluation in peacebuilding is diverse, but a number of key issues stand out.

Peacebuilding practitioners are under considerable pressure to show positive results, both for accountability and to demonstrate contributions made. This means that peacebuilding implementation often focuses on immediate and short-term responses, emphasising outputs rather than longer-term outcomes, which are more difficult to achieve.

This, in turn, leads to a messy, or retrospective, monitoring and evaluation approach, beset with insufficient allocation of resources and capacity, and made even more complicated by a lack of clarity on what success or impact is; and what the outcomes are and should be. In this way, many opportunities for learning are lost. It also compromises the ability to gather satisfying evidence of success; both for practitioners and their stakeholders.

How can these shortcomings be reduced? Timely and thorough planning is crucial, and a good monitoring and evaluation approach is one that focuses on stakeholder confidence. This implies that through monitoring and evaluation, the contribution of a peacebuilding intervention can be seen in meaningful and satisfying results. It further implies that there is potential for information to be used in institutional learning and improvement. In this way, focusing on stakeholder confidence can contribute to stronger evidence, which supports both future efforts and the peacebuilding community at large.

There is some global momentum to respond to these challenges and make peacebuilding more effective. The UN is currently conducting review processes and thematic debates of its peace and security tools, including a review of the UN peacebuilding architecture. This review states that peacebuilding remains a critically ‘underrecognised, underprioritised, and underresourced’, both globally and ‘within the UN system.’
The need to better design, plan and respond to peacebuilding needs is a critical issue that must be addressed with urgency. Currently, the Institute for Security Studies (ISS) is developing a new capacity-building process that aims to address individual and institutional shortfalls, and support the development of more effective responses. Peacebuilding practitioners who can draw on credible evidence and well-grounded arguments are better equipped to make a difference.

**PEACEBUILDING OFTEN FOCUSES ON IMMEDIATE RESPONSES, NOT LONGER-TERM OUTCOMES**

Of course, there is no one-size-fits-all solution. Practitioners should therefore carefully identify approaches that are appropriate to their context, and which would yield valuable and usable results.

Now more than ever, peacebuilders need to learn how to do peacebuilding well. This means letting go of the idea that peacebuilding responses should be implemented simply through identifying a range of disconnected activities. Rather, peacebuilders need to design coherent processes, in a way that allows them to effectively demonstrate how their contribution reduces the likelihood of conflicts from recurring.

Peacebuilding plans and responses need to be realistic, more considered, and better monitored at all stages. This is how the field could see an important mind shift; one that focuses on effective results rather than quick-fix outputs, and which will ultimately help peacebuilders to implement their responses more effectively.

*Gustavo de Carvalho* is a Senior Researcher and *Onnie Kok* is a Researcher with the Peace Operations and Peacebuilding Division of ISS Pretoria | Twitter: @gb_decarvalho

This article was originally published by the Institute for Security Studies on February 14, 2016
MOGENS LYKKETOFT: THE CHALLENGE FACING THE UN IN PEACE AND SECURITY IS HOW TO BE AND BE SEEN AS TRULY RELEVANT

Mogens Lykketoft

THE UN NEEDS URGENTLY TO KEEP PACE WITH EVOLVING CHALLENGES AND THREATS TO INTERNATIONAL SECURITY FROM CLIMATE CHANGE TO VIOLENT EXTREMISM AND TERRORISM AND BEYOND.

H.E. Mr. Mogens Lykketoft is the President of the 70th session of the General. One of his key initiatives upon assuming office was to propose a collective reflection on the key pillars of the United Nations – development, peace and security and human rights – and how the United Nations and the next Secretary General in particular can confront new challenges and transform them into opportunities.

On 10 and 11 May 2016, he will host a high-level thematic debate on UN, Peace and Security in order to examine how to strengthen the role and the performance of the United Nations' engagement in these matters. The Global Peace Operations Review's Jim Della-Giacoma and Lesley Connolly recently interviewed Mr. Lykketoft about his initiative.

Jim Della-Giacoma (JDG): What motivated you to organize this High-level Thematic Debate?

Mogens Lykketoft (ML): Since taking office in September 2015, it has become clear to me that just as multilateralism is re-asserting itself in relation to sustainable development, regrettably, in the area of international peace and security, the opposite appears to be happening.

This is partly related to the perception that the Security Council is unable to deal with some of the most complicated and dangerous conflicts the world has witnessed in recent years, including in Syria. The result is a lack of credibility and a declining image of the UN.

The international community needs urgently to engage in a serious and dispassionate reflection on the role of the United Nations in today's world across the three inter-related pillars of the organization: development, peace and security and respect for human rights. This reflection needs to inspire all members of this organisation as they start considering who – as the next Secretary-General – will lead the UN in all those equally vital tasks.

The high-level thematic debate on UN, peace and security of 10-11 May is an integral part of this process. I will host two other complementary high-level thematic debates on Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals on 21 April and on human rights on 12-13 July.
I hope that those debates will constitute adequate opportunities for the members of the United Nations to recommit to the purposes and principles of the Charter.

**JDG: What do you hope to achieve from this debate?**

**ML:** There is a good reason why the recent reviews – on UN peace operations, peacebuilding and on women, peace and security – were undertaken coincidentally: they are all inspired by the sense that the UN needs urgently to keep pace with evolving challenges and threats to international security, from climate change or violent extremism and terrorism which are now at the top of the global agenda.

They all seek to address weaknesses that undermine the efficiency and credibility of the UN, and its ability to meet the objectives outlined in the Charter. The three reviews coupled with the process for selecting and appointing the next UN Secretary General, constitute genuine opportunities to reassert the role of the UN in matters of peace and security.

I hope that my high-level thematic debate will contribute to this momentum and provide Member States with the right platform to engage in a strategic reflection about those challenges and the ways to enhance the efficiency and credibility of the UN.

**Lesley Connolly (LC): What are the key issues from the three reviews of 2015 that will help keep the UN effective in the face of the changing nature of conflict?**

**ML:** The reviews contain a remarkable set of converging recommendations – for example, regarding the need to recognize the primacy of politics; to increase investment in prevention; to strengthen the protection and participation of women in any conflict situations; to advance a people centred approach to peace and security and to strengthen partnerships in this area, particularly with regional organizations.

But I would like to encourage the General Assembly to look also at other global challenges.

Look at the refugee crises in Eastern Mediterranean and in Eastern Africa and the dramatic consequences of an international response which was not immediately commensurate with the magnitude of the needs. Failure to prevent conflicts and to address their effects at an early stage has also a cost – a cost that is becoming unbearable. As the report on humanitarian financing shows, $15 billion are needed for a decent effort to deal with refugees. It will require the right system of financing and better interaction between all parts of the UN.

In matters of peace and security also, there is no alternative to the establishment of a more predictable and sustainable financing mechanism for international action – be it for peace operations carried out by the UN or the Africa Union for example.

Another crucial dimension of any reflection on those matters is the interconnectedness between development, peace and security and human rights. We need to consider peace and security coupled with development. Genuine commitment to the implementation of Goal 16 is the best way to prevent conflict and put human dignity at the heart of governance. The two go hand-in-hand.
JDG: Ahead of the debate, you have been encouraging a number of consultations around the world with civil society organizations in Brussels, Geneva, Brasilia, Addis Ababa, Cairo, Shanghai and other places. What has been the most valuable outcome of these consultations and how do they relate to the even in New York?

ML: When I announced my intention to convene a high-level thematic debate on UN, peace and security, I was approached by a number of prominent research institutions, civil society organizations, think tanks with global and regional reach – all of them with a genuine wish to contribute to this reflection and inform the debate.

I encouraged them to work together, organize regional debates and meetings that would be open also to experts from Member States, regional and sub-regional organizations and the private sector.

The task was to bring the perspective of Europe, Asia, Africa, America and the Arab world, to go beyond abstract terms and identify the concrete implications of the primacy of politics, conflict prevention and mitigation. During the high-level thematic debate, they will be given an opportunity to outline their conclusions and recommendations, to inspire our action and the next UN leadership.

LC: It is vital for the Member States, civil society and other stakeholders to form a consensus on the role of the UN in the field of peace and security. How will the thematic debate approach this?

ML: The high-level thematic debate will combine a high-level plenary segment with interactive sessions to discuss today’s threats, challenges for sustainable peace, and how the UN system can support Member States as the primary actors.

Member States will be invited to participate at the highest possible level. Observers, UN entities, civil society, media, and other stakeholders will be invited to attend and some of them will have a special role to play.

I believe sincerely that civil society has a very important role to play in the field of peace and security. The contributions of civil society organizations are very diverse. They have field experience and ideas about what kind of system will be needed in the future. They are able to offer perspectives that are unique and important for us to hear.

Finally, it is also my intention to invite all declared candidates for the position of UN Secretary General to be present so that they are fully aware of what lies ahead of them, if selected.

JDG: This is the year that the new Secretary General will be selected. How do you see the high-level debate contributing to their future agenda?

ML: Clearly, the challenge is not only the reform of the Security Council, which is a core issue, but its interaction with the Secretary General and General Assembly.

It is very important that those who want to hold this office understand that the role of the UN Secretary General is very much to be the right moral authority towards the principle organs. The Secretary General needs to call the Security Council at the right time and challenge it if necessary while making all efforts to ensure that it takes action in the face of a crisis.

LC: How effective will a UNGA debate be in unlocking the entrenched positions of the P5 or G77 on these issues and challenges?
ML: You mentioned only two of many constituencies within the General Assembly and two constituencies that are also deeply divided on important issues such as the link between SDGs and sustainable peace.

I hope that a transparent and inclusive debate in a format that is carefully designed to be adequate to a particular discussion on the role of the UN in matters of peace and security can make a difference, go beyond the usual recognition of an ‘ill defined’ need for change to focus instead on concrete steps to make that change happen.

Only the search for a common ground on key threats and appropriate international responses to them will strengthen the will and ability of the Security Council to act in a more timely and efficient manner. Take terrorism and violent extremism, for example. Even the most powerful State on earth cannot address this threat alone. It has to be a concerted action from all the major world and regional powers. And it is not possible to deal with such threat with military might only.

JDG: One of the themes from the HIPPO report is that the UN should not work alone; it has to work with others and it should be conceived more as a facilitator rather than an implementer. What is your vision for the role of regional organizations in these peace and security challenges and how do you think the debate will bring these out?

ML: The nature of conflict has changed. It is widely recognized that the nature of conflicts has changed and that the vast majority of conflicts do not take place any more among States but within States and involving non-state actors – but at the same time with increasingly regional consequences, from a political, humanitarian, security point of view.

It requires obviously a change in the international approach, taking into consideration the regional dimensions of conflicts and the risk of spill-over. Designing and implementing regional strategies constitute only one of the responses to this phenomenon.

Another one if enhanced partnership with regional organisations. But it requires also from regional organisations to be ready for it. What has enabled the African Union to become an effective actor in the field of peace and security is firstly a political consensus on key values and key approaches, such as the principle of ‘non-indifference’ – sometimes opposed to the principle of non-interference – but also, very importantly, its concrete capacity to act. Building requisite administrative and military capacity has paid off. Today, the partnership between the AU and the UN is a concrete reality and it will only be further strengthened in the future.

LC: What will be the greatest challenge for the UN in peace and security moving forward?

ML: The challenge facing the UN in matters of peace and security is how to be and be seen as truly relevant.

In all my interaction with the General Assembly and its committees over the last few months – as the reviews and the way forward were being discussed –, I have urged member states to translate recommendations into action within a reasonable time frame.

There is a need to define both the division of labour between the UN and the regional organizations and ensure that policies, practices and funding mechanisms are adequate to the challenges linked with the objective to build sustainable peace. But a number of recommendations outlined in the reviews require more than a decision – it takes a change in mind-set to recognize the primacy of politics and put conflict prevention at the forefront of the international approach.
There is a need for a new vision, a new agenda that the next UN leadership will need to formulate and translate into action.

Mogens Lykketoft is the President of the 70th session of the UN General Assembly. | Twitter: @UN_PGA

Jim Della-Giacoma is the Deputy Director of the Center on International Cooperation. | Twitter: @jimdella

Lesley Connolly is a research assistant at the Center on International Cooperation | Twitter: @LesleyConnolly3
PSC INTERVIEW: ‘WE’RE ASKING TOO MUCH FROM THE AU’

Ahmedou Ould-Abdallah

VETERAN MAURITANIAN MEDIATOR AHMEDOU OULD-ABDALLAH WAS THE UNITED NATIONS (UN) SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE TO BURUNDI (IN THE EARLY 1990S), SUDAN AND SOMALIA, AND HEADED THE UN OFFICE FOR WEST AFRICA.

THE PSC REPORT ASKED HIM HOW SUCCESSFUL THE AFRICAN UNION (AU) IS IN DEALING WITH CONFLICTS IN AFRICA.

There are a number of conflicts on the continent where the AU is trying to intervene. Does the AU have the capacity to solve these conflicts?

The major problem is the AU has very good intentions to solve conflicts, but it doesn’t have the capacity to do so.

This is what we are facing in Burundi, for example. In my view, we speak a lot about prevention [of conflicts], but that’s easier said than done. You need to have a strong moral authority and the material and financial capacity to carry this out.

Burundi remains the best example because it is an old problem. I was representative in Burundi since the 1994 agreements, which led to the Arusha Accord of 2005. But for countries to implement these you need agendarme [policeman], otherwise it won’t work.

Can the AU play the role of gendarme?

Ahmedou Ould-Abdallah: The AU can’t fix this problem [of Burundi], in the same way that the Union of South American Nations can’t solve the problems in Latin America, like in Colombia, for example.

The Arab League can’t solve the problems between the Arab countries. We are asking the AU to do things that don’t correspond to the global reality. We have given the AU a mandate and responsibilities that do not exist in international relations. What I’m saying is very serious.

The AU cannot solve these problems, partly because it doesn’t have the material and financial capacity – it has the moral capacity, which is good – but one has to find a way to strengthen its capacity. Still, the AU can’t be the gendarme, it doesn’t have the means to do so.

Whenever there is a conflict, we see a multiplicity of special envoys, of the UN, the AU, regional organisations. There is also the AU’s Panel of the Wise. How effective are these envoys?
Ahmedou Ould-Abdallah: Today, mediation has become a problem, but it's not the fault of the AU. There is a multiplicity of external actors in every conflict – some are freelance, some represent governments and organisations. It's become so bad that we need a mediator to mediate between the mediators. But there is also an advantage to this because every one of these brings their own sensibilities, their own approach. It has really become a problem that has to be sorted out.

When it comes to intervention in conflicts, the last word seems to be with the regional organisations, as we are seeing in Burundi. Is this more effective?

Ahmedou Ould-Abdallah: The question of the relations between the AU and regional organisations is very complicated. Take the case of Burkina Faso. It was very difficult for ECOWAS [the Economic Community of West African States], which is a very respected organisation, to intervene. In the end the people and the army stood together to solve the problem. The East African Community, to which Burundi belongs, has a lot of expertise, but we always come back to the same problem, the interests of individual states: Tanzania, Rwanda, Uganda and others.

Is there a country in Africa today that has the moral authority and the means to back it up, to successfully intervene in conflicts?

Ahmedou Ould-Abdallah: The neighbours can play an important role, but the problem is that in many African countries there is not a proper integration of everyone in the country. So it is difficult to give moral and ethical lessons while you have problems at home. You have to set an example. There has to be model recognised by all. Between the desire [to make peace] and the capacity to do so, there is a big gap.

The question of sanctions comes to mind. The AU is doing a good job and it is looking at ways to convince countries to do the right thing, without resorting to sanctions.

One of the perverse effects of these sanctions is that where a leader comes to power through rigging elections, you’re telling him: you’re safe, whatever happens, there won’t be a coup d’état because we’ll impose sanctions.

It is a good rule, but it must be imposed when there are coups against a government that was freely and fairly elected. But when you rig an election and people say you can go on governing, that isn’t good. The AU’s position is good, but it has to be qualified.

Many say that the nature of conflicts in Africa has changed and so it needs a new approach. What do you think of that?

Ahmedou Ould-Abdallah: Every region and every country has its own specific problems, but we mustn’t push this too far to make Africa a separate case. Africans, just like all other communities, stand up to defend themselves when their vital material, spiritual, moral or political interests are under threat. Then, when you have irresponsible and populist politicians, they exploit these same political and ethnic considerations. When you have presidents who don’t have a vision for their country, they do the same to marginalise regions or communities. The nature of conflicts is the same everywhere. In fact, conflict forms part of daily life. Only violent and bloody conflicts don’t form part of life.

The specificity when it comes to Africa lies in the level of exclusion. When one group takes power, they simply don’t want to share the power or apply the rules that they helped to make. Secondly, they don’t contribute to the development of the country. The
country stays poor, so there is not enough wealth to go around. Besides that, the demographic explosion in Africa is a time bomb. I know people say it could be an advantage for Africa, but it is something we can't control.

This interview was originally published by ISS Africa on March 10, 2016
Since October 2014, the region around the town of Beni in northeastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DR Congo) has been the site of some of the worst massacres in the country’s recent history. Over five hundred people have been killed and tens of thousands have fled their homes.

Download the infographic in English .PDF | .PNG or French .PDF | .PNG

Download the full publication - Qui sont les tueurs de Beni? (French)
RISING POWERS ARE KEY PARTNERS FOR UN PEACE OPERATIONS

These countries not only contribute infantry, but add to the capabilities of UN peace operations by providing formed police units, helicopter crews, field hospital staff, and military engineering teams.
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