

Over the past six decades, United Nations peacekeeping has evolved into a complex, global undertaking. During this time, the conduct of United Nations peacekeeping operations has been guided by a largely unwritten body of principles and informed by the experiences of the many thousands of men and women who have served in the more than 60 operations launched since 1948. This document captures these experiences for the benefit and guidance of planners and practitioners of United Nations peacekeeping operations.

United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Principles and Guidelines

2008





United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Principles and Guidelines

United Nations

Department of Peacekeeping Operations

Department of Field Support

Credits

Peacekeeping Best Practices Section
Division of Policy, Evaluation and Training
Department of Peacekeeping Operations
United Nations Secretariat
One UN Plaza, New York, NY 10017
Tel. 212 963 1234

Approved by J.-M. Guéhenno, USG/DPKO
Approved on 18 January 2008
Contact: PBPS/D-PET
Review date: January 2010

© United Nations 2008. This publication enjoys copyright under Protocol 2 of the Universal Copyright Convention. Nevertheless, governmental authorities or Member States may freely photocopy any part of this publication for exclusive use within their training institutes. However, no portion of this publication may be reproduced for sale or mass publication without the express consent, in writing, of the Peacekeeping Best Practices Section, United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations.

Design and layout: Rick Jones (rick@studioexile.com)

Contents

Foreword Jean-Marie Guéhenno	6
Introduction Scope and Purpose of the Document	8
 PART I: THE EVOLUTION OF UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING	
Chapter 1 The Normative Framework for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations	13
1.1 The Charter of the United Nations	13
1.2 Human Rights	14
1.3 International Humanitarian Law	15
1.4 Security Council Mandates	16
Chapter 2 The Evolving Role of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations	17
2.1 The Spectrum of Peace and Security Activities	17
2.2 Linkages and Grey Areas	18
2.3 The Core Business of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations	20
2.4 Peacebuilding Activities	25
2.5 Supporting Other Actors	29

Chapter 3 The Basic Principles of United Nations Peacekeeping	31
3.1 Applying the Basic Principles of United Nations Peacekeeping	31
3.2 Other Success Factors	36
Endnotes	41

PART II: PLANNING UNITED NATIONS PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS

Chapter 4 Deciding to Deploy a United Nations Peacekeeping Operation	47
4.1 Assessing the Options for United Nations Engagement	47
4.2 Key Lessons for Planners and Decision Makers	49
4.3 The Importance of Consultations with Contributing Countries	52
Chapter 5 Planning a United Nations Peacekeeping Operation	53
5.1 The Integrated Approach	53
5.2 The Integrated Mission Planning Process (IMPP)	54
Endnotes	57

PART III: THE ART OF SUCCESSFUL MANDATE IMPLEMENTATION

Chapter 6 Deployment and Start-Up of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations	61
6.1 Typical Phases of Deployment	61
6.2 The Mission Start-Up Process	62
6.3 Managing the Mission Start-Up Process	64
Chapter 7 Managing United Nations Peacekeeping Operations	66
7.1 The Relationship between Headquarters and the Field	66
7.2 The Challenge of Mission Integration and Coordination	69

Chapter 8 Supporting and Sustaining United Nations Peacekeeping Operations	75
8.1 United Nations Logistics and Administration	75
8.2 Human Resource Management	77
8.3 Security of Personnel	79
Chapter 9 Maintaining Support for the Mission	81
9.1 Managing Mission Impact	81
9.2 Communications and Outreach	92
Chapter 10 Transition and Exit	85
10.1 Partnerships and Transition Planning	85
10.2 Hand-Over and Withdrawal	86
Endnotes	91
Annex 1 United Nations Peacekeeping Doctrine Framework	92
Annex 2 Selected Glossary of Acronyms and Terms	94

Foreword


Jean-Marie Guéhenno

Over the past sixty years, United Nations peacekeeping has evolved into one of the main tools used by the international community to manage complex crises that pose a threat to international peace and security. Since the beginning of the new millennium, the number of military, police and civilian personnel deployed in United Nations peacekeeping operations around the world has reached unprecedented levels. Not only has United Nations peacekeeping grown in size but it has become increasingly complex. Beyond simply monitoring cease-fires, today's multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations are called upon to facilitate the political process through the promotion of national dialogue and reconciliation, protect civilians, assist in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of combatants, support the organization of elections, protect and promote human rights, and assist in restoring the rule of law.

In order to meet the challenges posed by the unprecedented scale and scope of today's missions, the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Department of Field Support (DFS) have embarked on a major reform effort, *Peace Operations 2010*, aimed at strengthening and professionalizing the planning, management and conduct of United Nations peacekeeping operations. A key objective of this ongoing reform process is to ensure that the growing numbers of United Nations peacekeeping personnel deployed in the field, as well as those serving at Headquarters, have access to clear, authoritative guidance on the multitude of tasks they are required to perform.

The present publication, which has been developed in close consultation with field missions, Member States, United Nations system partners and other key stakeholders, represents the first attempt in over a decade to codify the major lessons learned from the past six decades of United Nations peacekeeping experience. It is intended to help practitioners better understand the basic principles and concepts underpinning the conduct of contemporary United Nations peacekeeping operations as well as their inherent strengths and limitations.

I would like to express my gratitude to all those who have contributed to the development of this key guidance document, which will continue to be reviewed and updated in the coming years as United Nations peacekeeping evolves and new lessons are learnt. ■



Jean-Marie Guéhenno

Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations

March 2008

Introduction

Scope and Purpose of the Document

Over the past six decades, United Nations peacekeeping has evolved into a complex, global undertaking. During this time, the conduct of United Nations peacekeeping operations has been guided by a largely unwritten body of principles and informed by the experiences of the many thousands of men and women who have served in the more than 60 operations launched since 1948. This document captures these experiences for the benefit and guidance of planners and practitioners of United Nations peacekeeping operations.

The spectrum of contemporary peace operations has become increasingly broad and includes both United Nations – led peace operations, as well as those conducted by other actors, normally with the authorization of the Security Council. This guidance document focuses on only one element of that spectrum: United Nations-led peacekeeping operations, authorized by the Security Council, conducted under the direction of the United Nations Secretary-General, and planned, managed, directed and supported by the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Department of Field Support (DFS). The specific focus of this document recognizes the need for a clearer articulation of the doctrinal foundations of United Nations peacekeeping operations, in light of the new challenges posed by the shifting nature of conflict, from inter-state to intra-state conflicts.

The present document aims to define the nature, scope and core business of contemporary United Nations peacekeeping operations, which are usually deployed as one part of a much broader international effort to build a

sustainable peace in countries emerging from conflict. It identifies the comparative advantages and limitations of United Nations peacekeeping operations as a conflict management tool, and explains the basic principles that should guide their planning and conduct. In doing so, it reflects the primary lessons learned during the past sixty years of United Nations peacekeeping. It draws on landmark reports of the Secretary-General and legislative responses to these reports, as well as relevant resolutions and statements of the principal organs of the United Nations.

The present document is an internal DPKO/DFS publication. It sits at the highest-level of the current doctrine framework for United Nations peacekeeping. Any subordinate directives, guidelines, standard operating procedures, manuals and training materials issued by DPKO/DFS should conform to the principles and concepts referred to in this guidance document.

The document is intended to serve as a guide for all United Nations personnel serving in the field and at United Nations Headquarters, as well as an introduction to those who are new to United Nations peacekeeping. Although it is intended to help guide the planning and conduct of United Nations peacekeeping operations, its specific application will require judgement and will vary according to the situation on the ground. Peacekeeping practitioners in the field are often faced with a confusing and contradictory set of imperatives and pressures. This document is unable to resolve many of these issues; indeed, some have no clear, prescribed answers. Instead, it provides a handrail to assist planners and practitioners manoeuvre through the complexities of contemporary United Nations peacekeeping operations.

This document reflects the multi-dimensional nature of contemporary United Nations peacekeeping operations, which are normally led in the field by a senior United Nations political figure. It does not seek to override the national military doctrines of individual Member States participating in these operations and it does not address any military tactics, techniques and procedures (TTPs), which remain the prerogative of individual Member States. It is, nonetheless, intended to support civilian, police and military

personnel who are training and preparing to serve in United Nations peacekeeping operations. Troop Contributing Countries and Police Contributing Countries (TCCs/PCCs) to United Nations peacekeeping operations may wish to draw on this document in developing their respective doctrines, training and pre-deployment programmes.

For partners, this guidance document is intended to foster a clearer understanding of the major principles guiding the conduct of United Nations peacekeeping operations. Key partners include TCCs/PCCs, regional and other inter-governmental organizations, the range of humanitarian and development actors involved in international crisis management, as well as national and local actors in the countries where United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed. In this regard, the document supports a vision of a system of inter-locking capabilities in which the roles and responsibilities and comparative advantages of the various partners are clearly defined.

This document draws on analysis contained in the landmark 2000 *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations* (The Brahimi Report) and other existing sources to help guide United Nations peacekeepers in the coming years. It is a living document that will be reviewed and updated regularly to reflect major evolutions in United Nations peacekeeping practices. The current version will be due for review in January 2010 and may be updated earlier, if required. As with the current version, Member States, TCCs/PCCs, field missions, United Nations system partners, regional organizations and other key stakeholders will be consulted to ensure that the document continues to reflect the concerns, views, insights, and expertise of major partners both within and outside the United Nations system. ■

The Charter of the United Nations was signed, in San Francisco, on 26 June 1945 and is the foundation document for all the United Nations work. The United Nations was established to “save succeeding generations from the scourge of war” and one of its main purposes is to maintain international peace and security. Peacekeeping, although not explicitly provided for in the Charter, has evolved into one of the main tools used by the United Nations to achieve this purpose.

PART I

The Evolution of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Chapter 1

The Normative Framework for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Chapter 1

The Normative Framework for United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Chapter 2

The Evolving Role of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Chapter 3

The Basic Principles of United Nations Peacekeeping

1.1 The Charter of the United Nations

The Charter of the United Nations was signed, in San Francisco, on 26 June 1945 and is the foundation document for all the United Nations work. The United Nations was established to “save succeeding generations from the scourge of war” and one of its main purposes is to maintain international peace and security. Peacekeeping, although not explicitly provided for in the Charter, has evolved into one of the main tools used by the United Nations to achieve this purpose.

The Charter gives the United Nations Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.¹ In fulfilling this responsibility, the Security Council may adopt a range of measures, including the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation. The legal basis for such action is found in Chapters VI, VII and VIII of the Charter. While Chapter VI deals with the “Pacific Settlement of Disputes”, Chapter VII contains provisions related to “Action with Respect to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression”. Chapter VIII of the Charter also provides for the involvement of regional arrangements and agencies in the maintenance of international peace and security, provided such activities are consistent with the purposes and principles outlined in Chapter I of the Charter.

United Nations peacekeeping operations have traditionally been associated with Chapter VI of the Charter. However, the Security Council need not

refer to a specific Chapter of the Charter when passing a resolution authorizing the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation and has never invoked Chapter VI. In recent years, the Security Council has adopted the practice of invoking Chapter VII of the Charter when authorizing the deployment of United Nations peacekeeping operations into volatile post-conflict settings where the State is unable to maintain security and public order. The Security Council's invocation of Chapter VII in these situations, in addition to denoting the legal basis for its action, can also be seen as a statement of firm political resolve and a means of reminding the parties to a conflict and the wider United Nations membership of their obligation to give effect to Security Council decisions.

Linking United Nations peacekeeping with a particular Chapter of the Charter can be misleading for the purposes of operational planning, training and mandate implementation. In assessing the nature of each peacekeeping operation and the capabilities needed to support it, TCCs and PCCs should be guided by the tasks assigned by the Security Council mandate, the concept of operations and accompanying mission Rules of Engagement (ROE) for the military component, and the Directives on the Use of Force (DUF) for the police component.

1.2 Human Rights

International human rights law is an integral part of the normative framework for United Nations peacekeeping operations. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which sets the cornerstone of international human rights standards, emphasizes that human rights and fundamental freedoms are universal and guaranteed to everybody. United Nations peacekeeping operations should be conducted in full respect of human rights and should seek to advance human rights through the implementation of their mandates (See Chapter 2).

United Nations peacekeeping personnel – whether military, police or civilian – should act in accordance with international human rights law and under-

stand how the implementation of their tasks intersects with human rights. Peacekeeping personnel should strive to ensure that they do not become perpetrators of human rights abuses. They must be able to recognize human rights violations or abuse, and be prepared to respond appropriately within the limits of their mandate and their competence. United Nations peacekeeping personnel should respect human rights in their dealings with colleagues and with local people, both in their public and in their private lives. Where they commit abuses, they should be held accountable.

1.3 International Humanitarian Law

International humanitarian law is known also as “the law of war” or “the law of armed conflict,” and restricts the means and methods of armed conflict. International humanitarian law is contained in the four Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their two Additional Protocols of 1977, as well as in rules regulating the means and methods of combat. International humanitarian law also includes conventions and treaties on the protection of cultural property and the environment during armed conflict, as well as protection of victims of conflict.

International humanitarian law is designed to protect persons who do not participate, or are no longer participating, in the hostilities; and it maintains the fundamental rights of civilians, victims and non-combatants in an armed conflict. It is relevant to United Nations peacekeeping operations because these missions are often deployed into post-conflict environments where violence may be ongoing or conflict could reignite. Additionally, in post-conflict environments there are often large civilian populations that have been targeted by the warring parties, prisoners of war and other vulnerable groups to whom the Geneva Conventions or other humanitarian law would apply in the event of further hostilities.

United Nations peacekeepers must have a clear understanding of the principles and rules of international humanitarian law and observe them in situations where they apply. The Secretary-General's Bulletin on the Observance

by United Nations Forces of International Humanitarian Law of 6 August 1999 (ST/SGB/1999/13) sets out the fundamental principles and rules of international law that may be applicable to United Nations peacekeepers.

1.4 Security Council Mandates

United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed on the basis of a mandate from the United Nations Security Council. The tasks that a United Nations peacekeeping operation will be required to perform are set out in the Security Council mandate. Security Council mandates differ from situation to situation, depending on the nature of the conflict and the specific challenges it presents. Since United Nations peacekeeping operations are normally deployed to support the implementation of a cease-fire or a more comprehensive peace agreement, Security Council mandates are influenced by the nature and content of the agreement reached by the parties to the conflict.

Security Council mandates also reflect the broader normative debates shaping the international environment. In this regard, there are a number of cross-cutting, thematic tasks that are regularly assigned to United Nations peacekeeping operations on the basis of the following landmark Security Council resolutions:

- Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security;²
- Security Council resolution 1612 (2005) on children and armed conflict;³
- Security Council resolution 1674 (2006) on the protection of civilians in armed conflict;⁴

The range of tasks assigned to United Nations peacekeeping operations has expanded significantly in response to shifting patterns of conflict and to best address emerging threats to international peace and security. Although each United Nations peacekeeping operation is different, there is a considerable degree of consistency in the types of mandated tasks assigned by the Security Council. These are described in greater detail in Chapter 2, below. ■

Chapter 2

The Evolving Role of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

2.1 The Spectrum of Peace and Security Activities

Peacekeeping is one among a range of activities undertaken by the United Nations and other international actors to maintain international peace and security throughout the world. Although peacekeeping is the focus of this document, it is important for practitioners to understand how it relates to and differs from conflict prevention, peacemaking, peace enforcement and peacebuilding.

Conflict prevention involves the application of structural or diplomatic measures to keep intra-state or inter-state tensions and disputes from escalating into violent conflict. Ideally, it should build on structured early warning, information gathering and a careful analysis of the factors driving the conflict. Conflict prevention activities may include the use of the Secretary-General's "good offices," preventive deployment or confidence-building measures.

Peacemaking generally includes measures to address conflicts in progress and usually involves diplomatic action to bring hostile parties to a negotiated agreement. The United Nations Secretary-General, upon the request of the Security Council or the General Assembly or at his/her own initiative, may exercise his or her "good offices" to facilitate the resolution of the conflict. Peacemakers may also be envoys, governments, groups of states, regional organizations or the United Nations. Peacemaking efforts may also be under-

taken by unofficial and non-governmental groups, or by a prominent personality working independently.

Peacekeeping is a technique designed to preserve the peace, however fragile, where fighting has been halted, and to assist in implementing agreements achieved by the peacemakers. Over the years, peacekeeping has evolved from a primarily military model of observing cease-fires and the separation of forces after inter-state wars, to incorporate a complex model of many elements – military, police and civilian – working together to help lay the foundations for sustainable peace.


Peace enforcement involves the application, with the authorization of the Security Council, of a range of coercive measures, including the use of military force. Such actions are authorized to restore international peace and security in situations where the Security Council has determined the existence of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression. The Security Council may utilize, where appropriate, regional organizations and agencies for enforcement action under its authority.

Peacebuilding involves a range of measures targeted to reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities at all levels for conflict management, and to lay the foundation for sustainable peace and development. Peacebuilding is a complex, long-term process of creating the necessary conditions for sustainable peace. It works by addressing the deep-rooted, structural causes of violent conflict in a comprehensive manner. Peacebuilding measures address core issues that effect the functioning of society and the State, and seek to enhance the capacity of the State to effectively and legitimately carry out its core functions.

2.2 Linkages and Grey Areas

The boundaries between conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and peace enforcement have become increasingly blurred, as seen in Figure 1. Peace operations are rarely limited to one type of activity, whether United Nations-led or conducted by non-United Nations actors.

Figure 1 Linkages and Grey Areas



While United Nations peacekeeping operations are, in principle, deployed to support the implementation of a cease-fire or peace agreement, they are often required to play an active role in peacemaking efforts and may also be involved in early peacebuilding activities. United Nations peacekeeping operations may also use force at the tactical level, with the authorization of the Security Council, to defend themselves and their mandate, particularly in situations where the State is unable to provide security and maintain public order. As discussed in Chapter 3 below, although the line between “robust” peacekeeping and peace enforcement may appear blurred at times, there are important differences between the two. While robust peacekeeping involves the use of force at the tactical level with the consent of the host authorities and/or the main parties to the conflict, peace enforcement may involve the use of force at the strategic or international level, which is normally prohibited for Member States under Article 2 (4) of the Charter unless authorized by the Security Council.

Conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace enforcement rarely occur in a linear or sequential way. Indeed, experience has shown that they should be seen as mutually reinforcing. Used piecemeal or in isolation, they fail to provide the comprehensive approach required to address the root causes of conflict that, thereby, reduces the risk of conflict recurring. However, the international community's ability to combine these activities effectively remains limited and this has, in some cases, resulted in critical gaps in the international response to crises that have threatened international peace and security.

The creation of a new United Nations peacebuilding architecture reflects a growing recognition within the international community of the linkages between the United Nations peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding roles. When a country comes before it, the Peacebuilding Commission helps marshal the resources at the disposal of the international community and advise on and propose integrated strategies for peacebuilding and recovery. In doing so, it aims to bring together relevant actors, including international financial institutions and other donors, United Nations agencies, civil society organizations, and others in support of these strategies; as well as to provide strategic advice to the principal United Nations organs and help facilitate political dialogue, enhance coordination, and monitor the progress of both national and international actors.

2.3 The Core Business of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Although not provided for in the Charter, the practice of peacekeeping began in 1948 when the first United Nations military observers were deployed to the Middle East. During the ensuing Cold War years, the goals of United Nations peacekeeping were necessarily limited to maintaining cease-fires and stabilizing situations on the ground, so that efforts could be made at the political level to resolve the conflict by peaceful means. Several of the United Nations longstanding peacekeeping operations fit this “traditional” model.

Traditional United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed as an interim measure to help manage a conflict and create conditions in which the negotiation of a lasting settlement can proceed. The tasks assigned to traditional United Nations peacekeeping operations by the Security Council are essentially military in character and may involve the following:

- Observation, monitoring and reporting – using static posts, patrols, overflights or other technical means, with the agreement of the parties;
- Supervision of cease-fire and support to verification mechanisms;
- Interposition as a buffer and confidence-building measure.

By monitoring and reporting on the parties' adherence to commitments regarding a cease-fire or demilitarized zone and by investigating complaints of violations, traditional peacekeeping operations enable each party to be reassured that the other party will not seek to exploit the cease-fire in order to gain military advantage.

Traditional peacekeeping operations do not normally play a direct role in political efforts to resolve the conflict. Other actors such as bilateral partners to the parties, regional organizations or even special United Nations envoys may be working on longer-term political solutions, which will allow the peacekeeping operation to withdraw. As a result, some traditional peacekeeping operations are deployed for decades before a lasting political settlement is reached between the parties.

With the end of the Cold War, the strategic context for United Nations peacekeeping changed dramatically and the Security Council began to work more actively to promote the containment and peaceful resolution of regional conflicts. While the end of the Cold War coincided with a general decline in the incidence of conflict around the world, internal armed conflicts constitute the vast majority of today's wars. Many of these conflicts take place in the world's poorest countries where state capacity may be weak, and where belligerents may be motivated by economic gain, as much as ideology

or past grievances. Moreover, evidence has shown that a large proportion of all civil wars are due to a relapse of conflict, the risks of which are particularly high in the first five to 10 years following a conflict.


The transformation of the international environment has given rise to a new generation of “multi-dimensional” United Nations peacekeeping operations. These operations are typically deployed in the dangerous aftermath of a violent internal conflict and may employ a mix of military, police and civilian capabilities to support the implementation of a comprehensive peace agreement.⁵

Some multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations have been deployed following a request from the national authorities to support the transition to legitimate government, in the absence of a formal peace agreement. In exceptional circumstances, the Security Council has also authorized multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations to temporarily assume the legislative and administrative functions of the State, in order to support the transfer of authority from one sovereign entity to another, or until sovereignty questions are fully resolved (as in the case of transitional administrations), or to help the State to establish administrative structures that may not have existed previously.

Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations deployed in the aftermath of an internal conflict face a particularly challenging environment. The State’s capacity to provide security to its population and maintain public order is often weak, and violence may still be ongoing in various parts of the country. Basic infrastructure is likely to have been destroyed and large sections of the population may have been displaced. Society may be divided along ethnic, religious and regional lines and grave human rights abuses may have been committed during the conflict, further complicating efforts to achieve national reconciliation.

Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed as one part of a much broader international effort to help countries emerging

Figure 2 The Core Business of Multi-dimensional United Nations Peacekeeping Operations



from conflict make the transition to a sustainable peace. As shown in Figure 2 above, this effort consists of several phases and may involve an array of actors with separate, albeit overlapping, mandates and areas of expertise.

Within this broader context, the core functions of a multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation are to:

- a) **Create a secure and stable environment while strengthening the State’s ability to provide security, with full respect for the rule of law and human rights;**
- b) **Facilitate the political process by promoting dialogue and reconciliation and supporting the establishment of legitimate and effective institutions of governance;**
- c) **Provide a framework for ensuring that all United Nations and other international actors pursue their activities at the country-level in a coherent and coordinated manner.**

In addition to monitoring and observing cease-fires, multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations are frequently mandated to provide operational support to national law enforcement agencies; provide security at key government installations, ports and other vital infrastruc-

ture; establish the necessary security conditions for the free flow of people, goods and humanitarian assistance; and provide humanitarian mine action assistance.⁶ By helping to fill the security and public order vacuum that often exists in post-conflict settings, multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations play a critical role in securing the peace process, and ensuring that humanitarian and development partners are able to work in a safe environment.

In situations of internal armed conflict, civilians account for the vast majority of casualties. Many civilians are forcibly uprooted within their own countries and have specific vulnerabilities arising from their displacement. As a result, most multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations are now mandated by the Security Council to protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence. The protection of civilians requires concerted and coordinated action among the military, police and civilian components of a United Nations peacekeeping operation and must be mainstreamed into the planning and conduct of its core activities. United Nations humanitarian agencies and non-governmental organization (NGO) partners also undertake a broad range of activities in support of the protection of civilians.⁷ Close coordination with these actors is, therefore, essential.

In contrast to traditional United Nations peacekeeping operations, multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations usually play a direct role in political efforts to resolve the conflict and are often mandated by the Security Council to provide good offices or promote national political dialogue and reconciliation. The fact that multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations enjoy a high degree of international legitimacy and represent the collective will of the international community gives them considerable leverage over the parties. This leverage can be used to build and sustain a political consensus around the peace process, promote good governance and maintain pressure on the parties to implement key institutional reforms.

Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations also play a critical role in ensuring that the activities of the United Nations system and

other international actors are guided by a common strategic vision. The United Nations has the unique ability to mount a truly comprehensive response to complex crises and has developed the concept of “integrated missions” to maximize the overall impact of its support to countries emerging from conflict.⁸ To help draw these capabilities together, multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations are normally headed by a Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) who has overall authority over the activities of the United Nations. The SRSG also establishes the framework guiding the overall activities of the United Nations peacekeeping operation and those of the United Nations Country Team (UNCT).⁹ The SRSG is supported in this task by a “triple-hatted” Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General/Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator (DSRSG/RC/HC). This Deputy also serves as the principal interface between the United Nations peacekeeping operation and the UNCT; leads the coordination effort for humanitarian, development and recovery activities; and brings concerns raised by the UNCT to the attention of the SRSG.¹⁰

2.4 Peacebuilding Activities

While the deployment of a multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation may help to stem violence in the short-term, it is unlikely to result in a sustainable peace unless accompanied by programmes designed to prevent the recurrence of conflict. Every situation invariably presents its own specific set of challenges. However, experience has shown that the achievement of a sustainable peace requires progress in at least four critical areas:¹¹

- a) Restoring the State’s ability to provide security and maintain public order;
- b) Strengthening the rule of law¹² 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 or resettlement of internally displaced persons and refugees uprooted by conflict.

Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations generally lack the programme funding and technical expertise required to comprehensively implement effective peacebuilding programmes. Nevertheless, they are often mandated by the Security Council to play a catalytic role in the following critical peacebuilding activities:

- Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) of combatants;
- Mine action;
- Security Sector Reform (SSR)¹³ and other rule of law-related activities;
- Protection and promotion of human rights;
- Electoral assistance;
- Support to the restoration and extension of State authority.

DDR. DDR is a critical part of efforts to create a secure and stable environment in which the process of recovery can begin. United Nations multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations are usually mandated to assist in the development and implementation of national DDR programmes.¹⁴ This may entail the provision of technical advice; the securing of disarmament and cantonment sites; and/or the collection and destruction of weapons, ammunition and other materiel surrendered by the former combatants. Other agencies, working in close coordination with the United Nations peacekeeping operation, are responsible for supporting the critical reintegration process, which aims to provide demobilized former combatants with sustainable livelihoods.

Mine action. In many post-conflict settings, landmines and other unexploded ordnance constitute a threat to the safety of civilians and pose a major obstacle to successful post-conflict recovery. Mine action is therefore necessary to recreate a safe environment conducive to normal life and development. In addition to providing emergency mine action assistance, multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations are often mandated to help the national authorities develop medium- and long-term mine action plans.¹⁵

SSR and other rule of law-related activities. SSR is an essential component of efforts to re-establish and strengthen the rule of law. Progress in the area of SSR is critical to the success of a multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation and helps define its “exit strategy,” which is largely dependent on the ability of national security actors and institutions to function effectively. Depending on its mandate, a multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation may be called upon to assist in the restructuring, reform and training of the national police and/or armed forces. Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations also play a catalytic role in the strengthening of national judiciary and corrections systems, and have also been mandated by the Security Council to promote legal and judicial reform or support the development of essential legislation.

Protection and promotion human rights. The abuse and violation of human rights is at the heart of most modern conflicts and is also a consequence of them. Many of the worst human rights abuses occur during armed conflict and the protection of human rights must be at the core of action taken to address it. All United Nations entities have a responsibility to ensure that human rights are promoted and protected by and within their field operations.¹⁶ Most United Nations multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations are therefore mandated to promote and protect human rights by monitoring and helping to investigate human rights violations and/or developing the capacity of national actors and institutions to do so on their own.¹⁷ The integration of human rights and the sustainability of human rights programmes should always be a key factor in the planning of multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations.

Restoration and extension of State authority. Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations are frequently called upon to support the restoration and extension of State authority. In order to generate revenue and provide basic services to the population, the State must be able to exert control over its national territory. Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations may support the restoration and extension of State authority by creating an enabling security environment, providing

political leadership or coordinating the efforts of other international actors. Support to the restoration or extension of State authority may include efforts to develop political participation, as well as operational support to the immediate activities of state institutions. Where relevant, it may also include small-scale capacity building or support to larger processes of constitutional or institutional restructuring.

Electoral assistance. The holding of free and fair elections is often written into the peace agreement underlying a multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation and represents a major milestone towards the establishment of a legitimate State. Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations are usually mandated to play a direct role in efforts to organize, monitor and carry out free and fair elections through the provision of security, technical advice, logistical support and other forms of electoral assistance. To this end, the electoral component of multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations is normally staffed by experts recommended by the United Nations Electoral Assistance Division (EAD) of the Department of Political Affairs (DPA).

Although multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations may be required to initiate a limited number of critical peacebuilding activities, they are neither designed nor equipped to engage in longer-term institution and capacity-building efforts. This is normally the work of development actors within the UNCT, as well as key partners outside the United Nations, who have the resources and technical expertise required to effectively undertake long-term institution and capacity-building activities.

Nevertheless, experience has shown that, in the short-term, a United Nations peacekeeping operation may have little choice but to initiate longer-term institution and capacity-building efforts, due to the inability of other actors to take the lead. Whenever a United Nations peacekeeping operation is required to engage in activities of an institution and/or capacity building nature, it is essential that it be adequately resourced and that it seek out the requisite expertise. In such circumstances, the United Nations peacekeeping

operation's efforts should remain focused on preparing the ground for those actors within and outside the United Nations system with the mandate to provide long-term peacebuilding assistance.

2.5 Supporting Other Actors

There are a number of areas in which the role of United Nations peacekeeping operations is limited to facilitating the activities of other actors within and outside the United Nations system, when requested, and within the limits of their mandate and available capacity. The promotion of socio-economic recovery and development and the provision of humanitarian assistance are two critical areas in which multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations play a more limited supporting role.

Socio-economic recovery and development is critical to the achievement of a lasting peace. Experience has shown that security sector and other reform programmes are unlikely to succeed if not supported by transparent and effective economic management and civilian oversight systems. DDR efforts are likely to fail unless sustainable, alternative livelihoods can be provided to demobilized combatants.

Similarly, the return of refugees and other displaced populations is more likely to be smooth and sustainable if the special needs of these persons are taken into account in programmes designed to promote socio-economic recovery.

The promotion of socio-economic recovery and development is the responsibility of development partners within and outside the United Nations system. Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations are rarely mandated to play a direct role in the promotion of socio-economic recovery and development, nor do they have ready access to the requisite expertise and programmatic funding. Nevertheless, United Nations peacekeeping operations may assist the work of development partners by using

their influence with the national authorities to encourage key reforms, or using the good offices of the SRSG and/or the DSRSG/RC/HC to help mobilize donor funding and attention for key development activities.

Responsibility for the provision of humanitarian assistance rests primarily with the relevant civilian United Nations specialized agencies, funds and programmes, as well as the range of independent, international and local NGOs which are usually active alongside a United Nations peacekeeping operation. The primary role of United Nations peacekeeping operations with regard to the provision of humanitarian assistance is to provide a secure and stable environment within which humanitarian actors may carry out their activities.¹⁸

Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations often implement Quick Impact Projects (QIPs), which are small-scale projects, designed to benefit the population. QIPs may take a number of forms, including infrastructure assistance or short-term employment generation activities. QIPs establish and build confidence in the mission, its mandate and the peace process. They are not a substitute for humanitarian and/or development assistance and are used by United Nations multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations to support the mission's objectives, by building confidence in the mission's mandate and the peace process.

Coordination and consultation with humanitarian actors¹⁹ in regard to administration of QIPs is essential to help alleviate humanitarian concerns regarding the danger of conflating political-military activities with their humanitarian operations. The mission should be aware that humanitarian actors may have concerns about the characterization of QIPs, or Civil Military Coordination (CIMIC) projects, "hearts and minds" activities, or other security or recovery projects as being of a humanitarian nature, when they see these as primarily serving political, security or reconstruction priorities. ■

Chapter 3

The Basic Principles of United Nations Peacekeeping

3.1 Applying the Basic Principles of United Nations Peacekeeping

Although the practice of United Nations peacekeeping has evolved significantly over the past six decades, three basic principles have traditionally served and continue to set United Nations peacekeeping operations apart as a tool for maintaining international peace and security:

- **Consent of the parties**
- **Impartiality**
- **Non-use of force except in self-defence and defence of the mandate**

These principles are inter-related and mutually reinforcing. It is important that their meaning and relationship to each other are clearly understood by all those involved in the planning and conduct of United Nations peacekeeping operations, so that they are applied effectively. Taken together, they provide a navigation aid, or compass, for practitioners both in the field and at United Nations Headquarters.

Consent of the parties. United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed with the consent of the main parties to the conflict.²⁰ This requires a commitment by the parties to a political process and their acceptance of a peacekeeping operation mandated to support that process. The consent of the

main parties provides a United Nations peacekeeping operation with the necessary freedom of action, both political and physical, to carry out its mandated tasks. In the absence of such consent, a United Nations peacekeeping operation risks becoming a party to the conflict; and being drawn towards enforcement action, and away from its intrinsic role of keeping the peace.

In the implementation of its mandate, a United Nations peacekeeping operation must work continuously to ensure that it does not lose the consent of the main parties, while ensuring that the peace process moves forward. This requires that all peacekeeping personnel have a thorough understanding of the history and prevailing customs and culture in the mission area, as well as the capacity to assess the evolving interests and motivation of the parties.

The absence of trust between the parties in a post-conflict environment can, at times, make consent uncertain and unreliable. Consent, particularly if given grudgingly under international pressure, may be withdrawn in a variety of ways when a party is not fully committed to the peace process. For instance, a party that has given its consent to the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation may subsequently seek to restrict the operation's freedom of action, resulting in a *de facto* withdrawal of consent. The complete withdrawal of consent by one or more of the main parties challenges the rationale for the United Nations peacekeeping operation and will likely alter the core assumptions and parameters underpinning the international community's strategy to support the peace process.

The fact that the main parties have given their consent to the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation does not necessarily imply or guarantee that there will also be consent at the local level, particularly if the main parties are internally divided or have weak command and control systems. Universality of consent becomes even less probable in volatile settings, characterized by the presence of armed groups not under the control of any of the parties, or by the presence of other spoilers.²¹ The peacekeeping

operation should continuously analyze its operating environment to detect and forestall any wavering of consent. A peacekeeping operation must have the political and analytical skills, the operational resources, and the will to manage situations where there is an absence or breakdown of local consent. In some cases this may require, as a last resort, the use of force.

Impartiality. United Nations peacekeeping operations must implement their mandate without favour or prejudice to any party. Impartiality is crucial to maintaining the consent and cooperation of the main parties, but should not be confused with neutrality or inactivity.²² United Nations peacekeepers should be impartial in their dealings with the parties to the conflict, but not neutral in the execution of their mandate.

The need for even-handedness towards the parties should not become an excuse for inaction in the face of behavior that clearly works against the peace process. Just as a good referee is impartial, but will penalize infractions, so a peacekeeping operation should not condone actions by the parties that violate the undertakings of the peace process or the international norms and principles that a United Nations peacekeeping operation upholds.

Notwithstanding the need to establish and maintain good relations with the parties, a peacekeeping operation must scrupulously avoid activities that might compromise its image of impartiality. A mission should not shy away from a rigorous application of the principle of impartiality for fear of misinterpretation or retaliation, but before acting it is always prudent to ensure that the grounds for acting are well-established and can be clearly communicated to all. Failure to do so may undermine the peacekeeping operation's credibility and legitimacy, and may lead to a withdrawal of consent for its presence by one or more of the parties. Where the peacekeeping operation is required to counter such breaches, it must do so with transparency, openness and effective communication as to the rationale and appropriate nature of its response. This will help to minimize opportunities to manipulate the perceptions against the mission, and help to mitigate the potential backlash from the parties and their supporters. Even the best and

fairest of referees should anticipate criticism from those affected negatively and should be in a position to explain their actions.

Non-use of force except in self-defense and defense of the mandate. The principle of non-use of force except in self-defense dates back to the first deployment of armed United Nations peacekeepers in 1956. The notion of self-defense has subsequently come to include resistance to attempts by forceful means to prevent the peacekeeping operation from discharging its duties under the mandate of the Security Council.²³ United Nations peacekeeping operations are not an enforcement tool. However, it is widely understood that they may use force at the tactical level, with the authorization of the Security Council, if acting in self-defense and defense of the mandate.

The environments into which United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed are often characterized by the presence of militias, criminal gangs, and other spoilers who may actively seek to undermine the peace process or pose a threat to the civilian population. In such situations, the Security Council has given United Nations peacekeeping operations “robust” mandates authorizing them to “use all necessary means” to deter forceful attempts to disrupt the political process, protect civilians under imminent threat of physical attack, and/or assist the national authorities in maintaining law and order. By proactively using force in defense of their mandates, these United Nations peacekeeping operations have succeeded in improving the security situation and creating an environment conducive to longer-term peacebuilding in the countries where they are deployed.

Although on the ground they may sometimes appear similar, robust peacekeeping should not be confused with peace enforcement, as envisaged under Chapter VII of the Charter. Robust peacekeeping involves the use of force at the tactical level with the authorization of the Security Council and consent of the host nation and/or the main parties to the conflict. By contrast, peace enforcement does not require the consent of the main parties and may involve the use of military force at the strategic or international level, which

is normally prohibited for Member States under Article 2(4) of the Charter, unless authorized by the Security Council.

A United Nations peacekeeping operation should only use force as a measure of last resort, when other methods of persuasion have been exhausted, and an operation must always exercise restraint when doing so. The ultimate aim of the use of force is to influence and deter spoilers working against the peace process or seeking to harm civilians; and not to seek their military defeat. The use of force by a United Nations peacekeeping operation should always be calibrated in a precise, proportional and appropriate manner, within the principle of the minimum force necessary to achieve the desired effect, while sustaining consent for the mission and its mandate. In its use of force, a United Nations peacekeeping operation should always be mindful of the need for an early de-escalation of violence and a return to non-violent means of persuasion.

The use of force by a United Nations peacekeeping operation always has political implications and can often give rise to unforeseen circumstances. Judgments concerning its use will need to be made at the appropriate level within a mission, based on a combination of factors including mission capability; public perceptions; humanitarian impact; force protection; safety and security of personnel; and, most importantly, the effect that such action will have on national and local consent for the mission.

The mission-wide ROE for the military and DUF for the police components of a United Nations peacekeeping operation will clarify the different levels of force that can be used in various circumstances, how each level of force should be used, and any authorizations that must be obtained by commanders. In the volatile and potentially dangerous environments into which contemporary peacekeeping operations are often deployed, these ROE and DUF should be sufficiently robust to ensure that a United Nations peacekeeping operation retains its credibility and freedom of action to implement its mandate. The mission leadership should ensure that these ROE and DUF are well understood by all relevant personnel in the mission and are being applied uniformly.

3.2 Other Success Factors

United Nations peacekeeping operations continue to be guided by the basic principles of consent, impartiality and the non-use of force except in self-defense and defense of the mandate. The experiences of the past 15 years have shown that in order to succeed, United Nations peacekeeping operations must also be perceived as legitimate and credible, particularly in the eyes of the local population. The United Nations recent experience with multi-dimensional peacekeeping has also served to highlight the need for United Nations peacekeeping operations to promote national and local ownership, in order to contribute to the achievement of a sustainable peace.

Legitimacy. International legitimacy is one of the most important assets of a United Nations peacekeeping operation. The international legitimacy of a United Nations peacekeeping operation is derived from the fact that it is established after obtaining a mandate from the United Nations Security Council, which has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. The uniquely broad representation of Member States who contribute personnel and funding to United Nations operations further strengthens this international legitimacy. So too does the fact that United Nations peacekeeping operations are directed by the United Nations Secretary-General, an impartial and well-respected international figure, committed to upholding the principles and purposes of the Charter.

The manner in which a United Nations peacekeeping operation conducts itself may have a profound impact on its perceived legitimacy on the ground. The firmness and fairness with which a United Nations peacekeeping operation exercises its mandate, the circumspection with which it uses force, the discipline it imposes upon its personnel, the respect it shows to local customs, institutions and laws, and the decency with which it treats the local people all have a direct effect upon perceptions of its legitimacy.

The perceived legitimacy of a United Nations peacekeeping operation is directly related to the quality and conduct of its military, police and civilian personnel. The bearing and behavior of all personnel must be of the highest

order, commensurate with the important responsibilities entrusted to a United Nations peacekeeping operation, and should meet the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity. The mission's senior leadership must ensure that all personnel are fully aware of the standards of conduct that are expected of them and that effective measures are in place to prevent misconduct. Civilian, police and military personnel should receive mandatory training on sexual exploitation and abuse; and this training should be ongoing, as troops rotate in and out of peace operations. There must be zero tolerance for any kind of sexual exploitation and abuse, and other forms of serious misconduct. Cases of misconduct must be dealt with firmly and fairly, to avoid undermining the legitimacy and moral authority of the mission.

Experience has shown that the perceived legitimacy of a United Nations peacekeeping operation's presence may erode over time, if the size of the United Nations "footprint" and the behavior of its staff becomes a source of local resentment; or if the peacekeeping operation is not sufficiently responsive as the situation stabilizes. Peacekeeping missions must always be aware of and respect national sovereignty. As legitimate and capable government structures emerge, the role of the international actors may well need to diminish quickly. They should seek to promote national and local ownership, be aware of emerging local capacities, and be sensitive to the effect that the behavior and conduct of the mission has upon the local population.

Credibility. United Nations peacekeeping operations are frequently deployed in volatile, highly stressed environments characterized by the collapse or degradation of state structures, as well as enmity, violence, polarization and distress. Lawlessness and insecurity may still be prevalent at local levels, and opportunists will be present who are willing to exploit any political and security vacuum. In such environments, a United Nations peacekeeping operation is likely to be tested for weakness and division by those whose interests are threatened by its presence, particularly in the early stages of deployment.

The credibility of a United Nations peacekeeping operation is a direct reflection of the international and local communities' belief in the mission's ability to achieve its mandate. Credibility is a function of a mission's capability, effectiveness and ability to manage and meet expectations. Ideally, in order to be credible, a United Nations peacekeeping operation must deploy as rapidly as possible, be properly resourced, and strive to maintain a confident, capable and unified posture. Experience has shown that the early establishment of a credible presence can help to deter spoilers and diminish the likelihood that a mission will need to use force to implement its mandate. To achieve and maintain its credibility, a mission must therefore have a clear and deliverable mandate, with resources and capabilities to match; and a sound mission plan that is understood, communicated and impartially and effectively implemented at every level.

The deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation will generate high expectations among the local population regarding its ability to meet their most pressing needs. A perceived failure to meet these expectations, no matter how unrealistic, may cause a United Nations peacekeeping operation to become a focus for popular dissatisfaction, or worse, active opposition. The ability to manage these expectations throughout the life of a peacekeeping operation affects the overall credibility of the mission. Credibility, once lost, is hard to regain. A mission with low credibility becomes marginalized and ineffective. Its activities may begin to be perceived as having weak or frayed legitimacy and consent may be eroded. Critics and opponents of the mission may well exploit any such opportunities to this end. The loss of credibility may also have a direct impact on the morale of the mission personnel, further eroding its effectiveness. Accordingly, the maintenance of credibility is fundamental to the success of a mission.

Promotion of national and local ownership. Multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations are increasingly involved in efforts to help countries emerging from protracted internal conflict re-build the foundations of a functioning State. The terms of the peace process and/or the Security Council mandate will shape the nature of a peacekeeping operation's role

in this area. In some instances, state and local capacity may be so weak that the mission is required to temporarily assume certain functions, either directly, as in the case of transitional administration, or in support of the State. Other situations require less intrusive support to state authority, and sometimes no such support at all. The nature and scale of a particular United Nations peacekeeping operation's role will depend on its mandate, the gravity of the situation on the ground, the resources the international community is willing to invest and an assessment of the availability of capable, credible and legitimate partners within the host nation. Each of these variables may change during the course of a United Nations peacekeeping operation's lifetime and require adjustments in the peacekeeping operation's approach.

National and local ownership is critical to the successful implementation of a peace process. In planning and executing a United Nations peacekeeping operation's core activities, every effort should be made to promote national and local ownership and to foster trust and cooperation between national actors. Effective approaches to national and local ownership not only reinforce the perceived legitimacy of the operation and support mandate implementation, they also help to ensure the sustainability of any national capacity once the peacekeeping operation has been withdrawn.

Partnerships with national actors should be struck with due regard to impartiality, wide representation, inclusiveness, and gender considerations. Missions must recognize that multiple divergent opinions will exist in the body politic of the host country. All opinions and views need to be understood, ensuring that ownership and participation are not limited to small elite groups. National and local ownership must begin with a strong understanding of the national context. This includes understanding of the political context, as well as the wider socio-economic context.

A mission must be careful to ensure that the rhetoric of national ownership does not replace a real understanding of the aspirations and hope of the population, and the importance of allowing national capacity to re-emerge quickly from conflict to lead critical political and development processes.

The mission will need to manage real tensions between the requirement, in some instances, for rapid transformational change from the *status quo ex ante*, and resistance to change from certain powerful actors who have a vested interest in maintaining the status quo. The ownership of change must be built, first, through dialogue. Political, financial and other forms of international leverage may be required to influence the parties on specific issues, but those should only be used in support of the wider aspirations for peace in the community.

The activities of a multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation must be informed by the need to support and, where necessary, build national capacity. Accordingly, any displacement of national or local capacity should be avoided wherever possible. A multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation may be obliged, in the short-term, to take on important state-like functions, such as the provision of security and the maintenance of public order. However, these functions should be conducted in a consultative manner. The aim must always be to restore, as soon as possible, the ability of national actors and institutions to assume their responsibilities and to exercise their full authority, with due respect for internationally accepted norms and standards. In building national capacity, women and men should have equal opportunities for training. Targeted efforts may need to address gender inequalities. ■

Endnotes

- 1 Although the United Nations Charter gives primary responsibility to the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security, General Assembly resolution 377 (V) of 3 November 1950, also known as the “Uniting for Peace” resolution, states that:

“... if the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression, the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security.”

General Assembly resolution 1000 (ES-1) of 5 November 1956 authorizing the establishment of the First United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF I) was adopted under procedure established by the “Uniting for Peace” resolution.

- 2 It is widely recognized that the international community’s objectives in countries emerging from conflict will be better served if women and girls are protected and if arrangements are put in place to allow for the full participation of women in the peace process. Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security therefore calls on all United Nations peacekeeping operations to mainstream gender issues into operational activities.
- 3 Security Council resolution 1612 (2005) stresses the responsibility of United Nations peacekeeping operations to ensure a coordinated response to children and armed conflict concerns and to monitor and report to the Secretary-General. Under resolution 1612 (2005) the Secretary-General is required to ensure that the need for, and the number and roles of Child Protection Advisers are systematically assessed during the preparation of each United Nations peacekeeping operation. In United Nations peacekeeping operations where there are country monitoring and reporting Task Forces on CAAC, these are headed by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG).
- 4 Security Council resolution 1674 (2006) reaffirms the Council’s commitment to ensuring that the mandates of peacekeeping operations, where appropriate and on a case-by-case basis, include provisions regarding: (i) the protection of civilians, particularly those under imminent threat of physical danger within their zones of operation, (ii) the facilitation of the provision of humanitarian assistance, and (iii) the creation of conditions conducive to the voluntary, safe, dignified and sustainable return of refugees and internally displaced persons.

- 5 In most post-conflict environments, a peace accord or other agreement, such as a cease-fire agreement or agreement on disengagement of forces, is likely to be in effect and include provisions directly related to the peacekeeping operation. The peace accord may be quite detailed, spelling out the various phases of the peace process and the specifics of post-conflict arrangements. Or, it could be more general, leaving details for future negotiation. The signatories to a peace agreement have an obligation to abide by the terms of the agreement. In certain cases, the United Nations or key Member States have also signed peace agreements as guarantors, who undertake to ensure that the peace process remains on track.
- 6 Even if the clearance of landmines and other explosive remnants of war (ERW) has not been explicitly mandated by the Security Council, humanitarian mine action activities will invariably need to be undertaken by a mission, as an issue of United Nations staff safety and security.
- 7 The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) have express protection mandates. In an increasing number of countries, one of these agencies will be responsible for the overall coordination of the protection response among humanitarian actors through a dedicated protection "cluster" or working group. The Mine Action Service of DPKO is also designated as the focal point for mine action within the Protection Cluster Working Group (PCWG), and is actively engaged with these agencies and partners.
- 8 See Secretary-General's Note of Guidance on Integrated Missions, clarifying the Role, Responsibility and Authority of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General/Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordination, 17 January 2006.
- 9 See para. 5 of the Secretary-General's Note of Guidance on Integrated Missions.
- 10 See Secretary-General's Note of Guidance on Integrated Missions, para. 22.
- 11 See Report of the Secretary-General, No Exit without Strategy: Security Council Decision-making and the Closure or Transition of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, S/2001/394.
- 12 According to Decision No. 2006/47 of the Secretary General's Policy Committee, the rule of law in the context of conflict and post-conflict settings includes the following sectors: transitional justice; strengthening of national justice systems and institutions, including police and law enforcement agencies and prisons; and other priority areas such as victim and witness protection and assistance, anti-corruption, organized crime, trans-national crime, and trafficking and drugs.
- 13 According to Decision No. 2007/11 of the Secretary-General's Policy Committee: "The objective of a United Nations approach to SSR is effective, accountable and sustainable security institutions operating under civilian control within the framework of the rule of law and respect for human rights. The focus should be on executive security agencies, armed forces, police and law enforcement agencies, relevant line ministries and judicial and civil society oversight bodies."
- 14 The role of United Nations peacekeeping operations in this area is defined in the United Nations Integrated DDR Standards (IDDRS), available at www.unddr.org/iddrs.
- 15 The United Nations Mine Action Service (UNMAS) is responsible for building the capacity of the national institutions that will ultimately assume responsibility for long-term mine action management within the country.
- 16 Decision No. 2005/24 of the Secretary-General's Policy Committee on Human Rights in Integrated Missions directs that human rights be fully integrated into peace operations and all human rights functions coordinated by one component.
- 17 The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR) is responsible for providing expertise, guidance and support to the human rights components of multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations.
- 18 Depending on the situation, and when specifically requested by the relevant organizations, the peacekeeping operation may also need to provide more direct forms of assistance to humanitarian actors, such as escorting convoys or transporting humanitarian aid and personnel. Specific requests for assistance should be managed through standing coordination structures of the mission, and with reference to the United Nations Humanitarian Coordinator.
- 19 The term 'humanitarian' is often applied loosely to a wide group of actors and activities, whereas many in the humanitarian community take a more restricted interpretation to embrace only those delivering life-saving assistance delivered in accordance with the Humanitarian principles. United Nations peacekeepers should respect this distinction.
- 20 The Security Council may take enforcement action without the consent of the main parties to the conflict, if it believes that the conflict presents a threat to international peace and security. This, however, would be a peace enforcement operation. It may also take enforcement action for humanitarian or protection purposes; where there is no political process and where the consent of the major parties may not be achievable, but where civilians are suffering. Since the mid-1990s, enforcement action has been carried out by ad hoc coalitions of Member States or regional organizations acting under United Nations Security Council authorization.
- 21 Spoilers are individuals or parties who believe that the peace process threatens their power and interests, and will therefore work to undermine it.
- 22 Humanitarian actors also use the terms impartiality and neutrality as two of the fundamental principles of humanitarian action, along with humanity and independence. However, their meanings are different. It is important to be aware of these differences, in order to avoid misunderstandings. For the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, in particular, impartiality means being guided solely by needs, making no discrimination on the basis of nationality, race, gender, class, or religious/political beliefs; while neutrality means to take no sides in hostilities or engage, at any time, in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature.
- 23 See para. 5 of the Report of the Secretary-General on the Implementation of Security Council resolution 340 (1973), of 27 October 1973, (S/11052/Rev.1).

United Nations peacekeeping operations are likely to be far more effective when deployed as part of a United Nations system-wide response based on a clear and shared understanding of priorities, and on the willingness of all actors to contribute to achieving common objectives. Integrated planning is at the heart of the United Nations' efforts to develop such a response.

PART II

Planning United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Chapter 4

Deciding to Deploy a United Nations Peacekeeping Operation

Chapter 4

Deciding to Deploy a United Nations Peacekeeping Operation

Chapter 5

Planning a United Nations Peacekeeping Operation

4.1 Assessing the Options for United Nations Engagement

It is the prerogative of the United Nations Security Council, acting in its capacity as the organ with primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, to determine when and where a United Nations peacekeeping operation should be deployed. The Security Council responds to crises on a case-by-case basis and it has a wide range of options at its disposal. Nevertheless, without prejudice to its ability to do so and to respond flexibly as circumstances require, the Security Council has indicated that it may take the following factors into account when the establishment of new peacekeeping operations is under consideration:

- Whether a situation exists the continuation of which is likely to endanger or constitute a threat to international peace and security;
- Whether regional or sub-regional organizations and arrangements exist and are ready and able to assist in resolving the situation;
- Whether a cease-fire exists and whether the parties have committed themselves to a peace process intended to reach a political settlement;
- Whether a clear political goal exists and whether it can be reflected in the mandate;
- Whether a precise mandate for a United Nations operation can be formulated;

- Whether the safety and security of United Nations personnel can be reasonably ensured, including in particular whether reasonable guarantees can be obtained from the principal parties or factions regarding the safety and security of United Nations personnel.¹

The United Nations Secretariat plays a critical role in helping the Security Council determine whether the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation is the most appropriate course of action, or whether other options for United Nations engagement should be considered. As a particular conflict develops, worsens, or approaches resolution, consultations will normally take place among Member States, the Secretariat, the parties on the ground, regional actors, and potential contributing countries. One or more of the parties may even insist on a United Nations role as a precondition for signing a peace agreement.

During this initial phase of consultations, the United Nations Secretary-General may decide to convene a Strategic Assessment of the situation, involving all relevant United Nations actors, with the aim of identifying possible options for United Nations engagement. The Strategic Assessment would likely involve consultations with Member States, including the potential host government and TCCs/PCCs, as well as regional and other intergovernmental organizations, and other key external partners. The Strategic Assessment allows United Nations planners and decision-makers to conduct a system-wide analysis of the situation, identify conflict resolution and peace-building priorities, and define the appropriate framework for United Nations engagement.

As soon as security conditions permit, the Secretariat usually deploys a Technical Assessment Mission (TAM) to the country or territory where the deployment of a United Nations mission is envisaged. The role of the TAM is to analyze and assess the overall security, political humanitarian, human rights and military situation on the ground, and the implications of an eventual United Nations peacekeeping operation. As such, the TAM may also consist of representatives from several departments and offices with-

in the Secretariat, as well as the specialized agencies, funds and programs, and should involve relevant actors from the UNCT.

Based on the findings and recommendations of the TAM, the United Nations Secretary-General normally issues a report to the Security Council, recommending options for the possible establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation, including its size and resources. The Security Council may then pass a resolution authorizing the United Nations peacekeeping operation's deployment and determining its size and mandate.

4.2 Key Lessons for Planners and Decision Makers

Pressures to halt the slaughter of civilians or avert a humanitarian catastrophe may lead the Security Council to deploy a United Nations peacekeeping operation in circumstances that are far from ideal. Nevertheless, the Secretariat has a responsibility to provide the Security Council with an accurate assessment of the risks associated with its decision to deploy a United Nations peacekeeping operation, and ensure that its mandate and capabilities are tailored to the requirements of the situation. The lessons learned over the past six decades indicate that a United Nations peacekeeping operation is unlikely to succeed when one or more of the following conditions are not in place.

A peace to keep. 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. A United Nations peacekeeping operation deployed in the absence of such a commitment runs the risk of becoming paralyzed or, worse still, being drawn into the conflict. The signing of a cease-fire or peace agreement is an important indicator of whether or not the parties are ready to engage in a political dialogue. However, the signing of a cease-fire or peace agreement may not always translate into a genuine commitment to peace, particularly if the parties have done so as a result of international pressure.

Judging the parties' real intentions is never easy and the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation always entails an element of risk. Nevertheless, in gauging the parties' level of commitment to a peace process, the Secretariat should always be prepared to tell the Security Council what it needs to know, rather than what it may want to hear. If the parties do not appear committed to resolving their differences through peaceful means, the Security Council should be encouraged to explore the full range of options at its disposal, such as the deployment of an advance mission, or the reinforcement of mediation and other peacemaking efforts.

Positive regional engagement. Many of the crises before the Security Council are regional in character. Rarely can the problems in one state be treated in isolation from its neighbours. The attitude of neighbouring states can be as important a factor in determining the viability of a peace process, as the commitment of the local parties, some of whom may even be acting as proxies for neighbouring states. The role regional actors or organizations may be playing in the conflict must be carefully examined by the Secretariat and the Security Council when the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation is under consideration. A managed, positive and supportive regional engagement strategy can pay enormous dividends in encouraging the parties to stay the course and prevent the spread of conflict. To exclude regional actors from the peace process may have a more detrimental effect than managing their participation.

The full backing of a united Security Council. While the establishment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation only requires nine votes from the Security Council's fifteen members, anything other than unanimous Security Council backing can be a serious handicap. Divisions within the Security Council are likely to send mixed messages to the parties, and may undermine the legitimacy and authority of the mission in the eyes of the main parties and the population as a whole. Any perception that the Security Council is not fully committed to the implementation of a peace agreement is likely to embolden spoilers at both the local and regional levels, as well as hamper contributions from Member States. On the other hand, by

showing the parties that it is actively engaged in the peace process and is determined to stay the course, the Security Council can greatly enhance a United Nations peacekeeping operation's impact on the ground.

A clear and achievable mandate with resources to match. When the Security Council decides to deploy a United Nations peacekeeping operation, the Secretariat must help to ensure that the mandate is clear and achievable. Since the credibility of a United Nations peacekeeping operation is dependent on it being able to carry out its mandated tasks, it is important to ensure that the mandate reflects the level of resources that contributing nations are able and willing to provide. There must be reason to believe that Member States will be ready to finance the operation, to contribute the necessary military and police personnel and to provide it with political support, on a continuing basis. If the situation on the ground requires the deployment of capabilities that a United Nations peacekeeping operation is unlikely to have, the Security Council should be encouraged to consider alternative options.

The deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation is just the start of a long-term, but volatile peace and capacity-building process. In recommending to the Security Council the resources and capabilities needed for the peacekeeping operation, the Secretariat and its partners should also conduct a rigorous assessment of the requirements for longer-term engagement. In conducting this assessment, worst case scenarios should be examined as an aid in planning. Planning based solely on short-term engagement and best case scenarios has rarely proven to be a successful basis for the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping mission and should be avoided.

If changing circumstances on the ground warrant an adjustment to a mission's mandate, this should be done explicitly on the basis of an objective re-evaluation of the United Nations role. If a change in mandate entails a significant increase in the number, scope or complexity of the tasks assigned to a mission, the Secretariat should seek the necessary additional resources to match a revised mandate. Similarly, if the mission's role is augmented or diminished, then the types and amount of resources required should also be adjusted.

4.3 The Importance of Consultations with Contributing Countries

The United Nations has no standing army or police force. For every new United Nations peacekeeping operation, the Secretariat must seek contributions of military, police and other personnel from Member States who are under no obligation to provide them. Sustained consultations with TCCs/PCCs and other contributing countries at all stages of the planning and decision-making process are therefore critical to the success of any United Nations peacekeeping operation.

Consultations with TCCs/PCCs may take several forms and should be held at all key stages in the life of a United Nations peacekeeping operation, including: a) the development of the concept of operations and the elaboration of the mandate of a new operation; b) any change in the mandate, in particular the broadening or narrowing of the scope of the mission, the introduction of new or additional functions or components, or a change in the authorization to use force; c) the renewal of the mandate; d) significant or serious political, military or humanitarian developments; e) a rapid deterioration of the security situation on the ground; f) the termination, withdrawal or scaling down in size of the operation, including the transition from peacekeeping to post-conflict peacebuilding; and g) before and after Security Council missions to a specific peacekeeping operation.²

Since United Nations peacekeeping operations would not be possible without the participation of contributing countries, it is critical that every effort be made to ensure that they are fully consulted on any decisions that may affect their personnel on the ground. Additionally, regular consultations with contributing countries provide the Secretariat with a valuable opportunity to consider their views on a range of strategic and operational issues. ■

Chapter 5

Planning a United Nations Peacekeeping Operation

5.1 The Integrated Approach

As discussed in Chapter 2, United Nations peacekeeping began during the Cold War as a tool for managing inter-state conflicts. Since then, a new generation of multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations has emerged. These multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed as one part of a broader international effort to assist countries making the transition from conflict to sustainable peace.

Successful recovery from conflict requires the engagement of a broad range of actors – including the national authorities and the local population – in a long-term peacebuilding effort. The rationale for the integration of activities undertaken by the United Nations is to better assist countries to make this transition from conflict to sustainable peace. A multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation is likely to be far more effective when it is deployed as part of a United Nations system-wide response based on a clear and shared understanding of priorities, and on a willingness on the part of all United Nations actors to contribute to the achievement of common objectives. Integrated planning is at the heart of the United Nations efforts to develop such a response.

An integrated mission is one in which there is a shared vision among all United Nations actors as to the strategic objectives of the United Nations presence at the country-level. This strategy should reflect a shared under-

standing of the operating environment and agreement on how to maximize the effectiveness, efficiency, and impact of the United Nations overall response. Structural or programmatic integration between United Nations actors must be driven by an assessment of whether or not it will add real value and improve the impact of the United Nations engagement. An integrated mission's structure should be derived from an in-depth appreciation of the specific country setting and an honest assessment of the United Nations capacities to respond effectively. It should be driven by the United Nations strategy for that country and the resources available to the United Nations.

Integrated planning may, at times, appear to slow the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation. Therefore, a balance must be struck between the need to ensure that developmental, human rights, gender and other perspectives are fully taken into account, and the need to deliver a timely and effective humanitarian and security response. Finding such a balance is not easy and requires cooperation, coordination and communication. Ultimately, integrated planning helps to ensure that all the actors in the United Nations system, when deployed in the field, are pointing in the same direction.

Forcing integration where it is not needed may well be counter-productive. Chapter 7 provides more detail on managing integrated missions in the field. In situations where there is little or no peace to keep, integration may create difficulties for humanitarian and development partners, particularly if they are perceived to be too closely linked to the political and security objectives of the peacekeeping mission. In the worst case, integration may endanger their operations and the lives of their personnel. Integrated planning should also bear these worse case scenarios in mind and ensure appropriate dialogue, communication and contingency planning.

5.2 The Integrated Mission Planning Process (IMPP)

The United Nations has adopted an Integrated Mission Planning Process (IMPP) to facilitate the planning of multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operations.³ The IMPP is intended to help the United Nations system arrive at a common understanding of its strategic objectives in a particular country by engaging all relevant parts of the United Nations system. It aims to ensure that the right people are at the planning table, that the right issues are being discussed, and that the appropriate authorities and accountabilities are in place to motivate integrated thinking and planning.

Full application of the IMPP may not always be necessary or feasible since the deployment of an integrated mission is just one among a range of possible options for United Nations engagement. Nevertheless, even in situations requiring a more traditional United Nations peacekeeping response, every effort should be made to ensure that planning is conducted in close coordination with relevant United Nations system partners and other key stakeholders.

The IMPP should be driven by a realistic assessment of existing capacities at country-level, in order to avoid duplication of effort and ensure the most efficient use of the United Nations limited resources. Any plans based on overly ambitious, unfunded or aspirational capacities must be carefully scrutinized at this stage to avoid unrealistic planning assumptions. The UNCT should, therefore, be involved in the IMPP from the outset and continue to play an active role in planning efforts within the context of an integrated mission. These considerations should be factored into the IMPP and reflected in the accompanying budgetary process.

The IMPP does not and cannot take over all other planning processes. The number of international and national actors involved in efforts to support the process of post-conflict recovery means that, in practice, planning cannot always be fully coherent or integrated. These actors have different roles, decision-making processes, deployment time-lines, procedures, budgetary pressures and supervising authorities. However, the IMPP does provide

an inclusive framework to engage external partners, such as the International Financial Institutions (IFIs), regional organizations or bilateral donors. The cooperation of such external partners is necessary for the United Nations to achieve its broader objectives.

Peacekeeping planners need to be aware of the other assessment and planning processes that may be going on alongside the IMPP and actively seek to create substantive linkages between them wherever possible. Such processes include the Consolidated Humanitarian Appeal (CHAP)/Consolidated Appeal (CAP), Common Country Assessment (CCA)/UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), Joint Assessment Missions (JAM)/Post-Conflict Needs Assessments (PCNA) and Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSP). The IMPP should draw on and capture any elements contained in these parallel planning frameworks that are relevant to the achievement of the United Nations overall strategic objectives. Development of these linkages will help prevent circumstances in which uncoordinated initiatives create friction and spark conflict among the many actors.

The IMPP should be seen as a dynamic, continuous process allowing for activities and objectives to be revised, as the mission's understanding of its operational environment grows and as that environment itself changes. Significant developments at the country level – for example following national elections, or a changed political, security or humanitarian situation – may require a change in the United Nations strategic objectives, or a reconfiguration of the overall role and/or capabilities of the United Nations peacekeeping operation. Such a revision may also be requested by the United Nations Security Council. In such situations, the SRSG/HOM will be responsible for revising the strategic framework guiding the United Nations system's activities on the ground as the basis for the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council, which is ultimately responsible for deciding whether the mission's mandate should be revised. ■

Endnotes

- 1 Statement by the President of the Security Council S/PRST/1994/22, of 3 May 1994.
- 2 Security Council resolution 1353 (2001), of 13 June 2001, on Measures for Cooperation with Troop Contributing Countries
- 3 The IMPP was formally endorsed through a decision of the Secretary-General's Policy Committee, on 13 June 2006. A comprehensive set of implementation guidelines for the IMPP are currently under development, in coordination with field missions and Headquarters planners.

The arrangements for directing and managing modern United Nations peacekeeping operations are distinct from those of other organizations, particularly those only deploying a military capability. United Nations peacekeeping has evolved into a complex, multi-dimensional enterprise, involving personnel from a wide range of nationalities, disciplines and professional cultures pursuing multiple lines of activity.

PART III

The Art of Successful Mandate Implementation

Chapter 6

Deployment and Start-Up of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Chapter 6

Deployment and Start-Up of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Chapter 7

Managing United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Chapter 8

Supporting and Sustaining United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Chapter 9

Maintaining Support for the Mission

Chapter 10

Transition and Exit

6.1 Typical Phases of Deployment


Part III of this document addresses some of the major challenges facing United Nations peacekeeping operations during the various phases of deployment. Although the trajectory of each United Nations peacekeeping operation evolves differently, for planning purposes the lifecycle of a United Nations peacekeeping operation can be divided into the following broad phases, shown simplistically in Figure 3 below:

- **Mission Start-Up**
- **Mandate Implementation**
- **Transition (hand-over, withdrawal and liquidation)**

In general, the scale and tempo of operations rise steadily during initial deployment and start-up, reaching a plateau during mandate implementation, and finally tapering off once hand-over and withdrawal begin. Although they are conceptually distinct, the various phases of the mission lifecycle may overlap. There will also be spikes of activity during implementation as critical milestones and tasks are achieved, for example, during a large DDR programme, or during the period leading up to an election, or the critical months and years following formation of a government.

Each phase of deployment presents its own specific challenges. During start-up, the mission strives to reach an initial operating capability (IOC), and

Figure 3 Typical Phases of Deployment



eventually a full operating capability (FOC) so that mandate implementation can begin in all areas of deployment. During the implementation phase, efforts are focused on carrying out the tasks set out in the Security Council mandate and achieving the objectives set out in the mission plan. The process of handover, withdrawal and liquidation begins following a decision by the Security Council. It involves the departure of mission personnel following the hand-over of all remaining tasks to partners, and the final disposal of mission assets and infrastructure in accordance with United Nations rules.

The remainder of this chapter describes the United Nations mission deployment and start-up concept, and the challenges associated with managing the mission start-up process. Chapters 7, 8 and 9 describe the challenges of managing, supporting and sustaining large integrated missions, as well as managing their impact on the host country. Finally, Chapter 10 turns to the challenges of transition, hand-over to partner organizations and withdrawal.

6.2 The Mission Start-Up Process

The first months after a cease-fire or peace accord are often the most critical for establishing a stable peace and bolstering the credibility of a new operation. Opportunities lost during this period are hard to regain. The

General Assembly has thus endorsed a requirement to be able to establish a traditional peacekeeping mission within 30 days and a multi-dimensional mission within 90 days of the authorization of a Security Council mandate.


In reality, there is no set sequence of events for establishing a United Nations peacekeeping operation. The lead time required to deploy a mission varies and depends on a number of factors, particularly the will of Member States to contribute troops and police to a particular operation, and the availability of financial and other resources. For missions with highly complex mandates or difficult logistics, or where peacekeepers face significant security risk, it may take several weeks or even months to assemble and deploy the necessary elements. The 90-day timeline for deploying the first elements of a multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation is, thus, a notional target.

The term 'mission start-up' is used to describe the earliest phase of establishing a mission in the field. During mission start-up, the main priority is to bring internal mission processes, structures and services to an initial level of operating capability so that mandate implementation can begin across the mission area.

As shown in Figure 4, the mission start-up process covers several notional stages, even though these may overlap in practice, as follows:

- **Pre-deployment** is largely a Headquarters responsibility and involves many tasks such as the United Nations budgetary process, pre-deployment visits to TCCs/PCCs to assess readiness, the negotiation of a Status of Mission/Status of Forces Agreements (SOMA/SOFA), the mobilization of Strategic Deployment Stocks (SDS), and the tendering of major supply and service contracts for the mission;
- **Rapid deployment** involves the deployment of a small advance team to commence the establishment of mission premises and other prerequisite infrastructure and administrative systems, to allow for the reception of larger numbers of staff and contingents as start-up progresses;

Figure 4 The Mission Start-Up Process



- **Mission headquarters start-up** is the period when the mission leadership team arrives, managerial and command and control systems are formed and increasing numbers of substantive and support personnel begin arriving in-mission to help achieve an IOC. It also involves the establishment of liaison offices and logistics hubs, if required;
- **Functional component and field office start-up** occurs alongside the establishment of the central structures of mission headquarters and involves the coordinated establishment of the different substantive civilian, police and military command and managerial capacities. It also involves the start-up of sector headquarters and field offices of the mission.

6.3 Managing the Mission Start-Up Process

Mission start-up can be a fast-paced and seemingly chaotic experience. Small numbers of staff are pitted against time to put in place the foundations of a complex, new mission, often in unknown and volatile operating environments. At the same time, new staff and contingents begin to deploy and begin scoping out initial operations. Mission leaders must also use these

early weeks, sometimes referred to as a ‘honeymoon period,’ to push ahead political progress with the parties so as to sustain the momentum of the peace process. During this critical phase, it is essential that mission leaders and personnel adhere to the basic principles of United Nations peacekeeping, as outlined in Chapter 3 above, and actively seek to establish the mission’s legitimacy and credibility in the eyes of the parties, the host population and the international community, as a whole.

Effective leadership and strong managerial skills are at a premium during start-up. If basic systems and procedures are not established early on, this can cause compounding confusion as the mission rapidly expands during start-up. If effective and streamlined institutional processes to control the fragmentation of a large and diverse mission are not installed during the start-up period – such as establishing mission decision-making forums, information sharing and information management protocols, reporting lines, etc. – they will become increasingly difficult to introduce later.

Leadership and conflict management are essential skills for a mission start-up manager. Few, if any, of the mission staff will have worked together before. Peacekeeping personnel will come from diverse national and professional backgrounds (including from significantly different civilian, military and police working cultures) which may cause friction in a pressurized start-up environment. Internal tensions must be managed proactively, during the early months, to minimize misunderstandings and avoid resentments that could pollute staff relations over the long-term. Mission leaders must underscore the need for all components to work towards shared objectives under the leadership of a cohesive and collaborative mission leadership team. ■

Chapter 7

Managing United Nations Peacekeeping Operations


7.1 The Relationship between Headquarters and the Field

The arrangements established by the United Nations to direct and manage its peacekeeping operations are distinct from those of other organizations, particularly those only deploying a military capability.¹ This is largely due to the fact that United Nations peacekeeping has evolved into a complex, multi-dimensional enterprise, involving personnel from a wide range of nationalities, disciplines and professional cultures pursuing multiple lines of activity.

As depicted in Figure 5, the levels of authority in United Nations peacekeeping operations are not as clear-cut as they are in military organizations. This difference must be noted when the United Nations is working in the field with partner organizations.

Within the United Nations Secretariat, DPKO is responsible for providing United Nations peacekeeping operations with policy guidance and strategic direction, while DFS is responsible for providing logistical and administrative support. In order to ensure unity of command at the Headquarters level, the Under-Secretary-General for Field Support reports to the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations on all peacekeeping related matters. Standing Integrated Operational Teams (IOTs), located within DPKO and managed by the Office of Operations (OO), bring together, in a formal structure, political, military, police and mission support personnel, sup-

Figure 5 Authority, Command and Control in Multi-dimensional United Nations Peacekeeping Operations



ported by other specialist capacities as required, to provide integrated teams to support missions, and to provide integrated policy advice and guidance for senior DPKO and DFS staff. These teams enable delegation of decision making and increased accountability; and they provide a principal entry point for missions, TCCs/PCCs and partners to engage in the planning and conduct of integrated peacekeeping operations.

In the field, the Head of Mission (HOM) exercises operational authority over the United Nations peacekeeping operation's activities, including military, police and civilian resources. In the case of military personnel provided by Member States, these personnel are placed under the operational control of the United Nations Force Commander or head of military component, but not under United Nations command. However, once assigned under United Nations operational control, contingent commanders and their personnel report to the Force Commander and they should not act on national direction, particularly if those actions might adversely affect implementation of the mission mandate or run contrary to United Nations policies applicable to the mission. Member States may withdraw their contributed personnel from the mission through advice to United Nations Headquarters.

In integrated missions, the SRSG/HOM is a civilian who reports to the Secretary-General through the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations at United Nations Headquarters.² The SRSG/HOM is given significant delegated authority to set the direction of the mission and to lead its engagement with the political process on the ground. The SRSG/HOM is responsible for coordinating the activities of the entire United Nations system in the field and is assisted in this task by the DSRSG/RC/HC, who is expected to serve as the principal interface with the UNCT.

The SRSG/HOM and his/her deputies form part of a Mission Leadership Team (MLT). The core membership of the MLT is comprised of the heads of the major functional components of the mission. The MLT is responsible for overseeing the implementation of the mission's activities. In the absence of a standing "operational headquarters" structure, United Nations Head-

quarters and the mission headquarters must form a strong and collegial relationship to ensure that the mission can quickly and effectively leverage political support for its operations on the ground. The United Nations Headquarters personnel and the mission's MLT need to play mutually supporting roles, both in developing a political strategy for the mission and in managing the operations and resources to support that strategy.

7.2 The Challenge of Mission Integration and Coordination

Integrated missions are designed to facilitate a coherent, system-wide approach to the United Nations engagement in countries emerging from conflict. The United Nations has the unique ability to employ a mix of civilian, police and military capabilities, under a unified leadership to support a fragile peace process. At the same time, United Nations peacekeeping operations are almost always deployed alongside a variety of external actors, with widely differing mandates, agendas and time horizons. The challenge of managing an integrated mission is thus further compounded by the need to ensure that there is some degree of coordination between the United Nations and the range of non-United Nations actors who are often present in conflict and post-conflict settings.

In essence, an integrated mission is a strategic partnership between a multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation and the UNCT, under the leadership of the SRSG and the DSRSG/RC/HC. The SRSG is the "the senior United Nations representative in the country" with "overall authority over all the activities of the United Nations" and is responsible for "ensuring that all the United Nations components in the country pursue a coordinated and coherent approach."³ The DSRSG/RC/HC is responsible for the coordination of both humanitarian operations and United Nations development operations, and for maintaining links with governments and other parties, donors, and the broader humanitarian and development communities for this purpose.⁴

Ultimately, successful integration and coordination requires a high degree of sensitivity to the interests and operating cultures of three broad sets of actors:


- Mission components
- UNCT members
- External partners

Integration is more than just a matter of bureaucratic reporting lines. Figure 6, below, presents a simplified view of what is, in fact, a highly complex operating environment.

Integrating the mission's components. The various components of a United Nations peacekeeping operation – civilian, police, military and support – come under the direct authority of the SRSG/Head of Mission (HOM) and the MLT. In large integrated missions, the MLT is normally supported by the following structures, which are designed to facilitate integration between the mission's components:

- A Joint Operations Centre (JOC) that collates situation reports and operational information from all mission sources to provide current situational awareness for the mission. The JOC also acts as a crisis coordination hub.⁵

Figure 6 The Challenge of Mission Integration



- A Joint Mission Analysis Centre (JMAC) that provides integrated analysis of all-sources of information to assess medium- and long-term threats to the mandate and to support MLT decision-making.
- An Integrated Support Service (ISS) that harnesses all logistical resources of the mission.
- A Joint Logistics Operations Centre (JLOC) to coordinate the provision of logistical support, in accordance with MLT priorities.

Although the components of a United Nations peacekeeping operation have the same mandate, share a single budget, and depend on the same integrated support services, there are significant cultural differences, both national and professional, within and between them. Many civilian organizations and government departments routinely function with a high degree of tolerance for ambiguity and highly flexible management models. At the same time, military staff tend to seek to minimize ambiguity by making informed assumptions within a strong planning culture. Mission leaders and staff must seek to reconcile these differing “institutional cultures,” while being careful not to stifle the cultural diversity that constitutes one of the United Nations main strengths.

Integrating the United Nations effort. As discussed in Chapter 5, integrated planning allows the United Nations system to maximize the impact of its engagement in countries emerging from conflict by ensuring that its activities are guided by a common strategic vision. However, integration does not mean that all United Nations actors on the ground should be physically integrated or subsumed under a single structure. Moreover, while the members of the UNCT come under the overall authority of the SRSG/HOM, in reality, they are governed by mandates, decision-making structures and funding arrangements that are quite distinct from those of the United Nations peacekeeping operation. As a result, integration among the members of the broader United Nations family cannot simply be imposed by edict from above, and can only be achieved through a constant process of dialogue and negotiation between the actors concerned.

There is no “one-size-fits-all approach” to achieving integration among United Nations actors in the field. There is a range of implementation modalities through which an integrated mission may pursue common United Nations objectives in its mandated areas of activity. In some areas, for example, human rights or electoral assistance are fully integrated into the mission’s activities, and the relevant components of the United Nations peacekeeping operation are usually staffed by personnel drawn from the lead department or agency concerned. Others, such as DDR, see a looser arrangement driven by joint planning and conduct of programmes by different actors. Alternatively, the delivery of humanitarian assistance is conducted by humanitarian agencies, as a parallel activity, under the coordination of the DSRSG/RC/HC.⁶ The United Nations system should decide at the country-level which implementation modalities are best suited to the achievement of its common objectives. To this end, individual United Nations actors may need to revise their respective country programmes, annual work plans, and other frameworks to reflect the new plans that have been developed.

Ultimately, it is the responsibility of the SRSG/HOM, supported by the DSRSG/RC/HC and the other members of the MLT, to define the United Nations system’s strategic priorities at the country-level and to ensure that the activities of all United Nations actors contribute to the achievement of the mission’s strategic objectives. The SRSG/HOM must always consider the views and concerns of the various constituencies within the mission in order to ensure that, to the extent possible, activities undertaken in one area do not undermine other aspects of the mandate. Senior mission leaders and staff must ensure that any friction remains manageable and that the United Nations family remains in control of the dynamic, in order to ensure that others do not exploit the differences between United Nations actors. This entails a respect for the diversity of approaches being pursued in a post-conflict context and the need for international strategies to evolve over time along with the peace process.

Coordination with external partners. The large number of international and national actors implementing activities in post-conflict environments

precludes the development of one common plan or strategy, much less one common structure or programme. Nevertheless, it is incumbent upon the peacekeeping operation to meet regularly and share information with all actors, and to harmonize activities, to the extent possible, by seeking their input into the mission’s planning process and to respond actively and substantively to requests for cooperation. Examples of such actors include:

- Bilateral and multilateral donors, including the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), as well as NGOs or contractors working for donors;
- Non-United Nations led military formations deployed nationally, under the aegis of a regional organization or as part of an ad hoc coalition;
- The diplomatic corps and other regional or international political actors;
- The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and other components of the International Movement, as well as other independent humanitarian actors, such as humanitarian NGOs.

These actors normally pursue independent agendas, which may or may not coincide with the strategic priorities identified by the peacekeeping operation. Some may be operating according to widely different timelines and work methods, or they may simply not be capable of engaging in intensive cooperation due to the periodic nature of their engagement in the country. In these circumstances, proactive sharing of information by the mission is still important, even if the intensity of cooperation is limited.

Humanitarian actors, such as the ICRC, have as an institutional imperative to maintain a high level of visible independence from political-military structures to ensure the safety and feasibility of their actions and personnel. United Nations peacekeepers must be cognizant of the concept of “humanitarian space,” which can be understood as the space created through respect for the humanitarian principles of independence and neutrality. It is in this space that humanitarian action takes place. As such, a clear distinction must be made between politically motivated actions to end conflict and move

toward national development, and apolitical humanitarian assistance based exclusively on impartial response to assessed need, aimed at saving lives, alleviating suffering and maintaining or restoring the dignity of people affected by conflict. Maintaining this distinction better assures humanitarian agencies safe and secure access throughout a conflict zone.

It is incumbent upon the peacekeeping operation to regularly meet and share information with all actors and, to the extent possible, harmonize activities by seeking their input into the mission's planning process. This includes the sharing of non-operationally sensitive geospatial data. The mission may also be requested to assist with large-scale humanitarian responses *in extremis*. For this eventuality, the MLT, through the DSRSG/HC/RC, should seek to establish effective information sharing and coordination mechanisms to ensure maximum coherence and to prevent any adverse impact on humanitarian and development operations. Due to the high turnover of some mission personnel, coordination arrangements and induction programmes should be designed to minimize the burden on partner organizations. ■

Chapter 8

Supporting and Sustaining United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

8.1 United Nations Logistics and Administration

As discussed in Chapter 2, United Nations peacekeeping operations have evolved to encompass a wide range of mandated tasks. The administrative, logistical and other specialized support arrangements for United Nations peacekeeping operations are crucial for the effective implementation of these tasks. The relationship between the military, police, substantive civilian and support components of a United Nations peacekeeping operation is, therefore, of crucial importance.

At the United Nations Headquarters level, DFS is responsible for delivering dedicated support to United Nations field operations, including personnel, finance, field procurement, logistical, communications, information technology, and other administrative and general management issues. In the field, the support component of a United Nations peacekeeping operation provides administrative and logistic support services that enable the mission to carry out its core functions in an effective, coordinated and timely manner, consistent with the regulations and procedures prescribed by the United Nations.

Mission assets are distributed to all mission components on an equitable basis, depending on functional need and assessed priorities. Delivering common support services is part of the administrative functions of a United Nations peacekeeping operation and falls under the responsibility of the

Director of Mission Support (DMS) or Chief of Mission Support (CMS). The DMS/CMS reports directly to the SRSG/HOM. The DMS/CMS has up-to-date information on the status of all resources available within the mission, and direct access to all available means of acquiring items.

United Nations peacekeeping operations are often deployed in environments which are both volatile and unpredictable, and where host nation infrastructure is minimal or severely degraded. Within this challenging operating environment, United Nations peacekeeping operations undertake a broad spectrum of civilian and military tasks, which may need to be sustained over several years. Moreover, an operation may be required to switch to a more robust posture and back again at various points in a mission's lifecycle and may need to switch the emphasis of operations between different components of the mission, for example, to support a DDR programme, an election or a security operation.

A mission support element which is flexible enough to adapt quickly to changing circumstances on the ground allows for greater internal capacity to respond to the mission's substantive operations. This requires good logistic planning, communication and resourcing, and close integration between the uniformed and support components of a mission. Most of all, it requires strong integrated planning and priority-setting among the mission's leadership team. It also requires flexibility in the management of mission assets by the mission's support element.

The logistic and administrative support for United Nations operations is more complex than many other logistical support models. This complexity is due to the requirement to support contingents deploying with widely varying levels of self-sufficiency, and the differing requirements between military contingents, civilian staff, police and military observers. United Nations operations are also subject to financial accountability procedures which do not align operational responsibility with budgetary accountability. Accordingly, the system of United Nations logistics is not well-designed to support high-tempo, short-notice military operations. This helps define a point beyond which a United Nations peacekeeping operation is not able to escalate.

United Nations peacekeeping operations function through a mix of civilian contracted services procured by the United Nations and military support capabilities, provided through 'lease' arrangements between the United Nations and contributing Member States.⁷ When formed military units are deployed to a mission, the logistic support concept is based on the integration of United Nations-provided and contingent-provided resources to support all components of the mission. All of a mission's support resources are managed jointly through an integrated civilian and military logistics support service and a common administrative system throughout all United Nations missions.

The consolidation and integration function of integrated support services is focused in a JLOC, which is staffed by military and civilian logistics personnel and coordinates the logistical needs of all mission components. The JLOC often becomes a focal point for cooperation and mutual assistance on logistical issues between the United Nations peacekeeping operations, other agencies and NGOs.

Mission support elements must comply with strict rules and regulations and are sometimes criticized for not being responsive enough to operational requirements, especially during crises. Financial accountability controls for United Nations peacekeeping are essential, and demanded by the Member States. Yet, for the system to work effectively in support of the mission leadership, they need to be balanced with operational principles of flexibility and responsiveness, and administered with a view to effective risk management.

8.2 Human Resource Management

Attracting and retaining qualified personnel is a critical support function in United Nations peacekeeping operations. As stated in Article 101 of the Charter, securing the highest standards of efficiency, competence and integrity is the paramount consideration in the employment of United Nations staff and the determination of conditions of service. The international and national staff and uniformed personnel of a United Nations peacekeeping

operation are its most valuable assets and must be managed carefully. Being a United Nations peacekeeper requires extraordinary professionalism, dedication and self-restraint. The vast majority of the women and men serving in United Nations peacekeeping operations around the world do, indeed, possess these rare qualities. Yet, recent experience has shown that the actions of a minority who do not possess such qualities can result in irreparable damage to the reputation of the mission and the United Nations, as a whole.

Given the difficult environments in which many United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed, turn-over rates for international personnel can be high. The conditions of service in many United Nations peacekeeping operations make it extremely difficult to attract qualified and experienced personnel. In the field, the provision of adequate welfare arrangements for both uniformed and civilian personnel is not only crucial for maintaining morale, but is also a key tool for preventing the instances of gross misconduct that have marred the United Nations peacekeeping record. Missions should make an effort to establish welfare committees and provide recreational facilities for peacekeeping personnel, within their existing resources. In particular, the civilian and military leadership within the mission must make an effort to ensure that funds allocated by TCCs/PCCs for the welfare of uniformed personnel actually reach their intended beneficiaries and that the welfare needs of civilian staff, which are often neglected, are also addressed.

Individual personalities are a major factor in any United Nations peacekeeping operation. Even when the necessary coordination mechanisms and processes are in place, it is vital to ensure that key positions are filled by the right individuals with the right skill-sets. Ultimately, it is the example and guidance provided by the senior leadership of a United Nations peacekeeping operation that will unite the components and ensure that the United Nations system is working as a team.

The selection of senior mission leaders must be a carefully considered process. Mutual respect and the ability to transcend “turf” issues are essential qualities for the successful management and integration of multi-dimensional

United Nations peacekeeping operations. Education and training are vital to ensuring that the appointment of senior mission leaders is not a “lottery.” Prior to assuming their functions, senior mission leaders should be given adequate training and preparation on the challenges that they are likely to face in the field. All personnel in leadership positions should exemplify the highest standards and should be held accountable for their behaviour and performance. If not performing up to expectations, they should be counselled and, if necessary, removed from the mission.

8.3 Security of Personnel

The primary responsibility for the security and protection of United Nations peacekeeping personnel and assets rests with the host government. This responsibility flows from the government’s inherent function of maintaining law and order, protecting persons and property within its jurisdiction, as well as from the special responsibility enshrined in the Charter.⁸

The Designated Official (DO), usually the senior-most United Nations official in a country, is responsible for the security of United Nations staff. When appointed DO, the SRSG/HOM is accountable to the Secretary-General (through the Under-Secretary-General for Safety and Security) for the security of all civilian personnel employed by the organizations of the United Nations system and their recognized departments throughout the country or designated area. The DO is supported by the Chief Security Adviser (CSA), Department of Safety and Security (DSS), and the Security Management Team (SMT) which oversees United Nations security arrangements in country. The SMT’s composition and standing operating procedures are articulated in the DSS *Field Security Handbook*.

While the safety and security of staff and facilities is largely situation specific, some key standards have been developed, such as the Minimum Operating Security Standards (MOSS). These standards are established, implemented and monitored at the direction of the CSA and the DO. These standards apply

to both international and national staff. While uniformed personnel do not fall under the United Nations security management system, the heads of the military and police component should work closely with the CSA to ensure that the best possible security arrangements are put in place for all personnel. To this end, the respective heads of component will determine the best balance between operational necessity and the security of uniformed personnel. The heads of the military and police components are accountable to the HoM for the security of uniformed personnel. ■

Chapter 9

Maintaining Support for the Mission

9.1 Managing Mission Impact

United Nations peacekeeping operations must be aware of and proactively manage their impact, both real and perceived, in the host country and community. United Nations peacekeeping operations are highly visible and generate high expectations. Accordingly, United Nations peacekeeping personnel should be careful to mitigate the possible negative consequences of the mission's presence. United Nations peacekeeping personnel must adhere to national laws, where these do not violate fundamental human rights standards, respect local culture, and maintain the highest standards of personal and professional conduct.

Personnel serving in United Nations peacekeeping operations should be alert to any potential, unforeseen or damaging consequences of their actions and manage these as quickly and effectively as possible. Poor driving and vehicle accidents and lax waste management practices are just some of the negative impacts that may seriously undermine the perceived legitimacy and credibility of a mission, and erode its popular support. The size of a United Nations peacekeeping operation's human and material footprint is likely to have a direct bearing on its impact, or perceived impact, in the community. Missions should be aware of the possible side-effects they may generate, including:

- Social impact (for example, in the conduct and behavior of staff);

- Economic impact (for example, on housing and staple foods and materials);
- Environmental impact (for example, waste management or water usage).

Social impacts such as different cultural norms of mission staff and host country customs may create friction (e.g.: employment of women in non-traditional gender roles, mixing and socialization amongst genders, drinking, gambling, inappropriate behaviour, etc.). United Nations peacekeeping operations also have a major impact on the host economy, by pushing up the price of local housing and accommodation, or placing demands on local producers for staple foods and materials, placing such items out of reach of the local community. All of these have the potential for creating friction and discontent within the local population and they should be continuously monitored and managed by the mission's leadership.

In assessing mission impact and devising strategies to address it, the mission should be careful to ensure that the differential impacts on men and women, as well as children and vulnerable groups, are considered. Although no mission can control all of the side-effects of its presence, it must undertake due diligence in managing its own impact. Where problems do arise, they should be addressed swiftly and honestly. At the same time, rumors and vexatious or erroneous accusations against the mission must be countered with vigor to maintain the good reputation of the international presence.

9.2 Communications and Outreach

Effective public information is a political and operational necessity. Its overall objective in United Nations peacekeeping operations is to enhance the ability of the mission to carry out its mandate successfully. Key strategic goals are to maintain the cooperation of the parties to the peace process, manage expectations and garner support for the operation among the local population, and secure broad international support, especially among TCCs/PCCs and major donors. Public information should be thoroughly integrated into

a United Nations peacekeeping operation at all stages of planning and deployment. The mission's Chief of Public Information should be a key actor in the senior leadership's decision-making process.

From the moment a peacekeeping operation is authorized, the United Nations must be able to ensure that the mandate and objectives of the mission are fully understood by the host population and other key actors. Consideration of the role that public information will play in the future peacekeeping operation, as well as the structures and resources that will be required to support that role, must begin at the earliest possible stage. A public information assessment gauging the most effective ways of reaching the population should, thus, be conducted prior to the launch of any field mission.

Effective communications and outreach will enhance the mission's ability to achieve its mandate and contribute to the security of mission personnel. A well designed and skilfully implemented communications strategy will increase confidence in the peace process, build trust among parties to a conflict, and generate support for national reconciliation. It will establish the mission as a trusted source of information and help counter the negative effects of irresponsible, hostile and controlled media. If the parameters of United Nations activity are clearly laid out and explained to the local population and other target audiences, fear and misunderstanding will be minimized, disinformation will be corrected, and the impact of those who wish to damage the peace process through rumour and untruth will be minimized. In addition, mission public information activities should be geared towards helping establish an environment that promotes the development of free and independent media, and the adherence to the highest journalistic ethics and standards.

The mission's public information campaign provides an opportunity to reach out to key groups within society, whose voices may not otherwise be heard, and to promote consensus around the peace process. Use should be made of local public radio and television, if available, as well as traditional

forms of public information dissemination, such as the local community and religious groups. Where no local dissemination capacity exists, a United Nations capability should be deployed at the earliest stages, while helping concurrently to build local capacities. ■

Chapter 10

Transition and Exit

10.1 Partnerships and Transition Planning

No single organization can presently conduct all of the multifaceted tasks required to support and consolidate peace processes. Partnerships are thus indispensable to the success of the international community's efforts in post-conflict settings. Chapter 5 and 7 have provided guidance on how to manage the relationship with partners in the planning and conduct of ongoing operations. This chapter focuses on two important aspects of partnership: the transition from other security actors to a United Nations peacekeeping operation; and the hand-over of responsibilities from a United Nations peacekeeping operation to United Nations system partners and others, as it prepares to withdraw.

The United Nations is no longer the only actor conducting peace operations. The number of peace operations mounted by non-United Nations actors has doubled in the past decade. The African Union (AU), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the European Union (EU), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) have all mounted major operations of their own (in most cases with the authorization of the United Nations Security Council); and they are making concerted efforts to increase their capacities in this area.

The growing involvement of regional agencies and arrangements in the maintenance of international peace and security, as envisaged in Chapter VIII

of the Charter, has created new opportunities for combining the capabilities of United Nations and non-United Nations actors to manage complex crises. In several instances, troops and police deployed as part of a regional organization-led peace operation have been “re-hatted” upon the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation. In some cases, United Nations peacekeeping operations consisting only of civilian and/or police personnel have been deployed alongside forces under the command of a regional organization. The Security Council has also authorized the deployment of a “hybrid” peacekeeping operation, in which elements from the United Nations and a regional organization are deployed as part of the same mission under joint leadership. Although cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations in the area of peace and security has tended to occur on an ad hoc basis and is often dictated by political expediency, new more systematic partnerships are emerging.⁹

In circumstances where a United Nations peacekeeping operation is required to assume responsibility from a non-United Nations led peace operation, an effort should be made to develop a mutually agreed joint transition plan outlining the modalities, steps and timeframe for achieving transition and the assumption of United Nations responsibility. In addition to detailing when and how responsibilities will be transferred, such a plan should spell out any implications for the UNCT and other partners, in order to ensure consistency of approach and timing with the overall mission planning process. Emphasis should be placed on security and how to ensure maximum stability at a moment of potential weakness, including as a result of any mismatch in capabilities and tasks.

10.2 Hand-Over and Withdrawal

The United Nations engagement in a country which is emerging from conflict rarely begins with the deployment of a peacekeeping operation and is likely to continue long after its withdrawal. In most cases, the UNCT will have been on the ground long before the deployment of a United Nations

peacekeeping operation and will be responsible for supporting the process of long-term recovery once the peacekeeping operation has withdrawn. In some instances, a United Nations peacekeeping operation may be preceded by or deployed alongside a United Nations special political mission or peacebuilding support office. Some United Nations peacekeeping operations have also been succeeded by integrated offices, headed by an Executive Representative of the Secretary-General (ERSG).¹⁰

Ultimately, it is the prerogative of the Security Council to decide whether a United Nations peacekeeping operation should hand-over responsibility to another United Nations body or non-United Nations entity, and withdraw. Nevertheless, the Secretariat and the United Nations peacekeeping operation have a responsibility to ensure that the Security Council’s decision is based on an honest assessment of real progress made towards the achievement of a sustainable peace.

As discussed in Chapter 2, traditional United Nations peacekeeping operations are deployed as an interim measure to help manage a conflict and create conditions in which the negotiation of a lasting settlement can proceed. A traditional United Nations peacekeeping operation can be said to have successfully completed its mandate once the states concerned have arrived at a mutually agreed settlement to their conflict. Since they have little direct involvement in diplomatic efforts to resolve the conflict, some traditional peacekeeping operations are deployed for decades, due to the absence of a lasting political settlement between the parties.

Determining whether a multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping deployed in the aftermath of a violent internal conflict has successfully completed its mandate is far more challenging given the number of complex variables involved. Experience has shown that a domestic peace is truly sustainable when the warring parties are able to move their struggles from the battlefield and into an institutional framework where disputes can be settled peacefully. The deployment of troops and police must be accompanied by efforts to restore the State’s monopoly over the legitimate

use of force; re-establish the rule of law and strengthen respect for human rights; foster the emergence of legitimate and effective institutions of governance; and promote socio-economic recovery. The decision to shift the focus of the United Nations engagement from stabilization to longer-term peacebuilding must, therefore, take into account the degree of progress made in each of these critical areas.

The transition from a United Nations peacekeeping operation to subsequent phases of United Nations engagement should be factored into the planning process from the outset, with a view to clearly delineating the roles and responsibilities of the various United Nations actors on the ground. Reliable benchmarks and indicators are required to determine when the United Nations peacekeeping operation can begin the process of hand-over and withdrawal, without jeopardizing ongoing efforts to consolidate the peace.

There is no standard “check-list” of benchmarks applicable to all situations. The specific benchmarks used will differ from situation to situation, depending on the underlying causes of the conflict and the dynamics at play. They must be developed in close collaboration with the rest of the United Nations system, the national authorities, civil society, and other relevant stakeholders, taking into account the United Nations longer-term strategic goals.

Care must be taken to identify appropriate benchmarks that reflect real progress towards the consolidation of peace in the country. Indicators should not simply be measurements of international community inputs to a peace process, which may present an incomplete picture. Examples of key benchmarks that may be used to determine at which point the process of peace consolidation is sufficiently advanced to allow for the hand-over of certain mission responsibilities include the following:

- The absence of violent conflict and large-scale human rights abuses, and respect for women’s and minority rights;
- Completion of the DDR of former combatants (male and female, adults and children) and progress in restoring or establishing responsible state institutions for security;

- The ability of the national armed forces and the national police to provide security and maintain public order with civilian oversight and respect for human rights;
- Progress towards the establishment of an independent and effective judiciary and corrections system;
- The restoration of State authority and the resumption of basic services throughout the country;
- The return or resettlement and reintegration of displaced persons with minimal internal disruption or conflict in the areas of return or resettlement;
- The successful formation of legitimate political institutions following the holding of free and fair elections where women and men have equal rights to vote and seek political office.

Wherever possible, benchmarks should be established through dialogue with national interlocutors. The mission should seek multiple sources of validation regarding this progress and should not shy away from reporting on a deteriorating situation. In this respect, United Nations peacekeeping operations should resist the temptation to report overly optimistic assessments of progress against key benchmarks.

Depending on the evolving situation, it may be appropriate for the benchmarks to be amended over time. Whatever the benchmarks adopted, they should be regarded as interim objectives in the broader effort to build a self-sustaining peace, the realization of which will allow the international community to progressively shift the focus of its post-conflict assistance from stabilization to long-term peacebuilding and economic recovery.

The withdrawal of a United Nations peacekeeping operation should be planned and conducted in close consultation with all relevant partners and national stakeholders, to ensure minimal disruption of international programmes as a result of the mission’s departure, and to minimize the impact on the host population and environment. As a final contribution to the institutional learning process, it is important that an effort be made to

capture any remaining lessons learned at the end of the mission by conducting of After Action Reviews (AARs) and/or End of Assignment Reports (EoARs)¹¹ that may benefit those responsible for the planning and conduct of future United Nations peacekeeping operations. ■

Endnotes


- 1 See DPKO Policy Directive on Authority, Command and Control for United Nations Multi-dimensional Peacekeeping Operations (2007).
- 2 For missions of a military nature, the Secretary-General may appoint a Force Commander or Chief Military Observer as Head of Mission.
- 3 Note of Guidance on Integrated Missions, Clarifying the Role, Responsibility and Authority of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General/Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordination, 9 December 2005, para. 5.
- 4 *Ibid.*, para. 18–19.
- 5 See DPKO Policy Directive on JOCs and JMACs, 1 July 2006. In this context, the term “joint” refers to the internal collaboration required between all mission components to achieve shared objectives under a single leadership team.
- 6 Where the DSRSG/RC/HC is supported by an office of the United Nations Office of the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), OCHA will normally serve as the humanitarian coordination office. Where appropriate, the OCHA office may remain outside the mission structure to facilitate access by the broader humanitarian community.
- 7 Generally, contingents arrive with between 30–90 days of supplies to maintain self-sufficiency. During that period, the United Nations enters into service contracts to provide the bulk supplies of a mission, such as water, rations, laundry, waste disposal and some transport services. Contingents bringing their own equipment are paid for the lease of this equipment by the United Nations, based on agreed reimbursement rates.
- 8 Under Article 105 of the Charter, the United Nations is entitled to enjoy such privileges and immunities as are necessary for the fulfilment of its purposes. Additional diplomatic privileges are accorded to United Nations staff members and premises in times of international crisis, by the 1946 Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations and the Specialised Agencies and, more explicitly, by the 1994 Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated personnel, which obligates all signatories to ensure the safety and security of United Nations and associated personnel deployed in their territory.
- 9 The “Joint Declaration on EU-UN Co-operation in Crisis Management” was signed in September 2003.
- 10 Integrated offices consist of the members of the UNCT and may be augmented by the presence of military and police specialists.
- 11 After Action Reviews (AARs) and End of Assignment Reports (EoARs) are tools developed by DPKO to facilitate the capturing and sharing of lessons learned from the field.

Annex 1

United Nations Peacekeeping Doctrine Framework

As shown in the diagram below, the United Nations peacekeeping doctrine framework is currently divided into six major guidance “series” (1000–6000), which provide basic reference codes for the organization and management of internal DPKO/DFS policy and guidance materials. Each series is further subdivided into specific thematic and/or functional areas.

DPKO/DFS Policy and Guidance Index



1000-Series: Capstone Doctrine

The 1000-series covers the basic principles and key concepts underpinning the planning and conduct of contemporary United Nations peacekeeping operations as well as their core functions and the main factors affecting their success. *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines* sits at the highest level in the 1000-series. 1000-series guidance also includes the *Handbook on United Nations Multi-dimensional Peacekeeping Operations*. All subordinate guidance must be consistent with the principles and concepts set out in the 1000-series.

2000-Series: Headquarters Support to Operations

The 2000-series contains guidance on DPKO/DFS headquarters roles, responsibilities and functions in support of field missions. Specific areas covered in the 2000-series include: command and control and executive direction; mission planning and budgeting; recruitment and force generation; deployment and mission start-up; political analysis and briefings; and reporting, monitoring and operations management.

3000-Series: Management and Integration of Operations

The 3000-series covers the management and integration of United Nations peacekeeping operations in the field. Documents in this series are intended to provide guidance on arrangements for the effective planning, management and integration of operational and support capabilities in the mission. The 3000-series also contains guidance on the effective execution of managerial responsibilities related to the safety, integrity and oversight of the mission and its resources. Specific areas covered in the 3000-series include: mission command and control; political analysis and diplomatic activity; mission planning; safety and security; crisis management; and conduct welfare and discipline.

4000-Series: Multi-dimensional Operations

The 4000-series contains guidance on the employment of military, police and substantive civilian capabilities within a United Nations peacekeeping operation. The use of guidance in this series will vary depending on the deployed mission capabilities, and should be seen as modular. Guidance in the 4000-series also draws on and must be consistent with the principles and concepts set out in the 1000-series. Specific areas covered in the 4000-series include: political and civil affairs; military; law enforcement (police); legal and judicial; corrections/prisons; human rights; DDR; SSR; mine action; and elections.

5000-Series: Field Operations Support

The 5000-series contains guidance on the integration and employment of all support resources in a mission with the aim of providing timely, efficient and effective support to meet mandate priorities. Guidance on mission support capabilities should be consistent with and should directly support the operational and managerial requirements identified in the 3000- and 4000-series. Specific areas covered in the 5000-series include: logistics support; movement control; strategic deployment stocks; aviation; surface transport; engineering; communications and information technology; medical; finance; and procurement and contract management.

6000-Series: Headquarters Management and Administration

The 6000-series sets out the managerial and administrative procedures governing the functioning of DPKO and DFS as specialized, field-focused, operational arms of the United Nations Secretariat. Specific areas covered in the 6000-series include: planning, budget and oversight; human resources and travel; and writing and records.

Annex 2

Selected Glossary of Acronyms and Terms*

AU African Union

CAAC Children and Armed Conflict

CAP Consolidated Appeals Process

Cease-fire A temporary stoppage of war, which may also be undertaken as part of a larger negotiated settlement. A cease-fire marking the permanent end of war is referred to as an armistice.

CIS Commonwealth of Independent States

CMS Chief of Mission Support

CIMIC Civil-Military Cooperation

Conflict Prevention Any structural or diplomatic measures to keep intra-state or inter-state tensions and disputes from escalating into violent conflict.

Contingency Plan A management tool used to ensure adequate arrangements are made in anticipation of a crisis.

Designated Official The senior-most United Nations decision-maker on safety and security issues, in a given country.

DFS Department of Field Support

DMS Director of Mission Support

Doctrine The evolving body of institutional guidance that provides support and direction to personnel preparing for, planning and implementing UN peacekeeping operations.

DDR Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration

DSRSG Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General.

DSRSG/RC/HC Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General/Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator

DSS Department of Safety and Security

ECOWAS Economic Community of West African States

EU European Union

FC Force Commander

Good Offices The authority and legitimacy afforded by one's moral stature or gained through one's position or function that allows one to perform beneficial acts for another. This authority and legitimacy allows individuals to act as third-party mediators in various types of disputes.

HC Humanitarian Coordinator

HOM Head of Mission

HOMC Head of Military Component

HOPC Head of Police Component

Humanitarian Assistance Material or logistical assistance provided for humanitarian purposes, typically in response to humanitarian crises. The primary objective of humanitarian assistance is to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity.

Humanitarian Space This means the ability of humanitarian agencies to work independently and impartially, without fear of attack in pursuit of the humanitarian imperative.

Hybrid Operation A peace operation involving the deployment of military, police or civilian personnel from two or more entities under a single structure.

ICRC International Committee of the Red Cross

IFI International Financial Institution is a generic term referring to the World Bank, IMF and other international or regional development banks.

IMF International Monetary Fund

IMPP Integrated Mission Planning Process

Integration The process through which the United Nations system seeks to maximize its contribution towards countries emerging from conflict by engaging its different capabilities in a coherent and mutually supportive manner.

Integrated Mission A strategic partnership between a multi-dimensional United Nations peacekeeping operation and the UNCT based on a shared vision among all United Nations actors as to the strategic objectives of the United Nations presence at country-level.

IPBS Integrated Peacebuilding Strategy

ISS Integrated Support Services

JLOC Joint Logistics Operations Centre

JOC Joint Operations Centre

JMAC Joint Mission Analysis Cell

Multi-dimensional United Nations Peacekeeping Operations United Nations peacekeeping operations comprising a mix of military, police and civilian components working together to lay the foundations of a sustainable peace.

MOU Memorandum of Understanding

NATO North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NGO Non-governmental Organization

OCHA Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

OHCHR Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights

OSCE Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe

Parties Persons or entities involved in a dispute.

PCC Police Contributing Country

Peace Agreement A formal treaty intended to end or significantly transform violent conflict.

Peacebuilding Measures aimed at reducing the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict, by strengthening national capacities for conflict management, and laying the foundations for sustainable peace.

Peace Enforcement Coercive action undertaken with the authorization of the United Nations Security Council to maintain or restore international peace and security in situations where the Security Council has determined the existence of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression.

Peacekeeping Action undertaken to preserve peace, however fragile, where fighting has been halted and to assist in implementing agreements achieved by the peacemakers.

Preventive Diplomacy Diplomatic efforts to avert disputes arising between parties from escalating into conflict.

Peacemaking Action to bring hostile parties to agreement.

Peace Operations Field operations deployed to prevent, manage, and/or resolve violent conflicts or reduce the risk of their recurrence.

PRSP Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers

QIPs Quick Impact Projects

RC Resident Coordinator

Robust Peacekeeping The use of force by a United Nations peacekeeping operation at the tactical level, with the authorization of the Security Council, to defend its mandate against spoilers whose activities pose a threat to civilians or risk undermining the peace process.

ROE Rules of Engagement

Rule of Law A principle of governance in which all persons, institutions and entities, public and private, including the State itself, are accountable to laws that are publicly promulgated, equally enforced and independently adjudicated, and which are consistent with international human rights norms and standards.

SDS Strategic Deployment Stocks

SLT Senior Leadership Team

SMT Security Management Team

SOFA/SOMA Status of Forces Agreement/Status of Mission Agreement

Spoilers Individuals or groups that may profit from the spread or continuation of violence, or have an interest to disrupt a resolution of a conflict in a given setting.

SRS Special Representative of the Secretary-General

SSR Security Sector Reform

TAM Technical Assessment Mission

Traditional United Nations Peacekeeping Operations United Nations peacekeeping operations conducted with the consent of the parties to a conflict, usually States, in which “Blue Helmets” monitor a truce between warring sides while mediators seek a political solution to the underlying conflict.

Transition The hand-over of responsibilities between a non-United Nations led peace operation to a United Nations peacekeeping operation; or from the latter to other United Nations or non-United Nations actors upon the successful completion of its mandate.

Transitional Administration A transitional authority established by the Security Council to assist a country during a government regime change or passage to independence.

TRM Transitional Results Matrix

TCC Troop Contributing Country

UNCT United Nations Country Team

UNDP United Nations Development Programme

United Nations-Led Peace Operation A Peace operation authorized by the United Nations Security Council and conducted under the direction of the United Nations Secretary-General.

* The list does not provide authoritative United Nations definitions. It is intended to assist with understanding the usage of terms in this document only. Official United Nations definitions are being considered in the context of the ongoing terminology deliberations of the General Assembly's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations on the basis of the DPKO Interim Glossary of Terms.