Ready or not?

Revamping UN Peacekeeping for the 21st Century

Claes Nilsson and Kristina Zetterlund

FOI

Claes Nilsson and Kristina Zetterlund

Ready or Not?

Revamping UN Peacekeeping for the 21st Century

Bild/Cover: UN Photo September 1951

FOI-R--3833--SE

Titel	Ready or not? Revamping UN Peacekeeping for the 21st Century
Title	Ready or not? Revamping UN Peacekeeping for the 21st Century
Rapportnr/Report no	FOI-R--3833--SE
Månad/Month	Februari/February
Utgivningsår/Year	2014
Antal sidor/Pages	76
ISSN	1650-1942
Kund/Customer	Försvarsdepartementet/Ministry of Defence
Forskningsområde	8. Säkerhetspolitik
Projektnr/Project no	A14106
Godkänd av/Approved by	Maria Lignell Jakobsson
Ansvarig avdelning/Responsible Division	Försvarsanalys/Defence Analysis

Sammanfattning

Denna studie analyserar FN:s förmåga att leda fredsfrämjande insatser. Under 1990-talet riktades skarp kritik mot FN efter misslyckanden i Rwanda och på Balkan, vilket ledde till att många länder valde att inte längre bidra med trupp till FN. Var kritiken motiverad, och hur ser det ut idag? Studien beskriver några större reformer som har ägt rum sedan 2000, och analyserar FN:s nuvarande förmåga att leda fredsfrämjande missioner. Frågor såsom ledningsstrukturer, intern samordning, samarbeten med externa partners, och möjliga framtidsscenarier diskuteras.

I studien konstateras att FN har reformerats och utvecklats kontinuerligt sedan 1990-talet. Standards och policy liksom Sekretariatets förmåga att leda insatser har stärkts avsevärt. Den organisation som sände ut blå baskrar på 1990-talet ser idag fundamentalt annorlunda ut. Samtidigt kvarstår många utmaningar. FN är en politisk organisation och medlemsländernas inflytande är stort. Insatserna är också riktade mot att möjliggöra politiska lösningar vilket innebär att de ur ett militärt perspektiv riskerar att bli ineffektiva. En komplicerad ledningskedja liksom oförmågan att snabbt sätta in insatser diskuteras i rapporten. Sådana negativa aspekter kan minimeras genom fortsatta reforminitiativ. Det efterlyses även en diskussion kring när FN ska ta det fulla ansvaret för konfliktlösning i ett land och när organisationen gör mer nytta genom andra, mer begränsade interventioner.

Nyckelord: Förenta nationerna, FN, fredsfrämjande, fredsbevarande, insatser, ledningsstrukturer, Afrikanska unionen, AU, Europeiska unionen, EU, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Nato

Summary

This study looks at the UN's capacity to lead peacekeeping missions and how this capacity has evolved since the beginning of the 21st century. In the 1990s sharp criticism was levelled at the UN's ability to lead complex peacekeeping operations after failures in for example Rwanda and the Balkans. This led to the disengagement from missions by several UN member states. Was the criticism justified, and what is the state of affairs today? The study looks at some larger reforms which have taken place since 2000, and analyses the UN's current capacity to lead complex peacekeeping missions. Issues such as the UN chain of command, internal coordination, cooperation with external partners, robust peacekeeping and possible future scenarios for the development of UN peacekeeping are discussed.

Since 2000, there has been an ongoing reform process in the UN peacekeeping system. Guidance, policy and training on UN peacekeeping and the ability of the Secretariat to lead missions have steadily evolved and improved. The study concludes that the organisation that deployed peacekeepers to the Balkans 20 years ago is in many ways no more.

However, some things have not changed and are unlikely to do so. The UN is a political organisation where national interests ultimately take precedence. The missions are also aimed at facilitating a political process which means that the military components' effectiveness sometimes suffers. The chain of command and inability to deploy quickly are highlighted as problematic areas. Such negative aspects can be minimised by continuous reform efforts and an understanding of when the UN is the most appropriate actor to respond to a crisis militarily or, alternatively, when the UN should preferably contribute with other instruments from its comprehensive toolbox.

Table of Contents

List of Acronyms

AFISMA	African-led International Support Mission in Mali
AMISOM	AU Mission to Somalia
ASIFU	All Sources Information Fusion Unit
AU	African Union
CAR	Central African Republic
CONOPS	Concept of Operations
COPD	Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive
DDR	Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration
DFS	Department of Field Support
DPA	Department of Political Affairs
DPET	Policy, Evaluation and Training Division
DPKO	Department of Peacekeeping Operations
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
DSRSG	Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
EU	European Union
EUTM	EU Training Mission
GFSS	Global Field Support Strategy
HC	Humanitarian Coordinator
HOM	Head of Mission
HOMC	Head of the Military Component
HQ	Headquarters
IAP	Integrated Assessment and Planning
IMPP	Integrated Missions Planning Process
IOT	Integrated Operational Team
ISAF	International Security Assistance Force
JMAC	Joint Mission Analysis Centre
JOC	Joint Operations Centre
JTF	Joint Task Force

MINUSMA	United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali
MINUSTAH	United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti
MONUSCO	United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
OIOS	Office of Internal Oversight Services
OMA	Office of Military Affairs
OPLAN	Operation Plan
OROLSI	Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions
OSCE	Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe
PCC	Police Contributing Country
RC	Resident Coordinator
SHIRBRIG	Multinational Stand-By High Readiness Brigade for United Nations Operations
SMC	Strategic Military Cell
SOP	Standard Operating Procedure
SPM	Special Political Mission
SRSG	Special Representatives of the Secretary-General
TCC	Troop Contributing Country
UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
UN	United Nations
UNAMID	African Union/United Nations Hybrid operation in Darfur
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNIFIL	United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon
UNMIL	United Nations Mission in Liberia
UNOAU	UN Office to the African Union
USG	Under-Secretary-General

1 Introduction

This report explores the evolution of the ability of the United Nations (UN) to lead peacekeeping missions. In the new world order established after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the UN was again seen as an attractive tool for peacekeeping. In the early 1990s, the UN expanded its activities at pace and deployed new peacekeeping missions in locations such as Cambodia, Somalia and Liberia. Although some of these missions were successful, failures to prevent atrocities in Rwanda and the Balkans quickly changed the way in which the UN was perceived and valued. Widespread criticism dealt a hard blow to the organisation, not only in a loss of credibility and legitimacy but also through disengagement from missions by several UN member states. Only a handful of missions were launched by the UN after 1995, in a clear break with its ambitious peacekeeping agenda of the first half of the 1990s.

At centre of the critique was the UN's capacity to lead peacekeeping missions, especially in times of crisis. It was seen as slow and as lacking standards and a proper command and control structure, including a clear and effective chain of command. Indeed, in subsequent reform processes, the UN was highly critical of its own abilities to plan and lead missions.[1] In many aspects, the UN lacked a peacekeeping doctrine in the 1990s. This led to vague guidance for missions, leaving the mission leadership with little more than a Security Council mandate and whatever personal experience it brought. The UN Headquarters in New York was markedly understaffed, and unable to support the growing number of uniformed personnel. This produced an organisation little prepared to deal with high intensity, complex conflicts.

Looking back, it seems that the criticism was fair, while also concealing the fact that there were other issues beyond the control of the UN that contributed to the failings in missions in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, among others. UN missions are very little without their member states, from where the bulk of the resources necessary to implement each mandate are drawn. This is perhaps even more true in the military domain. What member states are willing to contribute in terms of troops and other resources, together with any restrictions on their use in the form of caveats, make up a large proportion of "UN capacity" in peacekeeping missions. Many have argued that the failures in Somalia or the former Yugoslavia had as much to do with the contributing states' inability to deal with the crises and their reluctance to fully engage with the UN peacekeeping leadership as with the UN's ability to lead.

---

[1] See for instance, UN, "Implementation of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations", A/55/977, 2001.

Whatever or whoever was to blame, the experiences of the 1990s had important consequences. First, several countries that had traditionally supported the UN started to look for other ways to engage in peacekeeping. The European Union (EU), already undergoing a reform process following the Balkan Wars where it was seen to be both toothless and paralysed, emerged as a serious alternative for EU member states wanting more influence over the peacekeeping agenda. The emerging European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) presented an opportunity for European governments to work with like-minded countries with advanced military resources on peacekeeping issues. From the turn of the century, the EU began to engage more actively in peacekeeping efforts. Operations in 2003 in Macedonia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) marked the first EU-led peacekeeping engagements.

At the time of the Balkan Wars, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) also proved to be a viable alternative to the UN. From initial air strikes to the use of peacekeeping forces in Kosovo, NATO proved that it had the will and the capacity to conduct advanced military missions in a peacekeeping setting. With NATO searching for a post-Cold War agenda, the stars seemed aligned for the organisation to take on a bigger role in peacekeeping. Soon, NATO would soak up the bulk of western resources for peacekeeping (or stabilisation) operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Around the same time, organisations such as the African Union (AU), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) were gearing up to take on bigger roles in international peacekeeping.

At the turn of the century, there was a new surge in UN-led peacekeeping missions. Large-scale engagements in Kosovo, Timor-Leste, the DRC, Sierra Leone and Ethiopia/Eritrea tripled the number of UN peacekeepers deployed in just a few years. The UN, however, still struggling with the challenges of the 1990s, was not prepared for the task. The Headquarters (HQ) in New York was still severely understaffed, something which was only exacerbated by the departure of all the gratis officers which member states had "lent" to the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO). Doctrine and guidelines on central aspects of peacekeeping missions were still not in place.[2] Criticisms from the member states and experts still centred on command and control, including the chain of command, the planning capability of the HQ, lack of resources, poor oversight and accountability, the inability to act rapidly in the face of a crisis and too little communication between the missions, the HQ in New York and the member states. It was therefore clear that something had to change.

---

[2] UN, "Implementation of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations", A/55/977, 2001, p. 16.

The termination of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission in Afghanistan at the end of 2014 will mark a new phase in many western countries' international engagement. This has not gone unnoticed in New York and there are hopes that these countries will once again engage in UN peacekeeping. This coincides with peacekeeping missions being deployed to countries such as Mali, where the conflict is linked to international terrorism. This could suggest that the appetite for UN peacekeeping among western countries will increase. However, many countries still see the UN as slow and ineffective. This report seeks to shed some light on developments within the UN system over the last decade, and how these developments affect the way the UN conducts peacekeeping missions today.

1.1   Aim of the Report

This study examines how the UN's ability to lead peacekeeping missions has changed since the beginning of the 21st century, a period in which the UN was facing widespread criticism in the wake of failures in several peacekeeping missions, notably the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda. The study takes these criticisms as its starting point, as well as the prevailing view among many western states that the UN lacks the appropriate tools to lead complex peacekeeping missions.

It analyses some of the main developments and reforms since 2000 with regard to the organisation's capacity to lead peacekeeping operations, the current state of affairs, and future challenges and opportunities. Are UN structures for planning and commanding peacekeeping missions more effective today? Is there still room for improvement? Policy, doctrine and command and control structures are central components of the study.

1.2   Method and Delimitations

The subject matter of this report could inspire countless reports. Some delimitations have therefore been essential. The analysis has been limited to those issues identified as especially consequential to the ability of the UN to lead peacekeeping operations now and in the future. This focus was in line with the stated interest of the Swedish Ministry of Defence, which commissioned the study. The specific issues were chosen following a thorough literature review, including of policy and research documents, as well as semi-structured interviews with officials and analysts conducted in New York and Stockholm during the autumn of 2013. The issues dealt with fall into three broad categories: operational effectiveness, coordination, and the positions and policies of member states. Some of the issues are not primarily concerned with command and control or the UN's capacity to lead peacekeeping missions. They do, however, set

preconditions for the UN to lead and were therefore deemed important to analyse.

Due to the restricted scope of the report, a number of issues have unfortunately been excluded from the analysis. The Peacebuilding Commission and the Peacebuilding Support Office which were set up to better support countries emerging from conflict are for instance not covered in the report.[3] Technical budget issues and some administrative reforms have also been left out. These are important in explaining how the UN works and in some ways set the parameters for UN peacekeeping. In addition, for the same reason, some issues have not been tackled in depth, such as the question of police and the development of civilian capacities for peacekeeping. The growing importance of police units in the missions marks an important shift in the way the UN views and implements its missions. It highlights the increasing importance of rule of law and long-term justice reform in conflict-affected countries. The increased number of police officers has been followed by augmented policies and guidelines, for example the development of a Standing Police Capacity. The demand for civilian capacities has in the same vein grown as the scope of peacekeeping missions has broadened to include development, rule of law and peacebuilding.

The report's results are primarily addressed to the Swedish Ministry of Defence and the Government Offices of Sweden. For practitioners familiar with the reform of UN peacekeeping and today's state of affairs, the various implication sections in chapter 3 and the concluding chapter 4 might raise some interesting thoughts.

The authors would like to express their gratitude to the interviewees listed in full in the reference list. Their expertise was invaluable to the study. We would also like to extend a special thank you to Jessica Xiaojie Guo (DPKO), who reviewed the report and whose constructive and insightful comments much improved the text. It should be emphasised though that the conclusions of the report are solely those of the authors.

1.3   Structure of the Report

Chapter 2 describes some of the major policy reform initiatives undertaken by the UN since 2000. It looks especially at the content of the Brahimi Report, the Capstone Doctrine and the New Horizon Report. The chapter ends with a discussion on command and control and the "doctrinal gap". Chapter 3 addresses areas considered to be of particular importance to the future structure and

---

[3] http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/mandate.shtml,
   http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pdf/pbso-strategy-2012-2013.pdf

performance of UN peacekeeping. Section 3.1 looks at operational effectiveness and discusses firstly, in section 3.1.1, *the UN chain of command*, which was the source of much criticism levelled at the UN in the 1990s. It describes the unique setup of an international and multifunctional organisation, and analyses the consequences for UN peacekeeping. Section 3.1.2 examines the development of and future demands on *support and supply to the missions*, including the creation of the Department for Field Support (DFS). Section 3.1.3 deals with the UN's search for possible *new approaches to peacekeeping*, exploring the renewed interest in robust peacekeeping as well as lighter, special political missions. This section also discusses the use of intelligence in UN missions. Section 3.2 looks at the increasing need for integration and coordination within the UN as well as with external partners. Section 3.2.1 discusses *the UN's integration process* in the search for comprehensive approaches to peacebuilding. The section includes an analysis of the UN's policies and structures that have guided integration and coordination in the missions. A discussion on *the UN's growing reliance on partnerships* in section 3.2.2 analyses associated challenges and benefits. Section 3.3, discusses the importance of *the positions and policies of member states*. Section 3.3.1 looks at the *divisions that have emerged between the member states* that contribute troops, on the one hand, and the member states that provide the financial resources, on the other, and their possible implications. Chapter 4 sets out some concluding thoughts and speculations on the future direction of UN peacekeeping.

2 Policy Reform: From Brahimi to the New Horizon

This chapter discusses and analyses major reform initiatives since 2000 that have influenced the UN's ability to lead peacekeeping missions. The past decade has seen a lot of innovation and reform of policy and structures, greatly changing the way in which the UN leads missions. The main reform initiatives, such as the Brahimi Report and New Horizon, are discussed below, with a focus on how they have affected UN peacekeeping and the command and control system. Implications of the reforms and the issue of a "doctrinal gap" are examined in the last section.

The term command and control is used broadly in this report to describe the guidelines, policies, cultures and structures that together define how the UN leads peacekeeping missions. The US Army Field Manual describes command and control as:

> …the exercise of authority and direction by a properly designated commander over assigned and attached forces in the accomplishment of the mission. Command and control functions are performed through an arrangement of personnel, equipment, communications, facilities, and procedures employed by a commander in planning, directing, coordinating, and controlling forces and operations in the accomplishment of the mission.[4]

This report uses a similar definition, expanding the scope to include the full UN engagement in a multidimensional mission setting as opposed to just the military component.

2.1 The Brahimi Report

Reform of the UN peacekeeping system truly started with the launch of the *Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations*, known as the "Brahimi Report", named after Lakhdar Brahimi, the former Foreign Minister of Algeria, who chaired the panel.[5] The report frankly addressed the major gaps and challenges that the UN was facing in its missions. It acknowledged failures of the past, stating that: "Without renewed commitment on the part of the Member States, significant institutional changes and increased financial support, the United Nations will not be capable of executing the critical peacekeeping and

---

[4] US, "Army Field Manual, FM 3-0, 5-71", 2001.
[5] UN, "Identical letters dated 21 August 2000 from the Secretary-General to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council", A/55/305–S/2000/809, 2000.

peacebuilding tasks that the Member States assign to it in coming months and years".[6] In addressing past failures, the report stressed that a UN mission has to be robust enough to be able to defend itself and the mission mandate when faced with aggression. Furthermore, it called for a new, more systematic and structured approach to peacekeeping, built on solid principles and an honest acknowledgement of what the UN can and cannot do.

Several of the recommendations made in the Brahimi Report remain relevant and are still at the forefront of the UN's reform process. The report touched on key features of peacekeeping, such as: the link between peacekeeping and peacebuilding; the importance of there being a peace to keep; the need for robust missions in complex conflict environments; the importance of clear and achievable mandates; the need for integrated approaches, including making better use of police and rule of law capacities in an integrated manner; the need for strategic analysis; logistics and the ability to rapidly deploy the appropriate personnel; and, last but not least, the need for a Secretariat able to plan and lead peacekeeping missions.

Some, but not all, of the recommendations were adopted by the Security Council. Suggestions on measures related to clearer mandates, integrated mission planning and rapid deployment were immediately welcomed and adopted. In the General Assembly, however, there was a divide among member states on some recommendations, not least on the issue of "robust peacekeeping", leading it to "take note" of the report instead of making any strong commitment to its agenda.[7] The Secretariat carried out internal reforms of the DPKO, including substantially boosting its resources for planning and leading missions.[8] Another important structural reform in line with the recommendations of the Brahimi Report was the creation of the Department for Field Support (DFS) in 2007, which reinforced the Secretariat's capacity to plan and support missions. DFS and mission support are discussed more in detail in section 3.1.2. The creation of the Division for Policy, Evaluation and Training (DPET) and of the Office for Rule of Law and Security Institutions (OROLSI) in 2007 were further steps to increase the UN's capacity in the peacekeeping area that build to a large extent

---

[6] Ibid, p. viii.

[7] William J. Durch, Victoria K. Holt, Caroline R. Earle, Moira K. Shanahan, "The Brahimi Report and the Future of UN Peace Operations", 2003, p. 8.

[8] Ibid, p. xx. Several initiatives for reforming the Secretariat followed the Brahimi Report. In 2001 for instance, DPKO initiated a comprehensive review of the department's weaknesses and highlighted areas that needed strengthening in order to be effective: UN, "Implementation of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations", A/55/977, 2001. Issues that were not dealt with immediately and some of those issues that would arise later were addressed in the "Peace Operations 2010" initiative from 2006, A/60/696.

on the need for reform outlined in the Brahimi Report. The setting up of OROLSI was a recognition of the increased importance of the rule of law and police components of UN peacekeeping missions. As an example, in October 2013, approximately 13 000 police officers were deployed in UN missions, compared to 6 000 in 2005 and 1 600 in 1995.[9] This period also saw an increase in the use of Formed Police Units[10] in peacekeeping missions.

Following the Brahimi Report, there have been a number of reform initiatives which have played key roles in adapting the UN to new demands and challenges. The *Peacekeeping 2010* initiative (published in 2006) was in many ways a follow-up to the Brahimi Report. It addressed areas that were still in need of reform: personnel, doctrine, partnerships, resources and organisation.[11] Peacekeeping 2010 gave new momentum to the reform process and guided Secretariat efforts in the area of peacekeeping.

2.2   The Capstone Doctrine

In 2008, the UN produced its first comprehensive document on the planning and conduct of peacekeeping missions. *The Capstone Doctrine* had a system-wide aim, targeting the full-spectrum of UN peacekeeping activities. It acknowledged that the UN had been without clear guidance on peacekeeping. It was, "the first attempt in over a decade to codify the major lessons learned from the past six decades of United Nations peacekeeping experience". Furthermore, the document was "…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".[12] The Capstone Doctrine outlined the core functions and overarching principles that guide the assessment, planning and implementation of UN peacekeeping missions.

A lot of attention was paid to the coordination and integration of the different components of a UN mission, both horizontally and vertically. The Capstone Doctrine described the UN command and control structure as distinct, due to "…the fact that UN peacekeeping has evolved into a complex, multi-dimensional

---

[9] UN, "Monthly summary of military and civilian police contribution to United Nations Operations", 1994-2004 and 2005-2013. DPKO website:
https://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors_archive.shtml
[10] For more information on Formed Police Units, see:
http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/sites/police/units.shtml.
[11] UN Report of the Secretary-General, "Overview of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations: budget performance for the period from 1 July 2004 to 30 June 2005 and budget for the period from 1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007", A/60/696, 2006, p. 6.
[12] UN, "UN Peacekeeping Operations, Principles and Guidelines", 2008, p.7.

enterprise, involving personnel from a wide range of nationalities, disciplines and professional cultures pursuing multiple lines of activity".[13] It marked a growing recognition of both the potential and the challenges that came with increasing coordination of peacekeeping activities.

Other important steps to improve command and control have been taken. The 2008 *Authority, Command and Control in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*, provides guidance on command and authority throughout UN missions. This is discussed in more detail in section 3.1.1. On the technical side, there has been a big increase in the number of Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), documents that guide and instruct the HQ and the peacekeeping missions on issues such as planning or communication. From having operated largely without any such guidance in the 1990s, there is now a wide range of SOPs available for peacekeepers – and more are being developed.

Efforts have also focused on standards, with DPKO and DFS working to improve common standards for the troop-contributing countries (TCCs). Most recently, the Secretariat has developed standards for Infantry Battalions, staff officers and medical support. Areas that are being considered for the development of future standards include engineers, logistics and Field Headquarters support.[14] While these standards are important, their value will be measured by their usefulness in the field.

2.3   New Horizon

In 2009, the reform process took another step with the introduction of the *New Horizon* initiative. It sought to forge a renewed dialogue and partnership between member states, the Secretariat and the Security Council to identify key areas that needed strengthening to improve UN peacekeeping.[15] The challenges facing the UN were not so different from those which had led to the Brahimi Report:

> There was concern that the scale of peacekeeping had outgrown the systems in place to generate, manage and support missions. Political strains in the global partnership had also intensified as Member States contributed larger numbers of personnel, in some cases without a clear or shared understanding of evolving mandates and tasks. There

---

[13] Ibid, p.66.

[14] Interview, New York, October 2013.

[15] UN DPKO/DFS, "A New Partnership Agenda: Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping", July 2009. For more information see also the UN webpage, http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/newhorizon.shtml.

were also growing demands on the part of troop- and police-contributing countries for expanded consultation and dialogue as a key element of the global partnership.[16]

The New Horizon focused on four broad areas: policy development; capability development; DFS strategy; and planning and oversight. Issues such as the need for clearer guidance on the protection of civilians and robust peacekeeping; development of standards and training; improved dialogue between troop and/or police contributing countries and the Secretariat; a capability-driven approach; and UN cooperation with regional organisations were all key features of the New Horizon agenda.[17] Issues concerning capacity and capability, in the Secretariat and among the TCCs/PCCs, were especially highlighted in New Horizon. Emphasis on standards and training targeted the need for member states to improve capacity and operational readiness. The importance of clearer guidance and better mission support was also discussed, pointing to the need for the Secretariat to become more proficient at serving the missions. The Senior Advisory Group's report, presented in November 2012, addressed some of the same concerns. Tasked to review reimbursement rates for troops, it also made several recommendations aimed at strengthening UN and member states' capacity and capabilities. For instance, the report recommended systems to ensure effective monitoring of pre-deployment training and operational readiness of member states' troops.[18]

The headway made so far on the New Horizon agenda has been accounted for in two progress reports (2010 and 2011), and has included initiating several new standards and guidelines such as on early peacebuilding. New approaches have been launched, such as the Civilian Capacities Initiative and the Global Field Support Strategy (see section 3.1.2), and training courses, for example on mission leadership, have been improved.[19]

Developing an approach to the protection of civilians has been an on-going effort in connection with several of the above initiatives. Acknowledging the changing nature of conflict and the increased targeting of civilians has led the UN to develop UN-wide as well as mission-specific guidance on protection. Several missions now have mandates that highlight the need for protection of civilians. The Security Council mandate for the no-fly zone in Libya specifically called for the protection of civilians, marking a new approach to the authorisation of

---

[16] UN, "The New Horizon Initiative: Progress Report No. 2", December 2011, p. 4.

[17] UN DPKO/DFS, "A New Partnership Agenda: Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping", July 2009. See also, UN, "Implementation of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations", A/64/573, December 2009.

[18] UN, "Letter dated 11 October 2012 from the Chair of the Senior Advisory Group on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and other related issues to the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Group", A/C.5/67/10, 2012.

[19] UN, "The New Horizon Initiative: Progress Report No. 2", December 2011.

interventions.[20] Guidance on protection of civilians is now available to peacekeepers for pre-deployment training, and scenario material has been developed for different missions.[21] Finding common ground on protection of civilians has not been an easy task and many member states have been anything but supportive of its broader inclusion. Other obstacles remain, not least pertaining to training and resources in the missions, but a focus on the protection of civilians is now a main feature of UN peacekeeping.

2.4 Command and Control and the "Doctrinal Gap"

The policies and documents described above have been important in developing the UN's command and control system. The Capstone Doctrine was a major step towards codifying principles and approaches to peacekeeping. However, there is still a perceived lack of doctrine for UN peacekeeping missions, referred to here as the "doctrinal gap". This gap was manageable in traditional Chapter VI missions. However, the changing conflict environment and mission mandates' expanding tasks and responsibilities mean that peacekeepers need more guidance. The UN has no detailed, comprehensive doctrinal guidance on the planning and implementation of its military missions, equivalent for example to NATO's Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive (COPD). The COPD covers all aspects of a military engagement, including placing the mission in the wider context of the international response to a conflict situation.[22]

It could however be argued that the policies and guidelines discussed in this report form the core of UN peacekeeping and together make up a UN peacekeeping doctrine. The focus in these documents on political solutions to conflict, multidimensional peacekeeping and the importance of integration and coherence in the missions are issues very much at the heart of UN peacekeeping.

DPKO recently conducted its own evaluation of its command and control structures, which were found to be appropriate for the types of missions that the UN currently runs. UN command and control was found to facilitate integrated multidimensional missions with civilian political leadership – key features of

---

[20] UN, "Security Council Resolution 1973", 2011.

[21] See for instance The UN Peacekeeping Resource Hub, http://peacekeepingresourcehub.unlb.org/PBPS/Pages/Public/library.aspx?ot=2&cat=71&level=2 &menukey=_4_5_1#. See also Justin MacDermott and Måns Hanssen, "Protection of Civilians – Delivering on the mandate through civil-military coordination", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), September 2010.

[22] NATO, "Allied Command Operations Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive (COPD) Interim Version 1.0", 2010.

today's missions. The study also found that leadership relations between Special Representatives of the Secretary-General (SRSGs) and Force Commanders were "clear and effective".[23]

Nonetheless, the UN has not been successful in packaging and communicating its command and control system to member states. A recent DPKO survey showed that two-thirds of all member states found UN command and control structures "somewhat clear".[24] Furthermore, command and control arrangements between different components in the UN were said in interviews to be unclear at times.[25] It is possible that member states for various reasons have an outdated understanding of UN command and control, but the issue remains: UN command and control is often seen as unclear and inefficient.

---

[23] IPI, "Enhancing European Military and Police Contributions to UN Peacekeeping Missions", 2013, p. 3.
[24] Ibid. About 20 per cent found command and control arrangements to be "very clear".
[25] Interviews, New York, October 2013.

3 UN Peacekeeping: Prepared for a New Reality?

The reforms described above have fundamentally changed the way the UN conducts its peacekeeping missions. This chapter highlights some of the key issues that impact today's peacekeeping missions. Challenges such as effective and efficient mission support and the coordination of different UN components characterise UN peacekeeping in the 21st century. These and other prominent subjects are analysed below. The chapter begins with a discussion about the ever changing context in which UN missions function. This heavily affects the way the UN operates, and creates new demands on policy and doctrine as new dynamics add to the complexity of peacekeeping.

Whether the UN is successful or not in contributing to conflict resolution and peacebuilding partly depends on its ability to adapt to each particular context. The settings in which peacekeeping missions operate have changed significantly in recent years. In addition to the possible pressures of the financial crisis and the continued deepening engagements with regional organisations, DPKO Under-Secretary-General (USG) Hervé Ladsous identified the changing nature of conflict as one of the key factors affecting the setting for peacekeeping.[26]

One the one hand, wars between states are now relatively rare and the number of major civil wars has fallen since the early 1990s. Moreover, today's civil wars are less violent, with battle-related deaths dropping from an average of 164 000 a year in the 1980s, and 92 000 a year in the 1990s, to 42 000 a year in the 2000s.[27] The decade 2000–2009 was the least conflict-ridden since the 1970s.[28] One the other hand, peacekeeping missions are today operating in areas where threats such as organised crime and terrorism are acute – threats which at times are directed against the UN. Although there are fewer wars, the World Bank Development Report 2011 emphasises that insecurity persists and that new threats such as organised crime and trafficking, civil unrest resulting from economic shocks, and terrorism have added to the threat of conventional war.[29]

---

[26] "Statement by Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Hervé Ladsous to the Fourth Committee", 28 October 2013.

[27] The World Bank, "The World Bank Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development", 2011, http://wdronline.worldbank.org.

[28] Lotta Themnér and Peter Wallensteen, "Armed Conflicts: 1946-2012", *Journal of Peace Research,* July 2013.

[29] The World Bank, "The World Bank Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development", 2011.

UN peacekeeping traditionally rests on the three basic principles: the consent of the parties, impartiality and the non-use of force except in self-defence or defence of the mandate. While these principles remain valid, their meaning and interpretations have been slightly modified in recent years. This is partly a result of a changed conflict setting. Today, consent does not necessarily mean consent at the operational and tactical level in the field. UN peacekeepers are instead often deployed to areas where there is no peace to keep or comprehensive peace agreement, and actors are still in conflict. In addition, some of those actors may view the UN as a party to the conflict, and thus target the UN specifically. Moreover, the UN now differentiates between impartiality and neutrality in most missions with a civilian protection mandate – where there is such a mandate forces will not stay neutral if civilians are in imminent danger.[30] A different and often more dangerous setting, together with stronger mandates, also means UN peacekeepers are less foreign to the idea of using force. Indeed, a more risky and violent setting places greater demands on the UN's ability to lead peacekeeping operations.

The UN does not shy away from hotspots such as Mali, and it is possible that a deployment to Syria will be in the cards in the future. That the UN itself can be a target has been illustrated by incidents such as the terrorist attack on the UN headquarters in Baghdad in 2003, which claimed the lives of 22 people including the UN envoy in Iraq, Sergio Vieira de Mello. In 2007, 17 UN staff members lost their lives in Algiers when a car bomb exploded near the offices of UNDP and UNHCR. More recently, on 19 June 2013, the UN Common Compound in Mogadishu was attacked by the Islamist militant group al Shabaab, resulting in some 20 deaths – among them UN staff.[31] Such attacks have led to questioning of the UN's ability to mitigate risks.[32] More importantly, however, they have shown that blue helmets now often operate in dangerous, complex settings.

How the UN copes in this changed setting will not only depend on efficient and effective internal structures and processes. The resources and capabilities made available to the UN through its member states will also be critical. Moreover, various forms of cooperation with partners will be decisive for the future of UN peacekeeping.

This chapter discusses areas that have been deemed essential for the UN's ability to lead peacekeeping missions today and in the future. Each section starts by

---

[30] Cedric de Coning, "The Evolution of Peace Operations in Africa: Trajectories and Trends", in Benjamin de Carvalho, Thomas Jaye, Yvonne Kasumba and Wafula Okumu (eds.), "Peacekeeping in Africa – The Evolving roles of the African Union and Regional Mechanisms", Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, 2010.

[31] Abdi Sheikh, "Somali Islamist rebels attack U.N. base, 22 dead", *Reuters,* 19 June 2013.

[32] See e.g. Colum Lynch, "'We Knew They Were Coming'", *Foreign Policy,* 7 October 2013.

looking at developments and reform processes in the various areas. Possible implications for UN peacekeeping are then discussed. The topics fall under three broad categories: operational effectiveness (3.1), coordination (3.2) and the positions and policies of member states (3.3).

3.1   Operational Effectiveness

In this section, three issues with critical impact on the planning and implementation of UN-led peacekeeping missions are discussed – the UN chain of command, mission support and the re-calibration of modern peacekeeping. These areas have been under much scrutiny and have continuously evolved during this study's period of interest. Many challenges, however, remain and the continued development of the UN chain of command, its support and supply to the missions and its toolbox for different types of new missions will heavily impact the effectiveness of UN peacekeeping.

3.1.1   Setting the UN Apart: The Chain of Command

Much of the criticism following the 1990s centred on the UN chain of command. Critical failures in Somalia and Yugoslavia in the 1990s, and in missions in Africa in the 2000s, can be linked to issues connected to the chain of command. Improvements have been made since, and best practices in and lessons from the field have been institutionalised and documented. Publications such as the *Handbook on United Nations Multidimensional Peacekeeping Operations*[33] and the more comprehensive and detailed *Authority, Command and Control in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*[34] define and discuss the issue of command and control and, more specifically, the UN chain of command.

In the UN chain of command, the Security Council provides the legal authority and the strategic direction for missions through their mandates. The Secretary-General has the operational authority to direct the missions. The USG for Peacekeeping Operations, the head of DPKO, has the delegated authority from the Secretary-General to direct and administer all peacekeeping missions from the UN Headquarters.[35]

---

[33] UN DPKO, Best Practices Unit, "Handbook on United Nations Multidimensional Peacekeeping Operations", 2003.
[34] UN, DPKO/DFS, "Authority, Command and Control in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations", 2008.
[35] Ibid, p 6.

In addition, the USG for Field Support directs all the support to the peacekeeping mission. The USGs for Safety and Security and the USG for Management also play key roles in the administration of and support for the missions.

In the field, the Head of Mission (HOM) has overall authority for all UN activities in the mission area. The HOM of a peacekeeping mission is in general also a Special Representative of the Secretary-General. The SRSG reports to the Secretary-General through the DPKO USG. A key objective for the SRSG is to ensure coordination of the various UN components in the mission area. The HOM/SRSG provides political guidance to the mission and "sets mission-wide operational direction including decisions on resource allocation in case of competing priorities".[36] In contrast to most other missions with military components, in a UN-led mission the highest rank in the field is thus usually held by a civilian.[37]

Component heads, such as the Head of the Military Component (HOMC/Force Commander), the Head of the Police Component, the Director of Mission Support/Chief of Mission Support or the Deputy Special Representative(s) of the Secretary-General (DSRSG) are responsible for the operational or tactical aspects of mandate implementation under the overall authority of the HOM.[38] The HOMC reports directly to the HOM and maintains a "technical reporting and communication link" with the Military Adviser at UN HQ. Any major decisions on operations need to be to be taken in consultation with the HOM and require his/her approval.

With regard to the missions' chain of command, UN guidelines provide that:

> The HOMC exercises "UN operational control" over personnel and contingents assigned by Member States to the peacekeeping operation. "UN operational control" allows the HOMC to assign separate tasks to units and sub units within the military component, as required, within the mission area of responsibility, in consultation (not meaning negotiation) with the senior national officer of the affected unit/sub-unit, who is responsible for administrative control of the unit/sub-unit. The HOMC may delegate UN operational control to appropriate subordinate levels defined within the command framework.[39]

---

[36] Ibid, p 7.

[37] This does not apply for lower levels in the mission area. For instance, civilian heads at the regional or sector level do not have authority over military or police components. He/she is however still responsible for coordinating all UN activity in the area of responsibility.

[38] UN, DPKO/DFS, "Authority, Command and Control in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations", 2008, p 7.

[39] Ibid, p 11.

The member states retain full strategic command of their forces.[40] When they participate in a UN-led peacekeeping mission they place their troops under the operational control of the HOMC. The specific terms for each national contingent, including where they are to be deployed and for what purposes, should be specified in a Memorandum of Understanding between the country and UN HQ.[41]

The UN command structure is often described as decentralised and flat, meaning that substantial autonomy is given to the mission with only light backstopping at UN HQ. Indeed, the HOM has a strong mandate and can also delegate authority further down the chain of command. For military components, this means that they are given relatively wide autonomy to shape their engagements. This is amplified by the light headquarter structures, both in the field and in New York. This autonomy also means that individuals in key positions and personal relationships play a big role in the missions. One person interviewed for this study with lengthy experience of UN peacekeeping said that the UN command and control structure works well as long as people in key positions are competent and able to work together.[42] If not, the decentralised structure and small HQ can prove slow and ineffective, which is especially dangerous in times of crisis. Individuals have a lot of influence in UN peacekeeping missions – a strength if

---

[40] *Command* is described by the UN as: "The authority vested in a Military leader/ Police Commander for the direction, coordination and control of military and police forces/ personnel. Command has a legal status and denotes functional and knowledgeable exercise of military/ police authority to attain military/ police objectives or goals." *Operational Control*, means "The authority granted to a Military Commander in a United Nations Peacekeeping Operation to direct forces assigned so that the Commander may accomplish specific missions or tasks which are usually limited by function, time, or location (or a combination), to deploy units concerned and/or military personnel, and to retain or assign Tactical Command or Control of those units/personnel. Operational Control includes the authority to assign separate tasks to sub units of a contingent, as required by operational necessities, within the mission area of responsibility, in consultation with the Contingent Commander and as approved by the United Nations Headquarters.". *Tactical Command*, is described as "The authority delegated to a military or police commander in a United Nations Peacekeeping operation to assign tasks to forces under their command for the accomplishment of the mission assigned by higher authority." *Tactical Control*, finally, is "The detailed and local direction and control of movement, or manoeuvre, necessary to accomplish missions or tasks assigned. As required by operational necessities the Head of Military Component (HOMC) and Head of Police Component (HOPC) may delegate the Tactical Control of assigned military forces/ police personnel to the subordinate sector and/or unit commanders." These definitions are similar to those of NATO, see NATO, "NATO Glossary of Terms and Definitions (English and French)", AAP-06, Edition 2013. There are however differences in how command and control is employed in UN and NATO missions. See e.g. Challenges Forum, "Results of Working Group V: Command and Control: UN and Regional Organizations: Current Issues, Structures and Solutions for the Future?", Geneva Centre for Security Challenges, July 2012.

[41] UN, DPKO/DFS, "Authority, Command and Control in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations", 2008, pp. 7 and 11.

[42] Interview, New York, October 2013.

the right person is in the right position but potentially dangerous when this is not the case. The UN has been criticised for having poor managers, both at its HQ and in the field.[43] While there is now more and better training for mission leaderships, more could still be done.

Furthermore, the higher degree of autonomy in the missions means that each contingent has more room to form the mission. To return to the issue of doctrine for military missions, this means that each leading country's command and control philosophy will shape that specific part of a peacekeeping mission, potentially creating a mix of different command cultures in the mission.[44]

The chain of command is affected by the level of interoperability and level of authority granted to the commander as well as well as national caveats. Multinational missions involve challenges that nationally led forces would not encounter.[45] First, the level of command that countries are willing to delegate to a Force Commander in a multinational mission usually does not exceed operational control, meaning that full command of the forces is still a national affair. This is true of NATO- as well as UN- or EU-led missions. In a UN mission, the Force Commander is instructed to establish a "coordination chain" with National Contingent Commanders. While national contingents are expected to act in a way that serves the overall objectives of the mission mandate, there is still an understanding that there will be national reporting lines between capitals and national contingents.[46]

This touches on the issue of national caveats. Most troop contributions come with caveats, that is, restrictions on geographical location, tasks, and so on, placed by governments on the use of their forces. National caveats should be clear to the mission from the outset. They are, however, still a major constraint for the Force Commander, not least when it comes to demands for more offensive peacekeeping and protection of civilians.[47]

Interlinked is the issue of interoperability. While not necessarily dependent on a shared culture, interoperability is likely to be greater with countries that share basic doctrine, have worked together in regional organisations or have past experience of cooperation in missions. EU and NATO member states, for

---

[43] Interview, New York, October 2013 and IPI, "Enhancing European Military and Police Contributions to UN Peacekeeping", February 2013.

[44] See for instance Arvid Ekengard, "Svensk militär ledningsfilosofi möter samtida fredsfrämjande operationer", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), 2010.

[45] It also has its advantages, such as greater legitimacy for the force and aggregation of resources for the participating countries.

[46] UN, DPKO/DFS, "Authority, Command and Control in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations", 2008, p. 12.

[47] UN, "The New Horizon Initiative: Progress Report No. 2", December 2011, p. 12.

instance, cooperate in joint exercises as well as concept and capability development and validation processes. Many have also cooperated in past missions, and have therefore had a chance to further develop their interoperability. Unfortunately for the UN, interoperability is something that is very hard to achieve on a global scale. The UN does not conduct exercises the way regional organisations often do. Nor does it run large capability development projects. Until recently, the UN focused very little on common standards or the evaluation of TCCs' capacity.

A recent attempt to address concerns over interoperability and the lack of support from HQ was the creation in 2006 of the Strategic Military Cell (SMC) for the UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) II. The driving force behind the set-up of the SMC was a group of a group of European TCCs. It was set up to strengthen the Secretariat's backstopping function and to supervise the mission. The SMC was staffed mainly by officers from TCCs worried that their troops would otherwise not receive the support they needed. Compared to UNIFIL, UNIFIL II would be a bigger and potentially more dangerous mission, albeit under Chapter VI of the UN Charter. Still not convinced that the UN had the ability to lead complex and more robust missions, European TCCs wanted stronger command and control arrangements, including a clear chain of command and robust rules of engagement, if they were to contribute troops. The Secretariat, realising that it would come to depend on European contributions, saw no other way than to accept the SMC. The hope of bringing back TCCs with more sophisticated resources to UN peacekeeping is likely to have softened resistance.[48]

3.1.2 Implications of the UN Chain of Command

The UN chain of command in peacekeeping missions continues to trigger debate. One recurring issue is the question of national influence. TCCs' reluctance to hand over full control to the UN affects missions' ability to function as effectively as possible, not least in times of crisis. For instance, some military component commanders might feel that they have to check with their governments before they take on complex tasks, leading to delays, frustration and potential failure to uphold the mandate. Several past missions, including those in Kosovo and Somalia, provide stark examples of the problems that can arise when the chain of command does not allow commanders to fully command their forces.

---

[48] Ronald Hatto, "UN Command and Control Capabilities: Lessons from UNIFIL's Strategic Military Cell", April 2009, pp. 189-190.

The more caveats a UN force has to deal with, the less likely it is that it will be able to take on today's challenges in complex conflict environments. It could also risk the mission's legitimacy if the soldiers are seen to be staying in their camps or otherwise not intervening in situations where civilians are being targeted. It should be noted that these particular hurdles are not exclusive to the UN. All multinational organisations face similar issues. It does however add to the challenges that the UN faces in other areas, including TCC capacity, interoperability and lack of resources. The Senior Advisory Group report on troop reimbursements of 2012 acknowledged this issue and proposed a higher compensation rate for those troops that take on the more dangerous tasks without caveats.[49]

At the operational and tactical levels, national influence – or interference – can thus potentially muddle command and control in UN peacekeeping missions. At the strategic level, member states are instead complaining about a lack of influence on top-level decision making and on the strategic direction of missions. Member states do not have the same level of influence in the UN as they do in the relatively smaller EU or NATO. Moreover, in the UN, planning documents such as the operation plan (OPLAN) and concept of operations (CONOPS) are DPKO's responsibility.[50]

There have been attempts to work around these issues and provide member states with more frequent reporting and better oversight of the planning and implementation of missions. For one, there are now more frequent consultations between the Security Council, the Secretariat and the TCCs during planning and in the event of major changes in the missions. However, many are still of the view that there is not enough dialogue between key stakeholders.[51]

Multinational missions bring together officers and soldiers from a range of different countries and cultures. This means that there are a lot of different views on command and control, on leadership and on basic military tactics. For troops not used to UN missions, it can be difficult and sometimes painful to adjust to a new type of mission culture. It can also mean that the mission becomes less effective due to a general lack of trust and understanding, coupled with language barriers.[52] The UN also continues to struggle to find the right people for the right positions. As the recruitment of leadership positions in the UN can be as much an

---

[49] UN General Assembly, "Letter dated 11 October 2012 from the Chair of the Senior Advisory Group on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and other related issues to the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Group", A/C.5/67/10, 2012.

[50] Challenges Forum, "Results of Working Group V: Command and Control: UN and Regional Organizations: Current Issues, Structures and Solutions for the Future?", 2012.

[51] Interviews, New York, October 2013.

[52] See Arvid Ekengard, "Svensk militär ledningsfilosofi möter samtida fredsfrämjande operationer", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), 2010.

issue of politics and representation as it is a question of merit, this is difficult to resolve. However, recruitment standards and more and better training would help to improve quality.

For traditional troop contributors that pulled out in the 1990s but are now returning to, or considering a return to, UN peacekeeping, this lack of interoperability will be a difficult challenge.[53] They will have to deal with new colleagues from countries with vastly different cultures, levels of expertise, resources and operational experience. Furthermore, the UN structures have naturally been geared towards facilitating the effective engagement of those countries that have actually provided troops. The more typical UN military engagement might not be suited to many western countries. In addition, the fact that the "light" UN HQ does not have the same capacity to lead complex military missions as NATO or national commands could become an issue, especially in mission contexts with higher levels of conflict. Nonetheless, the UN command and control system could be adjusted, should these countries decide to engage in UN peacekeeping. The big challenge would be to ensure that both old and new contributors, with different capacities and experience, can work effectively in the same structures and systems.

A basic problem for the UN is that it has to rely on the TCCs to ensure that standards are implemented and troops are sent on training courses. The UN has limited opportunities to validate whether troops have gone through appropriate training. In addition, as most training is conducted on a national basis, it is difficult to standardise training across the board, not least since the member states' capacities vary considerably. For training, standards and policies to be effective, the UN will have to increase its monitoring and evaluation systems in the area of peacekeeping. One measure which has been discussed for some time – and which was proposed by the DPKO USG Ladsous – is the introduction of an Inspector General for peacekeeping missions. Like Inspectors General in national armed forces, an Inspector General for UN peacekeeping would assess the efficiency, effectiveness and the use of troops and formed police units. He or she would explore the long-term strategic needs and requirements of the missions. This proposal did not, however, go down well with some member states, which strongly objected to inspections of their troops. In the end, a compromise was reached with the creation of the position of a Director of Peacekeeping Strategic Partnership.

With regard to the SMC, its value has been heavily debated. Ronald Hatto acknowledges in his examination of the SMC that it strengthened communication between the mission, New York and the member states – an issue that is often

---

[53] IPI, "Enhancing European Military and Police Contributions to UN Peacekeeping", 2013, p. 5.

cited as problematic and can possibly discourage member states from deploying troops. A report from the Secretary-General also deemed the SMC a success.[54]

Bigger TCCs were however unhappy with what they perceived as preferential treatment for the only mission with substantial western contributions, while the other missions had to make do with the strained resources of the DPKO.[55] The "double standards" that the SMC introduced threatened to cause a rift between western countries, the UN and traditional, non-western, TCCs. Hatto also notes the risk of "muddling" the chain of command by adding member state personnel to the command structure, making it possible for member states to influence missions, an interesting paradox as a main (western) rationale for the SMC was the UN's unclear chain of command.[56]

Academics and practitioners alike seem certain that the SMC will not be replicated in other missions. Many interviewed for this report felt strongly that the SMC had been a mistake, with the negative effects by far overshadowing the benefits. The SMC was never integrated into the ordinary HQ structures and the political implications meant the arrangement is unlikely to be repeated. However, it also showed that the UN was ready and able to adapt to a situation that called for new and innovative solutions. As one interviewee stated, the SMC was a success simply because the mission got the resources necessary for the mission to succeed. This does not mean that the SMC will be replicated elsewhere, but rather that the UN needs to be flexible in its approach to peacekeeping.[57]

3.1.3   Supporting and Supplying the Missions

In 2007, the Secretary-General addressed the need for a revision of peacekeeping HQ structures. The main point of departure was a major overstretch in DPKO, worsened by a new surge in peacekeeping operations, including missions in Lebanon, Timor-Leste and Sudan. The ratio of HQ personnel to field mission personnel had dropped by around 50 per cent in just four years.[58] The subsequent creation of DFS was expected to strengthen the HQ in delivering appropriate mission support to the field, an area that was becoming more and more complex, especially in areas such as logistics and procurement. Deployments in Sudan and the DRC proved massive logistical and administrative challenges, again

---

[54] UN, "Comprehensive review of the Strategic Military Cell", A/62/744, 2008, pp. 10-11.
[55] Hatto notes that while the SMC had 33 planners, DPKO had roughly 55 officers for the management of all other missions.
[56] Ronald Hatto, "UN Command and Control Capabilities: Lessons from UNIFIL's Strategic Military Cell", Apr 2009, p. 191.
[57] Interview New York, October 2013.
[58] UN, "Report of the Secretary-General, Comprehensive report on strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to manage and sustain peace operations", A/61/858, 2007, p 6.

highlighting the need for a dedicated field support department.[59] The objective for DFS was to strengthen several areas such as budget and financial management, the ability to tackle mounting legal requirements in the missions and the capacity to recruit missions' senior leadership. To ensure unity of command, the USG for Field Support would report to the USG for Peacekeeping Operations.[60]

The setting up of DFS corresponded with the realisation that there was a pressing need to think more strategically and systematically about field support. When DFS was set up, it brought the system of field support, previously divided between different offices, under one department. In that sense, DFS could support the missions in a more coherent way while also identifying possible synergies between different missions and functions of the HQ.

The Global Field Support Strategy (GFSS), initiated in 2010, was the next important step towards better field support.[61] The GFSS stated that UN HQ would maintain its strategic role while operational responsibilities would as much as possible be delegated to global and regional service centres. The initiative sought to make field support more efficient, by, for instance, standardising field support procedures. The GFSS also sought to reduce support components in the missions. The logistics bases in Brindisi, Italy, and Entebbe, Uganda, would be upgraded to serve as shared support centres for all missions, streamlining operations and cutting costs.

Well into its five-year plan the GFSS has helped to improve mission support. It has made it easier for the Secretariat to transfer equipment and resources between individual missions.[62] Mission support can potentially be approached in a more strategic way, with a continuous search to cut costs and make the support functions more efficient. According to Gowan and Gleason, the costs of peacekeeping missions could be reduced accordingly in the 2012–2013 budget (not counting newly started missions).[63] In a progress report in December 2012, the Secretary-General described a more coherent, timely and cost-efficient mission support system as a direct consequence of the GFSS.[64]

---

[59] Ibid, pp. 6-7.
[60] Ibid, pp. 23-33.
[61] UN, "Report of the Secretary-General, Global Field Support Strategy", A/64/633, January 2010.
[62] Interview, New York, October 2013.
[63] Richard Gowan and Megan Gleason, "UN Peacekeeping: The Next Five Years", 2012, p. 8.
[64] UN, "Report of the Secretary-General, Third annual progress report on the implementation of the global field support strategy", A/67/633, December 2012. For all progress reports, see http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/issues/fieldsupport.shtml

3.1.4 Implications of Increasing Demands on Support and Supply to UN Missions

Today's peacekeeping missions face tremendous challenges in the area of mission support. They are often deployed to hostile areas with little infrastructure to support them. The creation of DFS corresponded to a mounting pressure on support and supply to the missions.

However, many challenges remain. The ability to deploy quickly is still deficient and missions still take much too long to become fully operational. Some missions are in a "start-up phase" years after initial deployment.[65] Given that experience and research alike highlight the importance of a peacekeeping mission being able to deploy quickly in order to establish its authority and create crucial partnerships with stakeholders, this is a major issue for the organisation. While partnerships with other organisations or the private sector could help, the UN will have to improve its ability to rapidly deploy. Logistics is one part of the problem, administrative issues such as recruitment and procurement another. The introduction of the Civilian Capacity Initiative and the development of rosters for peacekeepers are steps towards faster deployment, even though deployment of civilian personnel is still a major challenge.[66]

Furthermore, implementation of the GFSS has not been without challenges. Several problems are highlighted in a 2013 report by the Board of Auditors on the implementation of the GFSS, such as weak project governance, poor reporting and a lack of effective implementation plans.[67]

As further discussed in chapter 4, there is a high probability of a continued strong demand for UN peacekeepers and, accordingly, a continued high demand for mission support. This is likely to be accompanied by discussions about robust missions, the need for advanced technology and information requirements. Should the missions develop towards more offensive interventions (see section 3.1.3), this will bring tremendous challenges for the support side. New capabilities for information, enhanced mobility for troops and access to some advanced technological innovations would be required – capabilities that are already in short supply.

The UN will also have to strengthen its human resources system, an issue highlighted in several interviews as especially pressing. The UN needs to

---

[65] Interview, New York, October 2013.

[66] Interviews, New York, October, 2013.

[67] UN, "Report of the Board of Auditors, Volume II, United Nations peacekeeping operations", A/67/5 (Vol. II), 2013. Other interlinked reform efforts such as the enterprise resource planning project (Umoja) or the International Public Sector Accounting Standards (IPSAS) will not be further elaborated here but will greatly affect the inner workings of the UN.

continue developing its processes for hiring, training and filling the missions with the right people – the latter a key area which is still the source of much criticism.

If western countries return to UN peacekeeping, it could boost the resource side of the missions substantially. Several key enablers, such as engineers, intelligence capabilities or helicopters, could potentially follow from a renewed engagement by certain countries. However, this would also force DPKO and DFS to approach force generation, planning and mission support in new ways if they are to make the most of such capabilities. Today's "numbers-driven approach"[68], i.e. the tendency to focus on filling templates with numbers of troops rather than looking for the right capabilities, would not work under such circumstances. This calls for a new partnership between the Secretariat and TCCs in order to find suitable solutions together.

3.1.5   Re-calibrating Peacekeeping Missions

Even though the UN has been through several major reform processes, it still struggles to keep up with ever changing demands for new and innovative ways to combat conflict. While many of the issues in the Brahimi Report have been addressed, new issues have emerged, forcing the UN to continuously adapt. In the fast-changing world of peace support, the search for improvement is far from over.

There are now discussions in the UN about "flexibility" and the need to find tailor-made interventions, as opposed to the template-focused approach that has guided planning for some time. While the traditional Chapter VII peacekeeping mission, with large numbers of military and police personnel on the ground, is still the norm, new, ad hoc solutions are increasingly being sought in several missions. This section considers two potential developments – a larger focus on lighter non-military engagements or more robust peacekeeping.

Looking for alternatives to the standard model of peacekeeping has already produced innovations. Cooperation with regional organisations, further explored in section 3.2.2, has produced sequential (UN-EU in Chad/ the Central African Republic), parallel (UN-EU in the DRC) and hybrid (UN-AU in Sudan) missions. UN support to the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) has created new procedures and structures in the search for flexible responses to an extremely difficult situation. In addition, UN authorisation for a mission led by

---

[68] Adam C. Smith and Arthur Boutellis, "Rethinking Force Generation: Filling the Capability Gaps in UN Peacekeeping", Providing for Peacekeeping No. 2, IPI, May 2013.

another organisation, such as that of NATO in Libya, has introduced new dynamics to peace efforts.

Another innovation was the Multinational Stand-By High Readiness Brigade for United Nations Operations (SHIRBRIG), introduced in 1996 by seven member states with the aim of strengthening the UN's rapid deployment capability. Discussions on stand-by forces, ready to deploy at short notice, had been on the agenda for some time as the UN struggled with new demands for speedy interventions in the post-Cold War world. The SHIRBRIG concept had a permanent headquarters in Denmark, and a multinational brigade of a maximum of 5 000 troops. The SHIRBRIG was an entry force, able to sustain its operations for up to two months, when a UN mission would take over. SHIRBRIG first deployed in 2000 to Eritrea and Ethiopia. Until its disbandment in 2009, SHIRBRIG participated in several missions in Africa and engaged in capacity building activities with African counterparts. In 2009, its members decided to terminate SHIRBRIG, citing "…the organisation's cumbersome decision-making process as well as the persistent absence of resources and political will" as the reasons.[69]

Today, the increased willingness to look for new and flexible approaches to peacekeeping points in two paradoxical directions. The first is towards more robust peacekeeping mandates, which authorise the possibility of more offensive mandate implementation and, at least in theory, better resourced forces. The other follows from those who advocate a shift in peacekeeping towards lighter, non-military engagements. These trends are not necessarily mutually exclusive, but rather exemplify a shift towards more ad hoc solutions.

3.1.5.1 Special Political Missions

Special political missions (SPMs), run by the Department of Political Affairs (DPA), are deployed with the objective of preventing or resolving conflict and building sustainable peace. The United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL) and the United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia (UNSOM) are two such missions. SPMs are by no means new – such missions have been deployed since the founding of the UN, starting with Count Folke Bernadotte's appointment as a Mediator in Palestine in 1948. In recent years, however, they have grown both in number and complexity.

SPMs are not peacekeeping missions, as the term is used in the UN, and do not employ uniformed peacekeeping personnel. Still, they are of interest to this study given the now widely recognised close link between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Except for the size of the different types of missions, other

---

[69] SHIRBRIG, "SHIRBRIG Lessons Learned Report", June 2009.

distinctions are becoming less important. SPMs take on tasks in areas such as SSR and Rule of Law, which are key also for peacekeeping missions, and can deploy armed "protection forces". Here, the SPMs are used as an example of the UN's willingness to look for alternatives to traditional peacekeeping missions when contexts have called for new and innovative engagements. The SPMs have important peacebuilding and peacekeeping implications as they touch on areas such as transnational organised crime, mediation and capacity building. Cooperation with other parts of the peacekeeping system in the UN has therefore grown in importance.

The increasing emphasis on SPMs is a recognition that the UN might not have the capacity or the political backing to instil peace, but does have other resources that can play a positive role. In addition, the lower costs of SPMs can appear attractive in times of fiscal restraint. While many of these missions still require some military components for security, they can focus their attention on the political process and coordination of international efforts. However, there is also a recognition that such missions are not enough to replace peacekeeping missions everywhere.[70] The Security Council recently approved a military protection force to support the political mission in the Central African Republic (CAR). These types of arrangements, where the UN has strictly political mandates but still needs military forces for protection could very well become a model for future engagements.

3.1.5.2 Robust Peacekeeping

The discussion about robust peacekeeping is not new. Since the end of the 1990s it has been acknowledged that the UN has to pack a credible punch in order to be able to defend its forces and mandate in some particularly difficult missions. Several missions have also been mandated to "use all necessary means" to protect the mandate, which often includes the protection of civilians. The UN distinguishes between robust peacekeeping and peacemaking by stating that a robust mandate only authorises the use of force at the tactical level and requires the consent of the parties.[71] DPKO in 2009 provided the following definition of robust peacekeeping:

> a posture by a peacekeeping operation that demonstrates willingness, capacity and capability to deter and confront, including through the use of force when necessary, an obstruction to the implementation of its mandate.[72]

---

[70] Richard Gowan and Megan Gleason, "UN Peacekeeping: The Next Five Years", 2012, p. 9 and Alischa Kugel, "No helmets, just suits – Political missions as an instrument of the UN Security Council for civilian conflict management", March 2011, p. 1.

[71] UN, "UN Peacekeeping Operations, Principles and Guidelines", 2008.

[72] UN DPKO/DFS, "Draft DPKO/DFS Concept Note on Robust Peacekeeping",

The introduction of the Force Intervention Brigade[73] in the United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) marks a new way of conducting peacekeeping. Following years of failed attempts to bring an end to the violence in the DRC, and mounting criticism of the UN's inability to protect the civilian population, the Security Council in 2013 authorised an Intervention Brigade to use offensive measures to neutralise rebel groups in eastern DRC. Importantly, the 3 000-strong Brigade consists of South African, Tanzanian and Malawian troops, adding regional pressure to end hostilities. The new troops include Special Forces and support such as aerial reconnaissance, intelligence and planning.

Thus far, the Intervention Brigade has made an impact, helping to force the armed rebel group M23 to end its military actions and in November 2013 declare its willingness to engage in disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) programmes. MONUSCO's Force Commander and the SRSG have been set on implementing the new mandate to the fullest, and the mission's new approach could restore some of the UN's credibility in the DRC. The Brigade's operations do not appear to have led to the targeting of civilian internationals, but such fears remain. Several member states also raised fears that it could set a new precedence for UN peacekeeping, with the missions moving closer to peace making. Whether the Intervention Brigade will be able to create enough space for a political process to address the root causes of the conflict remains to be seen.

The issue of robust peacekeeping is also interesting in the context of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA). MINUSMA operates under robust rules of engagement and is allowed to use all necessary means to address threats to the mandate. Of course, the interpretation of the mandate and translation into plans will be important, as will the resources made available, in determining how robustly MINUSMA will act. MINUSMA is deployed side-by-side, but closely coordinated, with French forces working under the framework of *Operation Serval*. They are mandated to provide support to MINUSMA in times of crisis and will act as the "sharp end of the spear" in Mali. However, it is likely that UN forces will find themselves in situations where armed groups threaten either the mission or the implementation of the mandate. With a robust mandate and potentially more sophisticated resources, the mission could be moving in a more confrontational direction, potentially blurring the line between peacekeeping and peace enforcement. Key principles of peacekeeping, such as impartiality and consent, could be at risk,

---

January 2010, cited in Thierry Tardy, "Robust Peacekeeping: a False Good Idea?", 2010.

[73] For more information on the Intervention Brigade, see e.g. Carina Lamont and Emma Skeppström, "The United Nations at War in the DRC? Legal Aspects of the Intervention Brigade", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), December 2013.

something TCCs and some of the permanent members of the Security Council have expressed concerns about.[74] Furthermore, while *Operation Serval* should be distinct from MINUSMA, it might be difficult for conflicting parties to distinguish between the different forces.

The fact that peacekeeping missions are operating with increasingly complex mandates and in more hostile environments has put the spotlight on the UN's intelligence capacity. While intelligence remains a contentious issue within the UN – indeed, the word *intelligence* is rarely articulated – there is now a growing acceptance that the organisation needs timely and accurate information if it is to successfully carry out its missions, for example, where mandates call for the protection of civilians. Moreover, the need to know is crucial if the UN is to ensure the safety of its staff in the field. Consequently, the UN's operational intelligence capacity has developed in recent years.

In recognition of the increasing need for effective intelligence, the UN in 2005 set up so-called Joint Mission Analysis Centres (JMACs), initially in the missions in Haiti, the DRC, Liberia and Burundi. JMACs have since been established in a number of peacekeeping missions. The centres are made up of military, police and civilian analysts who produce integrated analytical products for the mission leadership, and who all report exclusively to the civilian JMAC chief.[75]

Recent developments have also occurred in intelligence gathering at the operational level, including the use of technology to improve situational awareness. After years of debate, the UN's use of unarmed aerial surveillance drones (so called UAVs) in the DRC began on 3 December, 2013.[76] The use of surveillance drones has been suggested in other conflict locations, but this will likely depend on results in the DRC.

However, resistance to UAVs is considerable, which is reflected in the five years it took for the UN to convince member states that it needed them in the DRC. One reason is concern about access to and control of the imagery and information collected by the drones. Some member states worry that their use will lead to intelligence-gathering controlled by the richer countries that supply the drones.[77] Similarly, there are fears that the UAVs will collect intelligence beyond that which they are mandated to collect. Bordering countries may for

---

[74] Thierry Tardy, "Mali: The UN takes over", May 2013.

[75] Melanie Ramjoué, "Improving United Nations Intelligence: Lessons from the Field", Geneva Centre for Security Policy, GCSP Policy Paper No. 19, August 2011.

[76] UN News Centre, "UN launches unmanned surveillance aircraft to better protect civilians in vast DR Congo", 3 December 2013.

[77] Colum Lynch, "U.N. wants to use drones for peacekeeping missions", *Washington Post*, 8 January 2013.

example have concerns that they will also be surveyed. Some governments worry that the use of unarmed surveillance drones is a step towards using armed drones – a step which could easily be taken should a conflict worsen. Many member states had first-hand experience of what drones could do during the "War on Terror".[78] The UN has tried to still such fears, emphasising that it will only use unarmed UAVs. Part of the debate also boils down to concerns among TCCs that cheaper and more efficient technology will weaken demand for their military forces in peacekeeping missions.

Many of the same concerns have put the brakes on progress on UN intelligence capacity in general. Although there have been some developments with regard to operational intelligence, it has been more difficult to move forward at the strategic level. Differences among member states have hampered efforts to improve situational awareness in New York.[79] An attempt by Secretary-General Kofi Annan to set up an Information and Strategic Analysis Secretariat (ISAS) to support his Executive Committee on Peace and Security, for example, was blocked by the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). The UN finally got the green light to establish an Assessment Unit within the Office of Military Affairs (OMA) of the DPKO in 2009.[80]

3.1.6   Implications of New Approaches to Peacekeeping

The UN is currently looking for innovative and flexible ways to engage in peacekeeping. New challenges come from the outside (e.g. increasing threats and volatile political situations) and from within (e.g. calls for early peacebuilding and the protection of civilians). This leads the UN to look for new capabilities and partnerships. A move away from the traditional, big, and often static peacekeeping missions would require innovation and probably a period of trial and error. The interest in both more robust and lighter missions is key to these developments. The effects of the financial crisis and the continued difficulties in manning the peacekeeping missions should also be recognised. While the

---

[78] Interviews, New York, October 2013.

[79] Attempts included the Office for Research and Collection of Information (ORCI) and an Information and Research (I&R) unit in the Situation Centre. See for instance A. Walter Dorn, "United Nations Peacekeeping Intelligence", originally published in Loch K. Johnson (ed.), The Oxford Handbook of National Security Intelligence, Oxford University Press (2010), Per Martin Norheim-Martinsen and Jacob Aasland, "Towards Intelligence-Driven Peace Operations? The Evolution of UN and EU Intelligence Structures", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 18, No. 4, August 2011.

[80] A. Walter Dorn, "United Nations Peacekeeping Intelligence", originally published in Loch K. Johnson (ed.), "The Oxford Handbook of National Security Intelligence", Oxford University Press 2010.

peacekeeping budget has not been cut, most UN missions struggle with tight budgets as well as calls for downsizing and "doing more with less".

The Intervention Brigade is unique in several ways and could have important operational and political implications for the UN. At the operational level the mandate means that key peacekeeping principles such as the use of force only in self-defence, consent of the parties and impartiality are being seriously challenged. The offensive stance also raises questions about whether MONUSCO is now becoming a party to the conflict, effectively turning peacekeepers into combatants. Close cooperation with the DRC government and support for its armed forces could fuel this development. This, in turn, could have serious consequences for other UN entities and humanitarian organisations in the DRC which fear that the rebels could start targeting UN and other personnel as a consequence.[81]

Politically, it marks a step towards peacemaking, a direction that many large troop contributors do not favour. Several traditional TCCs, such as India and Pakistan, do not want their troops deployed in more hostile environments, something which a more offensive approach, if pursued broadly, would lead to.[82] Discussions in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations – also known as the C34 – in 2010 revealed big differences between member states, and many of the NAM countries were critical.[83] Tardy argues that western states have promoted "robustness" as an answer to most challenges in UN missions while ignoring the need for political support and broad participation by UN member states.[84] He notes that the term "robust" is really more about effectiveness – that peacekeepers should have the mandate and resources to be able to carry out their mission. While many member states would probably agree, references to "robust peacekeeping" today often tend to mean tougher and more offensive missions.[85] Many countries are suspicious about the way in which robust peacekeeping has been framed, and see it as a step away from the fundamental principles of peacekeeping.

---

[81] *Washington Post*, "In volatile Congo, a new U.N. force with teeth", November 2, 2013, and *New York Times*, "New U.N. Brigade's Aggressive Stance in Africa Brings Success, and Risks", November 12, 2013.

[82] *World Politics Review*, "Diplomatic Fallout: U.N.'s 'Intervention Brigade' Raises Cost of Interference in DRC", April 8, 2013, interviews in New York, October 2013, and *New York Times*, "New U.N. Brigade's Aggressive Stance in Africa Brings Success, and Risks", November 12, 2013.

[83] Thierry Tardy "Robust Peacekeeping: a False Good Idea?", p. 67, in Cedric de Coning, Andreas Oien Stensland and Thierry Tardy (eds.), "Beyond the 'New Horizon' – Proceedings from the UN Peacekeeping Future Challenges Seminar Geneva", 23–24 June 2010.

[84] Ibid, p. 69.

[85] Ibid, p. 70.

For the UN, this is a dangerous road to tread as many traditional TCCs could lose their appetite for UN peacekeeping, not least when they are being asked by countries that do not put boots on the ground to implement a potentially more dangerous and definitely more difficult and demanding approach. Robust peacekeeping could change the way a UN mission is viewed by the host country's government, population and spoiler groups. It could affect its legitimacy and impartiality in the eyes of stakeholders. Without strong support from the host country, TCCs and the wider international community it will be difficult, if not impossible, to implement a robust mission. Furthermore, many countries would simply refuse to have a robust UN presence on their soil, narrowing the possibilities of even deploying such missions.

The challenges in the DRC are enormous, of course, and MONUSCO will never be able to bring peace to the country without a firm commitment from the government and its neighbours to find a long-term solution. If the Intervention Brigade however is able to influence the conflict in a positive direction, something MONUSCO has failed to do for so long, the question arises: What would that mean for the future of peacekeeping missions? The push towards more robust peacekeeping by some countries will be a major area of concern for the UN in the coming years, and one which will greatly shape the direction of peacekeeping for some time to come.

The Intervention Brigade and the deployment of MINUSMA also highlight the importance of intelligence, which it needs if it is to engage with rebels and protect civilians. Overall, the UN's capacity for intelligence analysis is relatively strong and, with its many thousands of staff posted around the world, it has unparalleled human intelligence resources for observing developments in the field. Its capacity for collecting intelligence, on the other hand, is very limited.[86] The go-ahead for the use of surveillance drones in the DRC was a big step forward, but the UN does not have much high-technology equipment at its disposal. The UN employs monitoring technologies in some missions, but in a largely unsystematic way.[87] This shortage is likely to pose a considerable challenge to the UN in future peacekeeping operations.

One, albeit perhaps expensive, solution could be to contract commercial resources. Another solution could be the return of western countries to UN peacekeeping. The Dutch contribution to operations in Mali, including four Apache attack helicopters, intelligence officers and Special Forces, could mark a new phase in UN peacekeeping. It not only signifies the return of a European

---

[86] Interview, New York, October 2013.

[87] A. Walter Dorn, "United Nations Peacekeeping Intelligence", originally published in Loch K. Johnson (ed.), "The Oxford Handbook of National Security Intelligence", Oxford University Press 2010.

country with advanced capabilities much needed in peacekeeping missions, but also shows that intelligence is becoming more accepted as peacekeepers deploy to hostile environments. Importantly, new TCCs are also likely to come with new information flows as governments are more inclined to provide intelligence to UN missions when their own troops are deployed to those missions.[88]

While the need for operational intelligence capacities – restricted in terms of time and geographical space – now seems to be more widely accepted by member states, the UN's capacity for strategic intelligence remains limited. This is mainly due to concerns among some governments about the UN's inability to keep secrets, issues of sovereignty, and that the UN would be used by powerful member states to spy on them. Such concerns are unlikely to disappear.

One consequence of the above, and a key obstacle to the UN's intelligence capability, is that it lacks a an effective system with which to communicate restricted information. This obviously poses major challenges to coordination – internal as well as external – with partners. In addition, it may come to test the UN's ability to collect intelligence. The use of drones and other advanced technology to gather data will for example require an ability to handle that information, in terms of analytical capacity, and also to transfer sensitive information.

The SPMs represent an easier sell to member states. They are less costly and, while they might be dangerous, do not put member states' troops in harm's way. In a recent Secretary-General report on SPMs, the missions are said to have "…demonstrated their ability to defuse tensions, help countries to step back from the brink of conflict, and support national efforts to build a sustainable peace".[89]

Their biggest advantage is perhaps that they allow the UN to focus on some of the things that the organisation does best: facilitate political dialogue, strengthen human rights and engage in capacity-building processes. There is a fear in the UN, as well as among many member states, that peacekeeping missions have grown too broad, including too many components and activities. The risk of "Christmas tree mandates", where every policy area is hung on the tree to satisfy everyone, is real and something that the Secretariat is very aware of.

The SPMs can also be less threatening in the eyes of host countries and less contentious among UN member states. Thus, they provide the UN with an option to establish a presence in a country where it would not be able, due to political or operational constrains, to deploy a peacekeeping mission.

---

[88] Ibid.
[89] UN, "Report of the Secretary General, Overall policy matters pertaining to special political missions", A/68/223, July 2013.

This does however raise the question: if the UN will not send peacekeepers into conflicts – who will? Some missions need the recourse to military force to keep the peace and the UN is if not the only, then one of very few organisations that is able to sustain long-term, multidimensional peacekeeping missions. In Libya, Afghanistan and Somalia, other organisations have answered the call for military intervention with the UN mandating NATO and the AU primary responsibility for the operations. Increased cooperation with regional organisations and other partners could make it possible for the UN to focus its efforts on fewer areas, be it security, the rule of law or the political process. It is, however, unlikely that the UN would seek to limit its role in future peacekeeping missions. While there is a need for a debate on the UN's role in peacekeeping, the organisation is more likely to look for a broader set of possible operations than to limit its options.

3.2 Coordination and Integration in UN Peacekeeping

Coordination and integration, internal as well as external, have become central to the way the UN conducts its peacekeeping missions. Effective coordination can strengthen UN capacity in many ways. If different actors can find ways to share burdens and add to each other's work, much can be won. The realisation that the military can only accomplish so much – even more apparent in many intra-state conflicts – has led to a search for ways to incorporate political, military, rule of law, humanitarian and aid actors into a single framework for peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Coordination and integration have become something of a mantra in western concept- and doctrine-development, even if the results in the field have arguably been less obvious.

The UN has been at the forefront of this development, driven by the multidimensional character of UN peacekeeping. The range of tools that the UN has at its disposal in peacekeeping missions is unique. Also, as the UN increasingly emphasises the link between peacekeeping and peacebuilding, coordination between the missions and other UN entities engaged in long-term peacebuilding activities becomes critical. Below, issues connected to internal and external coordination are discussed. The first section deals with internal UN coordination for peacekeeping missions. The following section looks at coordination with external partners, an approach increasingly pursued by the UN over the last 10 years.

3.2.1 Internal Integration: From All-Inclusive to Minimum Standards

Since the 1990s, there has been an ongoing push towards integrated responses to conflict. Multilateral organisations, as well as governments around the world,

have developed different concepts for "whole-of-government" or
"comprehensive approaches" to peacekeeping.[90] In 2006, the UN stated that:

> Integration is the guiding principle for the planning, design and implementation of
> complex UN operations in post-conflict situations, for linking the different dimensions
> of peace support operations (political, development, humanitarian, human rights, rule
> of law, social and security), and integrating the imperatives of each dimension into its
> strategic thinking and design.[91]

The command and control structure thus reflects the multidimensional nature of
the UN. The civilian/political primacy of UN peacekeeping affects the way
missions are carried out. The role of the SRSG is key as he or she leads the full
spectrum of civilian and military efforts in the country. If the SRSG is able to
fully utilise and coordinate the efforts of all components under his/her authority,
the UN can play a major role in peace processes.

Although already under way during the 1990s, with initiatives such as *An
Agenda for Peace*[92] and the creation of DPKO, real progress was not made until
after 2000. Again, past failures were an important drive behind the reforms.
When UN peacekeeping quickly expanded in the 1990s in both scale and
complexity it became clear that in order to plan and support multidimensional
peacekeeping effectively, better coordination was necessary in the Secretariat as
well as between the Secretariat and the UN funds and programmes. Innovations
for greater coordination in the field soon followed.[93] New ways to strengthen
partnerships with actors outside of the UN family are currently being sought; a
process which Gowan and Gleason argue will be a deciding factor in the
"strategic future" of UN peacekeeping.[94] This is explored further in section 3.2.2.

Between 2000 and 2001, several initiatives were launched to enhance coherence
and integration in peacekeeping. Again, the Brahimi Report provided important
input, highlighting the need for coordination in peacekeeping missions.
Furthermore, the introduction of Integrated Mission Task Forces marked an early
structural innovation to foster integration in the missions. The introduction of the
triple-hatted Deputy SRSG (adding Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian

---

[90] See e.g. Claes Nilsson et al, "Contextualising the Comprehensive Approach – The Elements of a
Comprehensive Intervention", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), December 2008.

[91] UN, "Integrated Missions Planning Process, Guidelines endorsed by the Secretary-General on 13
June 2006", 2006, p. 3. The primacy of this principle has later been confirmed in e.g. a Policy
Committee decision of 2008, Decision number 2008/24, and the Policy of Integrated Assessment
and Planning in 2013.

[92] UN, "Report of the Secretary General, An Agenda for Peace – Preventive diplomacy,
peacemaking and peace-keeping", A/47/277 - S/24111, 1992.

[93] For an interesting discussion on UN integration see Arthur Boutellis, "Driving the System Apart?
A Study of United Nations Integration and Integrated Strategic Planning", IPI, 2013.

[94] Richard Gowan and Megan Gleason, "UN Peacekeeping: The Next Five Years", 2012, p. 10.

Coordinator – DSRSG/RC/HC) in 2001 was a major step, facilitating coordination between the UN country team, humanitarian actors and the peacekeeping mission.

The next phase of innovation occurred roughly between 2006 and 2008, and saw the establishment of the Integrated Missions concept. Building on the 2005 *Report on Integrated Missions*,[95] the concept was important as it gave structure to the principle of coordination. A Secretary-General note on the roles of the SRSG and the DSRSG/RC/HC,[96] and the launch of the Integrated Missions Planning Process (IMPP),[97] both documents published in 2006, laid the foundations for the Integrated Mission concept. Guiding principles included that missions would establish a single, mission-wide strategic vision, implemented through an integrated command structure with one person, the SRSG, ultimately responsible for the entire UN presence in the field.

The processes and structures that would produce a common vision as well as integrated analysis and planning throughout the peacekeeping mission were detailed in the IMPP. It provided guidance on the planning for a mission, establishing both structure – such as the Integrated Missions Task Force (HQ) and Integrated Missions Planning team (in the field) – and process – from analysis and pre-deployment planning to transition and exit planning. The IMPP highlighted the need to adapt the process to each (unique) mission, while also outlining the necessary outputs and decision points. The IMPP was envisaged as an additional layer of planning, striving to create coherence among the different entities' respective plans.[98] In 2008, the IMPP was supplemented by the Integrated Strategic Framework, a set of guidelines for the integration of peacekeeping missions and the UN Country Teams.[99]

In 2013 the Secretary-General endorsed the new Integrated Assessment and Planning policy, effectively disbanding the IMPP.[100] The policy is less detailed than the IMPP, which was criticised for overwhelming planners with outputs and structures. Instead, it centres on a few guiding principles and lays down the minimum requirements for any integrated UN-presence. The guiding principles include, for instance, flexibility and adaptation to the situation, inclusivity, awareness of the UN's role as one of several actors and recognition of the diversity of UN engagement. In line with this more focused approach, the policy

---

[95] Espen Barth Eide et al., "Report on Integrated Missions: Practical Perspectives and recommendations, Independent Study for the Expanded UN ECHA Core Group", May 2005.

[96] UN Secretary-General, "Note of Guidance on Integrated Missions", January 17, 2006,

[97] UN, "Integrated Missions Planning Process, Guidelines endorsed by the Secretary-General on 13 June 2006", 2006.

[98] Ibid.

[99] UN Secretary-General, "Decision No. 2008/24 – Integration", 2008.

[100] UN, "Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning", April 2013.

outlines four different sets of minimum requirements that every integrated UN presence should develop:

- A Joint Strategic Assessment to create a shared understanding of the conflict and overarching priorities;

- A common vision, including the priorities and responsibilities of UN actors (i.e. the Integrated Strategic Framework);

- The establishment of integrated mechanisms for analysis, planning, coordination, monitoring and decision-making, in the field and at HQ;

- Integrated monitoring and reporting on the implementation of the Integrated Strategic Framework.[101]

The IAP stresses the need to approach every potential new mission as unique and to plan accordingly – also when it comes to integration. Except for the four requirements, planners are free to set up coordination mechanisms suitable to each situation. This is in line with the broader focus on "flexible" planning of missions and recognises that ad hoc coordination in the field has often been effective in the past. Furthermore, the IAP could help relieve some of the "integration fatigue" (see below) by stressing that joint analysis should also determine when it is *not* appropriate to coordinate or integrate UN efforts. Analysis focuses on identifying areas where integration leads to synergies or at least to avoidance of duplication of efforts. Those that do not have an immediate role to play in an integrated mission will therefore not be "forced" to deploy much needed resources in meaningless and frustrating coordination efforts.

Other notable reforms included the decision in 2006 to introduce Joint Operation Centres (JOCs) and JMACs. While JOCs and JMACs had already been used in some missions, a Policy Directive in 2006 established that every peacekeeping mission should have them in order to establish mission-wide situational awareness through integrated reporting (JOC) and the ability to provide the mission leadership with integrated analysis products (JMAC).[102] The creation of DFS, with the integration of all mission support capacities into one entity, also strengthened integration, although it also created coordination requirements with DPKO, among others.

In 2006, the "Peace Operations 2010" process was initiated as a follow-up to the Brahimi Report. Although not focused exclusively on integration, it did introduce

---

[101] Ibid, p. 7.
[102] UN DPKO "Policy Directive, Joint Operations Centres and Joint Mission Analysis Centres", July 2006.

the Integrated Operational Teams (IOTs) in the Secretariat.[103] The IOTs were later set up as the main point of entry for the missions as well as for other UN entities, external organisations and member states. They are multifunctional entities, comprised of personnel from relevant departments in the Secretariat. The rationale was to set up a single backstopping entity that could handle the full range of operational support to the missions as well as the requirements of the HQ leadership. The IOTs are intended to support all aspects of the mission cycle, including integrated planning, reporting and monitoring.[104]

3.2.2 Implications of UN Integration and the Dismantling of the Integrated Mission

The military component in a UN-led mission plays a different role to that of an AU or a NATO force. While a NATO-led operation can have goals which affect or facilitate the political process in a country, its command structure is geared so that the military force can function as effectively as possible. In a UN mission, the command and control system is geared so that the military force can support the political peace process as effectively as possible. This could mean that what might be the most appropriate course of action from a military perspective may not be the most relevant course of action for the mission as a whole, and may therefore have to be reconsidered. While the decision-making in any UN mission often includes the Force Commander and the heads of the major components, the military is still only part of the wider UN mission. This can be compared for example to ISAF in Afghanistan, where civilian components have been added to a military mission.

The UN has arguably come a long way towards better coordinated responses to conflicts. The organisation has been able to formulate and agree on an organisation-wide approach to integration in peacekeeping, and develop the necessary policy, structures and guidelines to guide its implementation. There has been continuous striving to improve policy and structure, building on experiences from past missions. Several missions have come up with innovative ways to coordinate activities in the field, often with good results. The UN is the only organisation today that is capable of implementing multifunctional missions involving rule of law, military, police, humanitarian and civilian actors in one coordinated effort. A unified command structure with a common budget adds to

---

[103] UN Report of the Secretary-General, "Overview of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations: budget performance for the period from 1 July 2004 to 30 June 2005 and budget for the period from 1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007", A/60/696, 2006. The other initiatives concerned personnel, doctrine, partnerships and resources.

[104] UN, Report of the Secretary-General, "Comprehensive report on strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to manage and sustain peace operations", A/61/858, 2007, pp. 15 and 16.

the picture. There are, however, challenges still to be addressed. As with several other UN reforms, while the policies and guidelines might be in place, implementation has often been slow and ineffective. Furthermore, integration has been criticised since its introduction in the UN, a criticism that has gained momentum in recent years.

According to Arthur Boutellis, the integration agenda is facing increasing resistance, primarily from various actors within the UN system.[105] Boutellis describes an "integration fatigue" that has grown out of the difficulties in demonstrating the results of integration, high transaction costs and the lack of rewards for integration. Furthermore, he argues that the changing strategic context, in an increasingly complex, multi-actor environment, makes integration even more difficult – putting additional strain on the system.[106] Interviews for this study confirmed the increasing scepticism about integration within the UN.[107] The relationship between humanitarians and peacekeepers has always been contentious. Humanitarians argue the importance of a "humanitarian space" while peacekeepers highlight the need for a coherent response in conflict-affected countries. For some time, the intra-UN debate seemed to have been settled, but is now said to be on the rise with humanitarians stressing the importance of being separate from the military components of peacekeeping missions. From a non-peacekeeping perspective, there are also concerns that when new missions deploy all the resources are directed towards the missions while other actors, UN and external, see their budgets shrink.

The recent deployment to Mali and a new robust capacity in the DRC have fuelled the debate. Some UN humanitarian staff as well as humanitarian non-governmental organisations (NGOs) fear that increasingly blurred lines between the different actors will make it impossible for parties to the conflict to make a distinction between, for example, military and humanitarian agencies. This, in turn, will put humanitarian actors at greater risk and, as a consequence, hinder their work. In addition, some humanitarian actors fear that humanitarian priorities and activities will be subordinate to UN political interests. This is not a new debate, but interviewees concurred that it had gained renewed intensity due to the more risky environments in which UN missions operate today.

A 2011 study by the Humanitarian Policy Group and the Stimson Center, commissioned by the UN Integration Steering Group, concluded that the UN's integration policies had had both positive and negative effects on humanitarian

---

[105] Arthur Boutellis, "Driving the System Apart? A Study of United Nations Integration and Integrated Strategic Planning", IPI, 2013.
[106] Ibid, p. 1.
[107] Interviews, New York, October 2013.

space.[108] The report called for a more context-driven design of UN integration arrangements and suggested greater caution in integrating structures in settings with high risk and violent conflict, where the UN mandate and activities are disputed, and where actors cannot distinguish between humanitarian and other entities. However, while noting that different levels of structural integration may be appropriate, strategic integration was always seen as important in order to ensure coherence and realise synergies.

In reaction to the study, InterAction – an alliance of more than 180 US-based international NGOs – issued a statement saying that the UN's Integration Policy, requiring UN humanitarian agencies to operate together with political missions, was incompatible with the humanitarian principles of humanity, neutrality, impartiality and independence.[109] Concern among humanitarian actors has led some NGOs to distance themselves from the UN,[110] with some even withdrawing from UN humanitarian coordination mechanisms in countries such as Afghanistan.

Reviews of the initiatives for integration described above have been mixed. The IOTs received both praise and criticism from interviewees. They do not seem to have been able to overcome bureaucratic rivalries. Another criticism was that they have lacked the appropriate mandates, which has led component heads in the field to turn directly to their "home" organisation for support.[111]

The introduction of JMACs and JOCs was very much in line with the drive for integration in UN peacekeeping. The civil-military character of the JMACs and JOCs follows naturally on from multidimensional peacekeeping. There was a general consensus in the interviews that while the UN still struggles with issues pertaining to information and intelligence, especially at the strategic level, the JOCs/JMACs have improved missions' capacity.[112] The JMACs have been found to be particularly valuable in larger missions, where they strengthen information management and dissemination across the mission. The civil-military interaction has reportedly been productive and provides a new and important aspect of intelligence for the missions.[113] A study by Malaine Jamjoué showed that civil-

---

[108] Victoria Metcalfe, Alison Giffen and Samir Elhawary, "UN Integration and Humanitarian Space – An Independent Study Commissioned by the UN Integration Steering Group", Humanitarian Policy Group and Stimson Center, December 2011.

[109] InterAction, "A Humanitarian Exception to the Integration Rule", Policy Statement, December 2011.

[110] Norwegian Refugee Council, "A Partnership at Risk? – The UN-NGO Relationship in Light of UN Integration", An NRC discussion paper, 16 February 2012.

[111] Interview, New York, October 2013.

[112] Interviews, New York, October 2013.

[113] Melanie Ramjoué, "Improving United Nations Intelligence: Lessons from the Field", GCSP Policy Paper # 19, 2011.

military collaboration within the JMACs worked surprisingly well – possibly indicating that there should be less worry about mixing UN staff. However, relations between JMACs and military intelligence teams were often strained. Military intelligence chiefs often perceived the JMAC as a competitor, or were not familiar with the JMAC structure – the equivalent of which cannot be found in most other military operations.[114]

The introduction of the Integrated Mission concept and the IMPP marked an important new step in the planning and implementation of UN peacekeeping missions, at least in theory. The IMPP provided the UN with guidance on how to plan and integrate the various bodies of the UN, at HQ and in the field, and highlighted the need for close coordination with external actors. However, the criticism from researchers as well as from within the UN system has been harsh, and the IMPP is now being abandoned.[115] Interviews for this study confirmed that the IMPP had not lived up to its promise. It was depicted as "too slow, too complicated and too bureaucratic",[116] buried in procedures and therefore not able to match the tempo of the missions. There was also a sense that the IMPP was too "military" and therefore alien to the civilians involved in planning. There has been a lack of monitoring of the integrated plans, meaning that it has been difficult to link coordination to achievements in the missions.

Boutellis raises the importance of being able to answer the "so what?" question – what has integration led to in terms of results?[117] The UN must be able to demonstrate, internally and externally, the impact of integration. What are the casual links between integration and better implementation of the mandate? How are stakeholders better served by the UN through an integrated approach? This has not materialised through the IMPP framework.[118]

To summarise, integration and coordination are key principles of UN peacekeeping. They have grown out of experience in the field, a recognition of

---

[114] Melanie Ramjoué, "Improving UN Intelligence through Civil-Military Collaboration: Lessons from the Joint Mission Analysis Centres", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 18, No. 4, August 2011.

[115] For more on the IMPP, see for instance, Cecilia Hull, "Integrated Missions – A Liberia Case Study", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), December 2008, and Arthur Boutellis, "Driving the System Apart? A Study of United Nations Integration and Integrated Strategic Planning", IPI, 2013.

[116] Interview, New York, October 2013.

[117] Arthur Boutellis, "Driving the System Apart? A Study of United Nations Integration and Integrated Strategic Planning", IPI, 2013, p. 17.

[118] That is not to say that the introduction of the IAP will automatically lead to better monitoring and reporting. The IMPP also had guidelines and procedures for integrated review and monitoring of the missions and it still failed to deliver. Without proper resources, leadership attention to monitoring and an explicit focus on the link between integration and impact any mission is likely to fail in this aspect, no matter what the policy.

the need to share burdens and the realisation that increasingly complex missions in increasingly complex conflicts necessitate coordination of efforts. The UN has come a long way, in many ways further than other multilateral organisations, in its efforts to maximise the effects of its full-spectrum capabilities, but the challenges are many and new ones are arising. As peacekeeping mandates grow in complexity, so does the issue of coordination. Furthermore, regardless of how well the UN manages to coordinate its own efforts, the organisation operates in a wider international system where it needs to interact and coordinate with a number of external actors. The UN will have to continue to look for flexible solutions to coordination in its missions in order to be effective. As one of the organisation's main strengths lies in its comprehensive response to conflict, including security, political and development instruments, integration and coordination are key. Other issues, such as coordination between DPKO and DPA, and the link between peacekeeping and peacebuilding will also play important roles in determining the UN's ability to respond to conflicts.

3.2.3 External Cooperation and the Growing Reliance on Partnerships

Peacekeeping is to an increasing extent being carried out in various forms of partnerships between the UN and regional organisations. All NATO ground operations have cooperated with the UN, the EU or the OSCE while more than two-thirds of the EU's peace missions have run in parallel with the UN.[119]

Today, such collaborations are becoming the norm, but they are by no means new. The UN Charter sets out in Chapter VIII that the Security Council can use regional organisations and arrangements for enforcement action. Such enforcement action must, however, be authorised by the Security Council.[120] Secretary-General Kofi Annan expressed the view in 1998 that regional organisations were especially suited to play an important role in early warning and preventive diplomacy, and called for a real partnership with a rational and cost-effective division of labour between them and the UN.[121] The Brahimi Report sounded a word of caution, noting that troops in the most crisis-prone areas were also often less prepared for peacekeeping, and called for support, for

---

[119] Richard Gowan and Megan Gleason, "UN Peacekeeping: The Next Five Years", New York University Center on International Cooperation, 27 November 2012.

[120] United Nations, Charter of the United Nations, "Chapter VIII: Regional Arrangements", 1945, http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter8.shtml.

[121] Thalif Deen, "POLITICS: World Peace Precarious, Warns U.N. Chief", *Inter Press Service*, 14 September 1998.

example, with training and equipment, to be provided to regional and sub-regional organisations.[122]

Collaborations between the UN and regional organisations open many doors. Partners' different comparative advantages allow for synergies to be achieved. Regional organisations may for example have a greater understanding of local culture and conditions, and have stronger networks and direct communication links with conflicting parties. It is also possible that regional organisations would feel a more direct sense of urgency if the conflict is closer at hand, and be able to deploy quicker because of their size, proximity and perhaps greater political commitment. Regional organisations may, however, for the same reasons be too close to the conflict and perhaps even partial. In addition, handing over implementation to a partner means that the UN loses control over the way in which peacekeeping is carried out. Should, for example, troops of partners be responsible for crimes and abuse, this would also damage the UN's credibility and legitimacy. This is not to say that misconduct does not occur in UN peacekeeping – on the contrary, several missions have been plagued by reports of abuse and exploitation. However, depending on partners makes these issues even more difficult to address.

The UN, for its part, can offer the multiple resources and instruments – political, economic as well as military – of a uniquely comprehensive organisation. Moreover, the global organisation carries unparalleled political weight and legitimacy. The UN may however be slower to act and find it difficult to garner political support for engagement.

Thus, the UN and regional organisations can complement each other. This has been increasingly recognised since the late 1990s, especially as it became clear that it was impossible for the UN alone to meet the rising demand for peacekeeping operations. The UN therefore increased collaboration with regional organisations as well as bilateral partners. Not only have organisations worked together as needs have arisen on the ground, but institutional linkages have also been established. Examples include the setting up of a UN DPKO Liaison Office in Brussels, a UN-AU Joint Task Force on Peace and Security and the appointment of a civilian NATO liaison officer at UN headquarters.[123]

Links between the UN and the world's different regional organisations vary a great deal, in terms of both content and strength. The partnership with the AU

---

[122] UN, "Identical letters dated 21 August 2000 from the Secretary-General to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council", A/55/305–S/2000/809, 2000, paragraph 54.
[123] Richard Gowan, "Inter-institutional Cooperation in Peace Operations: United Nations and Regional Organizations Challenges", in "International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations, Challenges Forum Report 2012", 2012.

stands out, reflecting the prominence of Africa in the realm of peace and security. Many of the UN's peacekeeping operations are located in Africa. Some 78 per cent of the personnel deployed in UN peacekeeping operations are based on the African continent, where 8 of the 15 current peacekeeping missions are based.[124]

Ties with the AU are especially strong. The AU Peace and Security Council meets regularly with members of the UN Security Council, and in 2010 the UN and the AU set up a Joint Task Force on Peace and Security (JTF). Other formal links between the two organisations include the establishment in the same year of an Office to the African Union (UNOAU) in Addis Ababa, and the UN's capacity-building programme for the AU to run from 2006 to 2016.

Similarly, the UN's relationship with the EU has developed in recent years. The official frameworks include a *Joint Declaration on EU-UN Cooperation in Crisis Management* of 2003, a *Joint Statement on UN-EU Cooperation in Crisis Management* of 2007, as well as the *Actions to Enhance EU CSDP Support to UN Peacekeeping* of 2011 and the ensuing *Plan of Action to Enhance EU CSDP Support to UN Peacekeeping* of 2012, which sets out how the actions are to be implemented. A Steering Committee has also been established to facilitate coordination between the EU and the UN.

The situation is different when it comes to NATO. NATO is largely a military organisation with its roots in the Cold War, and it is still viewed by many UN member states as mainly an extension of US foreign policy. In addition, NATO's military might has led some member states to worry that the UN will become dependent on NATO's resources and thus lose its autonomy and independence in terms of operations and decision-making.[125] In 2008, NATO and the UN signed a joint declaration establishing a formal relationship. The sensitivity of the issue, among some UN member states, of moving closer to NATO made the UN Secretariat urge NATO not to publish the accord, and order its staff to keep the signing as low-key as possible.[126]

When it comes to the conduct of peacekeeping operations, partnerships with regional organisations and bilateral partners take different forms.[127] One version is sequential operations, whereby for example a regional partner deploys first and

---

[124] UN, "United Nations Peacekeeping Operations", Factsheet 31 October 2013.

[125] Michael F. Harsch and Johannes Varwick, "NATO and the UN", *Survival*, 24 March 2009.

[126] Ibid.

[127] For more on organisational cooperation in peace operations, see e.g. Markus Derblom, Eva Hagström Frisell and Jennifer Schmidt, "UN-EU-AU Coordination in Peace Operations in Africa", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), November 2008 and Claes Nilsson and Erik Wikén, "Interorganisatorisk samverkan i fredsfrämjande insatser", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), December 2011.

is then replaced by a UN mission. In parallel operations, the UN operates side-by-side with one or more partners. Finally, hybrid operations are those in which the UN and one or more partners together form a single peace operation.

MINUSMA in Mali is a perfect example, illustrating the various forms of collaboration and what solutions with different partners can look like today. When MINUSMA was launched in April 2013, it replaced the African-led International Support Mission in Mali (AFISMA) – an AU/ECOWAS mission. In addition to this sequential partnership, MINUSMA now operates in parallel with the EU, which runs a training mission in Mali (EUTM Mali), supporting the rebuilding of the Malian armed forces. Furthermore, France has a sizeable military presence in Mali under *Operation Serval* and plans to maintain a 1000-strong force in the longer term to conduct counterterrorism operations.[128]

Somalia is another model. There, the AU has taken the lead, operating the AU Mission to Somalia (AMISOM). DFS meanwhile provides logistics and capacity support to the mission through the United Nations Support Office for AMISOM (UNSOA), in order to prepare for a possible UN peacekeeping operation.[129] The EU also has a training mission in Somalia (EUTM Somalia), which largely operates out of Uganda.

3.2.4   Implications of Relying on Partnerships

The reliance on regional partnerships is likely to continue. The UN cannot cope with every crisis on its own, and the potential complementary benefits and synergies that come from collaborations with regional partners are considerable. However, it is important to bear in mind that there are inherent obstacles to such collaborations.

Thierry Tardy lists five hindrances to partnerships between international institutions.[130] First, regional organisations are very different with regard to their mandate, institutional set-up, resources and political clout as crisis management actors. This makes it difficult to form any kind of uniform approach to partnerships and tends to lead instead to unbalanced relations. Second, inter-institutional relations by nature involve competition as much as cooperation, with security organisations struggling for a role in the international arena and competing for limited resources. Third, some partnerships stem from a North-

---

[128] Claire Mills, "In Brief: International Military Forces in Mali", House of Commons Library, 19 August 2013.

[129] UN Political Office for Somalia,
http://unpos.unmissions.org/Default.aspx?tabid=9731&language=en-US

[130] Thierry Tardy, "Building Partnerships in Peace Operations: The Limits of the Global/Regional Approach", GCSP Policy Paper no1, May 2010.

South divide and therefore emphasise the politicisation of inter-institutional relations. Thus, Tardy notes, the EU's and NATO's partnerships with the UN are a consequence of member states' reluctance to contribute troops to UN operations. A fourth obstacle is that while burden-sharing on the basis of comparative advantage drives much cooperation, almost all institutions strive to be successful in the whole spectrum of crisis management activities, which tends to result in duplication and competition. The final impediment to partnerships is that internal coordination is of more concern to all institutions, and thus takes precedence over developing external ties with others. In sum, this makes partnerships ad hoc and uneven.

Francesco Mancini concurs, pointing out that partnerships in peace operations face challenges such as trying to align the interests of different participants and identify the goals and priorities of a mission.[131] The chain of command and control is weakened by the resulting slowed decision-making process, the often-dispersed authority, and differences in partners' structures and processes. Moreover, the considerable effort required to establish and maintain a partnership means that the process – arrangements and instruments – takes focus away from the substance of the collaboration. Mancini also notes that partners entering partnerships are always unequal in terms of resources and mandates. Differences in contributions to collaborations often result in tensions and conflict over who delivers what.

While there have been several initiatives to strengthen links with regional organisations at the strategic level, it is interesting to note that much of the UN's cooperation with regional organisations has developed from the bottom up, driven by developments at the operational level.[132] The fact that collaborations have formed on the basis of needs on the ground rather than long-term strategic plans has often resulted in deficient coordination.[133] Indeed, the UN's own watchdog, the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS), concluded in a report in 2011 that cooperation with regional organisations in the field was often ad hoc and the result of pressing operational needs, resulting in little systematic institutional learning.[134] In addition, cooperation was often costly, involving

---

[131] Francesco Mancini, "Managing Partnership", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol.18, No.5, November 2011.

[132] See e.g. Tobias Pietz, "The European Union and UN Peacekeeping: Half-time for the EU's Action Plan", Center for International Peace Operations (ZIF), Policy Briefing, October 2013.

[133] Richard Gowan and Megan Gleason, "UN Peacekeeping: The Next Five Years", New York University Center on International Cooperation, 2012.

[134] The Office of Internal Oversight Services, "Thematic evaluation of cooperation between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Department of Field Support and regional organizations", A/65/762, 28 February 2011. According to interviews in New York, discussions on the engagements in Mali and CAR however indicated that coordination is now also being advocated from the top-down.

large investments of staff time in planning and communications. Different institutional structures and cultures, and a lack of understanding of these, hampered smooth collaboration.[135]

The UN's different partnerships enjoy different benefits and face different challenges. The AU, for example, has proved more willing to take risks and conduct peace making than the UN. This has resulted in a complementary pattern whereby the AU has been prepared to deploy more quickly in situations where there is no comprehensive peace agreement. The UN has then taken up the baton, being better equipped for long-term multidimensional peacebuilding.[136] While this seems to indicate complementary approaches to peacekeeping, it can also be a source of tension and disagreement between the two organisations as they may differ on when particular interventions are desirable. Moreover, collaboration between the UN and the AU is hindered by the AU's limited capacities and lack of predictable funding.[137] In turn, this has ignited concern and criticism over an asymmetrical relationship where the AU is highly dependent on external financial and logistical support from donors and the UN.[138]

The UN and the EU, on the other hand, stand apart from other organisations in that they both boast a full-range toolbox for peacebuilding, including for example military, political and economic instruments. However, the EU has had limited success in combining all these capacities in one mission, instead deploying separate missions alongside each other.[139] EU member states can offer various key enabling capacities to UN peacekeeping missions. At the same time, the complexity of the EU's institutions and the multiple political views of its member states have inhibited collaboration with other actors in the area of peace and security. It has also been suggested that the EU may not always be welcome and viewed as a legitimate partner by African governments, due to EU policies

---

[135] Ibid.

[136] Cedric de Coning, "The Evolution of Peace Operations in Africa: Trajectories and Trends", in Benjamin de Carvalho, Thomas Jaye, Yvonne Kasumba and Wafula Okumu (eds.), "Peacekeeping in Africa – The Evolving roles of the African Union and Regional Mechanisms", Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, 2010.

[137] Kwesi Aning, "Understanding the relationship between the UN, EU & AU in African Peacekeeping", in Benjamin de Carvalho, Thomas Jaye, Yvonne Kasumba and Wafula Okumu (eds.), "Peacekeeping in Africa – The Evolving roles of the African Union and Regional Mechanisms", Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, 2010.

[138] See e.g. Arthur Boutellis and Paul D. Williams, "Peace Operations, the African Union, and the United Nations: Toward More Effective Partnerships", IPI, April 2013.

[139] Cedric de Coning, "The Evolution of Peace Operations in Africa: Trajectories and Trends", in Benjamin de Carvalho, Thomas Jaye, Yvonne Kasumba and Wafula Okumu (eds.), "Peacekeeping in Africa – The Evolving roles of the African Union and Regional Mechanisms", Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, 2010.

on, for example, the International Criminal Court and its stance on some African leaders.[140]

An alternative to collaboration between the UN and the EU could be bridging capabilities, whereby the EU deploys militarily ahead of a UN operation. USG Hervé Ladsous has identified stronger rapid deployment and force generation in start-up missions as a priority, suggesting that the capacities of regional partners should be explored as an option.[141] One such option could be to make use of the EU's Battlegroups, which were formed partly due to the UN's request for the EU to provide rapidly deployable troops for Chapter VII missions.[142] The EU Military Committee (EUMC) adopted the Battlegroup concept in 2004, and they reached full operational capability in 2007.[143] The Battlegroups, however, have never been deployed. EU member states have different views on the use of military force and have disagreed on whether various situations have warranted the use of the Battlegroups. Moreover, as costs lie where they fall, meaning that the member states contributing the troops also have to bear most of the costs, there is a general resistance among member states to deploy their own Battlegroups.[144] As has been suggested elsewhere, encouraging their use may require a revision of funding arrangements.[145]

With regard to the various forms of collaboration, there seems to be a considerable appetite for sequential and parallel operations. However, some interviewees expressed deep scepticism about hybrid missions, especially given the challenges faced by the African Union/United Nations Hybrid operation in Darfur (UNAMID). While UNAMID's performance has been questioned, the mission has had to operate in testing circumstances and it could be argued that it represents an example of the UN being flexible and finding a solution in the face of great challenges.

In sum, the UN will continue to rely on partnerships with regional organisations as well as bilateral partners to meet the demand for peacekeeping. Such

---

[140] Richard Gowan, "The Case For Co-operation in Crisis Management", European Council on Foreign Relations, Policy Brief, June 2012. For an analysis on progress made in the Peace and Security Partnership of the Joint Africa-EU Strategy (JAES), see Camilla Elowson and Per Nordlund, "Paradigm Lost? The Joint Africa-EU Strategy: A Study of the Peace and Security Partnership", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), December 2013.

[141] "Statement by Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Hervé Ladsous to the Fourth Committee", 28 October 2013.

[142] The BGs were also supposed to drive transformation of the national armed forces.

[143] EU External Action, "EU Battlegroups", updated April 2013, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/esdp/91624.pdf.

[144] Claudia Major and Christian Mölling, "EU Battlegroups: What Contribution to European Defence?", SWP Research Paper 8, June 2011.

[145] See e.g. Anna Barcikowska, "EU Battlegroups – ready to go?", European Union Institute for Security Studies, Brief 40, November 2013.

cooperation will increase demands on coordination. Coordination, in turn, is fundamentally hindered by the fact that the UN lacks a system for sharing secret, confidential information. In addition, it is important for the UN to keep in mind that partners cannot always be counted on to intervene where there is a need. Instead, all organisations have their own interests and constituencies. Competition for turf will continue to hamper smooth collaboration, with the UN and regional partners alike eager to justify their existence and prove that they play a critical role.[146]

3.3 UN Peacekeeping and the Positions and Policies of Member States

The importance to UN peacekeeping of what is often called political will, or political support, of member states cannot be overstated. Without the backing of the member states the missions suffer greatly, be it because of lack of resources, funding or political engagement to end the conflict. While not describing UN capacity, *per se*, cooperation between the UN and the member states ultimately affects UN capacity greatly. This section discusses the dynamics between the UN and member states and how these affect the UN's ability to plan and lead effective peacekeeping missions.

3.3.1 Increased Polarisation

The criticism against the UN and consequent departure of many western TCCs from UN peacekeeping has led to somewhat new dynamics in the organisation. Broadly speaking, a division of labour has developed in which some countries, mainly Asian and African, contribute manpower to peacekeeping missions while western powers provide financial support to UN operations. In November 2013, the top six troop and police contributors were Pakistan (8 298), Bangladesh (7 968), India (7 848), Ethiopia (6 609), Nigeria (4 830) and Rwanda (4 743).[147] On the financial side, the top six contributors to the UN peacekeeping budget in

---

[146] Interview, New York, October 2013 and Alexandra Novosseloff, "United Nations – European Union Cooperation in the Field of Peacekeeping", Global Governance Institute, GGI Analysis Paper No. 4/2012, June 2012.

[147] The figures include police, UN military experts on mission, and troops. United Nations, "Monthly Summary of Contributions", as of 30 November 2013, http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/contributors/2013/nov13_1.pdf.

2013 were the United States (28.38%), Japan (10.83%), France (7.22%), Germany (7.14%), the United Kingdom (6.68%) and China (6.64%).[148]

This division, in turn, means that member states enter discussions and negotiations from different perspectives and with different interests. The countries taking care of a large part of the bill tend to focus on trying to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of UN peacekeeping, while the TCCs have called for increased means to carry out the work in the field as well as a larger say at the strategic level. This division of labour has triggered criticisms. On the one hand, those countries that are contributing to the budget are criticised for paying their way out while poorer countries in the South are carrying out the risky work and bearing the subsequent human costs. On the other hand, TCCs are criticised for using UN peacekeeping as a way of financing and equipping their militaries and keeping them occupied.

Over the years, these groupings have solidified, which is reflected in the C34. It meets annually and reports to the General Assembly through the Fourth Committee (Special Political and Decolonisation). Initially comprised of 34 member states, it today consists of 148 countries – mainly past or current TCCs and PCCs. In 2013, things went as far as the C34 failing to reach agreement and produce a report. The breakdown of the C34 happened gradually over two or three years.[149] In 2012, the report was preceded by a lengthy six-month negotiation process before its delayed publication.[150]

The differences between those who pay and those who contribute troops were exposed in the Committee's general debate in February 2013. Many members voiced the view that TCCs and PCCs should be more included in the decision-making processes connected to peacekeeping missions, and some noted that this should also entail a more sizable representation in the Secretariat.[151] TCCs also emphasised the importance of peacekeeping missions being provided with the resources required to implement mandates, and that the safety and security of peacekeeping personnel was critical. One of the main funders of peacekeeping missions, Japan, called on the UN to "do more with less and do it better".[152] Funding states have also called on TCCs to provide information on the costs incurred through their troop contributions.

---

[148] United Nations, "Financing peacekeeping", https://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/financing.shtml, December 2013.

[149] Interviews, New York, October 2013.

[150] David Curran, "Rescuing the Functional Legitimacy of the C34", Global Action to Prevent War Blog, 4 November 2013.

[151] UN General Assembly, "Troop Contributors' Views Must be Reflected in Field, at Headquarters, Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations Told as General Debate Concludes", Department of Public Information, GA/PK/213, 20 February 2013.

[152] Ibid.

Efforts to find some middle ground are under way. One key point of contention is reimbursements to TCCs and PCCs. Reimbursement levels have remained unchanged for the past decade, but the UN has in the past two financial years added supplemental payments. In May 2013, the General Assembly approved recommendations made by a Senior Advisory Group to continue this practice and pay an additional 6.75 per cent on top of the base rate of USD 1028 per person per month from 1 April 2013 to 30 June 2014.[153] Where major equipment is missing or not working, the reimbursement rate will be reduced proportionally. A revised survey is to be carried out with the aim of setting a new base rate by June 2014. The Advisory Group recommended that bonuses should be paid to troops willing to take higher risks and operate without restrictions and caveats, and that a premium is paid for the contribution of key enabling capabilities in high demand and short supply. The Advisory Group also set a new standard rotation period of 12 months in order to encourage greater continuity on the ground and conserve scarce resources.

3.3.2 Implications of Polarisation

Interviewees held different views on whether the breakdown of the C34 would have any effect on UN peacekeeping. Many shrugged it off, saying it meant negotiations between member states would merely take place elsewhere instead.[154] One interviewee, however, said the failure of the C34 severely harmed the legitimacy of UN peacekeeping as the committee offers a way for member states to influence peacekeeping policy.[155]

On the issue of legitimacy, another consequence of the division of labour within the UN is that it dents the legitimacy of its peacekeeping missions. As one interviewee pointed out: "It is, after all, called the *United* Nations".[156] The criticism that some countries refuse to contribute their troops because they are risk-averse severely damages the sense of shared responsibility. Clearly, financial contributions should not be undervalued. These are at the expense of other priorities and make peacekeeping possible in the first place. Ultimately, what is of central importance is that all parties agree on the terms of their contributions to UN peacekeeping – whether these are financial, personnel,

---

[153] UN Department of Public Information, "General Assembly Adopts Recommendation of Senior Advisory Group on Reimbursement Rates for Peacekeeping Troops", 10 May 2013, http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2013/ga11368.doc.htm, and UN General Assembly Fifth Committee, "Report of the Senior Advisory Group on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and other related issues", A/C.5/67/10, 15 November 2012.

[154] Interviews, New York, October 2013.

[155] Interview, Stockholm, November 2013.

[156] Interview, Stockholm, December 2013.

material resources or other. If the polarisation persists, and if things are pushed to their extreme, UN peacekeeping could be severely eroded. Ultimately, it could dampen the willingness of TCCs and PCCs to continue contributing personnel to missions. Similarly, it would do little to encourage western countries to return to UN peacekeeping. Together, it would weaken the UN's peacekeeping capabilities, especially with regard to advanced technology and equipment. This, in turn, would risk pigeonholing UN peacekeeping as second-rate – lacking the required equipment and standards. There is a risk that countries like India choose to leave UN peacekeeping as it develops economically and no longer sees UN peacekeeping as appropriate for its new status. Ineffective and poorly managed peacekeeping operations could naturally also lead those providing financial support to stop paying.

Furthermore, the often cited lack of resources should be seen in light of the relationship between member states and the Secretariat. For a long time now, the UN has highlighted the shortage of helicopters, for example, but little has happened. The link between more complex mandates and more dangerous mission settings, on the one hand, and the need for sophisticated resources for peacekeeping, on the other, is obvious. Without a better and more strategic dialogue between the UN and its member states, not least the permanent members of the Security Council, critical capability gaps are unlikely to be filled. While initiatives such as the New Horizon specifically target that relationship, a lot remains to be done before the UN has the resources to fully meet expectations. Those interviewed for this study also indicated that the Secretariat lacks the capacity to proactively engage with potential TCCs in a strategic manner. The OMA's approach to force generation was described as too old-fashioned, focusing on filling the missions with the right number of troops rather than required capacities, and planning was said to be based on supply rather than demand.[157] Poor communication between the Secretariat and capitals risks worsening the problem.[158] It could be said that the Secretariat has adopted a pragmatic approach and adapted its routines to reality, engaging with the countries that are providing forces and other resources. However, to move forward on the issue of resource shortages, new TCCs will have to be engaged with.

However, while polarisation currently characterises relations between member states on many issues related to peacekeeping, there are also reasons for optimism for those favouring UN peacekeeping. Despite the economic and financial crisis, the budget for UN peacekeeping has significantly increased in

---

[157] Interviews, New York, October 2013.
[158] IPI, "Enhancing European Military and Police Contributions to UN Peacekeeping", February 2013.

the past decade, from USD 2.8 billion in 2001–2002 to USD 7.8 billion in 2011–12.[159] About USD 7.54 billion has been approved for 2013–14.[160] Interviewees did not expect the budget to suffer any severe cuts in the near future.[161] One reason for this is that UN peacekeeping operations are still relatively cheap, in contrast to e.g. stabilisation operations in Iraq or Afghanistan.[162]

Another bright spot is the increased US political interest in UN peacekeeping since the inauguration of President Barack Obama, having been put on the back burner by his predecessor, George W. Bush. Enhancing cooperation with and strengthening the UN were singled out as priorities in Obama's 2010 National Security Strategy.[163] It is plausible that the US views UN peacekeeping as a means to stabilise countries in for example Africa. While Washington's so-called rebalancing to Asia has ignited debate and raised many questions, there is a widespread recognition that the US is encouraging Europe to shoulder greater responsibility for security in its own neighbourhood.[164] For the US, the UN could perhaps be one actor that could support peace and stability in that region.

This is important as the US finances more than a quarter – 28.4 per cent – of the total UN peacekeeping budget.[165] The Obama administration has demonstrated its commitment to the UN by paying off US peacekeeping debts to the UN, including some USD 2 billion for the UN's peacekeeping budget in 2009 and nearly USD 3 billion in humanitarian and development assistance to the eight countries that host multidimensional UN peacekeeping missions.[166] The US also paid more than USD 600 million in 2009 for training, equipment and logistics assistance to 55 countries to strengthen their capacity to contribute troops and police for peacekeeping.[167] Moreover, it is possible that the renewed interest in Washington in UN peacekeeping could result in a US willingness to contribute logistical support and technically advanced equipment to missions.

---

[159] United Nations Department of Management, "Peacekeeping Budgets", February 2012, http://www.un.org/en/hq/dm/pdfs/oppba/Peacekeeping%20budget.pdf.

[160] United Nations Peacekeeping, "Peacekeeping Fact Sheet", as of 31 Oct 2013, http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/factsheet.shtml.

[161] Interviews, New York, October 2013.

[162] See for instance, Amy Belasco, "The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terrorism Operations Since 9/11", Congressional Research Service, RL33110, 29 March 2011.

[163] The White House, "National Security Strategy", May 2010.

[164] For more on US international strategic policy, see e.g. Eva Hagström Frisell and Kristina Zetterlund, "Getting it Right in Uncertain Times – The Defence Priorities of the United States, the United Kingdom and France", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), July 2013.

[165] United Nations Peacekeeping, "Financing peacekeeping", http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/financing.shtml.

[166] Nancy Soderberg, "Enhancing U.S. Support for UN Peacekeeping", *PRISM,* Vol. 2, No. 2, March 2011.

[167] Ibid.

4   Concluding Thoughts on the Future of UN Peacekeeping

Is the UN more capable and proficient at leading peacekeeping missions today than it was in the 1990s, a period tainted by a number of tragic failures of UN peacekeeping? Since 2000, there has been an ongoing reform process in the UN system. Guidance, policy and training on UN peacekeeping and the ability of the Secretariat to lead missions have steadily evolved and improved. The organisation that deployed peacekeepers to the Balkans 20 years ago is in many ways no more. Indeed, the UN's willingness to scrutinise its own weaknesses should be acknowledged and commended. Moreover, the UN has since conducted several successful operations and gained much valuable experience which has been translated into new and improved approaches.

On the other hand, some things have not changed and are unlikely to do so. The UN is a political organisation where national interests ultimately take precedence. The Security Council's inability to act in Syria provides a reminder, albeit tragic, of this. The political and global organisation can be a source of unparalleled legitimacy, capability and capacity. The range of tools that the UN has at its disposal is unmatched, and provides a truly comprehensive and long-term approach to peacebuilding. The precedence of politics, however, also means that the UN's effectiveness as a military actor is inherently imperfect. The chain of command and inability to deploy quickly are often highlighted as problematic areas. It is also important to bear in mind that many reforms take a long time to implement in the UN. Such negative aspects can be minimised by continuous efforts to improve the system and an understanding of when the UN is the most appropriate actor to respond to a crisis militarily or, alternatively, when the UN should preferably contribute with other instruments from its comprehensive toolbox.

For the UN to continue to evolve, it needs the support of its member states. Key issues such as rapid deployment, a capability-driven approach to peacekeeping, command and control, logistics and continued policy development will only go forward with the backing of the member states. Below are a number of concluding thoughts on the possible future direction of UN peacekeeping based on the results of this study. They outline areas where both the UN and the member states play key roles in making sure that the organisation is ready for the challenges of peacekeeping in the 21st century.

4.1   When Will the UN Deploy Peacekeepers?

One important lesson from the 1990s is that the UN should not, and cannot, take on all the challenges that it is asked to. Clear and achievable mandates based on

sober assessments of what can be done given the available resources were key prescriptions of the Brahimi Report. Recent years, especially with the new engagement in Mali and an operational shift towards offensive peacekeeping in the DRC, could mark a quantitatively and qualitatively new phase for UN peacekeeping. The organisation is now called on to deploy to conflicts where the principles of peacekeeping are not in place. Is the UN ready to take on such new challenges?

It seems likely that the UN will be open to new engagements in environments where it would not have deployed to some 10 years ago. Interviewees in New York spoke of a concern within the UN about the possibility of "losing market shares" when other organisations take on bigger roles.[168] This could lead the UN to be less selective when asked to act in complex conflict situations. While it is necessary for the UN to be flexible and adapt to the conflicts it faces, there appears to be a need for a renewed discussion on the UN's role in peacekeeping. That role should build on the UN's strengths as well as weaknesses. At the same time, the UN needs to continue to strive towards more effective engagements. The search for new and flexible approaches to peacekeeping is an important step in this direction. The broadening of possible responses means that the organisation is better equipped to tackle new challenges in a more effective way. Increased cooperation with external partners could also provide the UN with more options, expanding the scope of potential engagements.

4.2   How Will UN Peacekeepers Act?

Should the UN abandon its traditional way of engaging in conflict, that is, through large and predominantly "defensive" actions, and turn to more offensive tactics and robust engagements? This could symbolise a break with key principles of peacekeeping and would necessitate an in-depth re-evaluation of the UN's role in international peace and security, as well as forcing the UN into a new period of substantial reform. The outcome of the Intervention Brigade experiment will be decisive to the debate.

Discussions in late 2012 and early 2013 about a possible UN peacekeeping mission in Syria revealed that some actors are now open to the notion of deploying peacekeepers to ongoing conflicts with high levels of risk for the troops. Robust peacekeeping depends on troops that are able and willing to engage in such activities. Several of the bigger TCCs oppose the development of more robust mandates and are thus unlikely to support such a shift. Other countries, especially new African TCCs, have indicated a greater willingness to

---

[168] Interviews, New York, October 2013.

take on risk by deploying to more volatile situations with robust mandates.[169] However, limited capacity and resources in many cases restrict their potential impact. It seems unlikely that the countries that provide the bulk of the troops should change considerably in the coming years. The possible return of western countries to UN missions is likely to remain fairly limited and focus on niche capabilities. This suggests that the deployment of robust missions will remain limited, and that the ones that do have robust mandates will interpret them conservatively, recognising the principle of minimum use of force.

The issue of UN command and control, and more specifically the UN chain of command, will need to be revisited if the UN is set on implementing robust mandates. There can be little or no ambiguity in the chain of command if the military components of a peacekeeping mission are to act more offensively and proactively. If the UN pursues offensive tactics it will have to engage with old and new TCCs in innovative ways to make sure that they have the required resources and political backing. These partnerships will be of key importance to how the UN acts in future peacekeeping missions, and member states should support the Secretariat by engaging in an honest discussion about what type of peacekeeper the UN should be.

4.3   How Will UN Peacekeepers be Supported and Equipped?

Despite the many new initiatives and policies targeting mission support, such as the GFSS, the need to improve support functions is pressing. The missions still struggle in areas such as human resources and procurement. Perhaps most importantly, the UN is still unable to deploy peacekeepers rapidly. While member states play an important role, the organisation will have to continue its search for quicker and more effective ways to deploy its missions. On the positive side, while the missions in the 1990s were seen as separate entities, the Secretariat is increasingly trying to deal with them in a more integrated fashion. This could help to create synergies and improve efficiency. Cooperation between missions is one area that could see more development in the coming years. Member states' willingness to support the UN in these efforts will be crucial.

If the move towards robust missions continues, it will require a different approach to intelligence, force generation and mission support. The Secretariat's "numbers-driven approach" to planning will not suffice if peacekeeping missions

---

[169] Interview, New York, October 2013 and Arthur Boutellis and Paul D. Williams, "Peace Operations, the African Union, and the United Nations: Toward More Effective Partnerships", IPI, April 2013.

are to become more mobile, information-driven and able to offensively engage with spoilers and other groups hindering the successful implementation of mission mandates.

The need for operational intelligence has become more accepted among UN member states, especially given today's often complex conflict settings. The use of surveillance drones is a step in the right direction if peacekeepers are to be able to protect themselves and their mandates. At the strategic level, however, the UN is hindered by the lack of a system with which to communicate restricted information. This poses considerable challenges to coordination with partners – internal as well as external. It is, however, hard to imagine such a system being set up given member states' concern about sovereignty and the UN's inability to keep secrets.

Ultimately, without a genuine commitment from member states it will be difficult to move forward on issues such as a capability-driven approach. In today's system, where some countries tend to pay and others provide personnel to serve in the peacekeeping missions, the required capabilities are rarely made available – and will not be so unless a new strategic partnership is created. With the C-34 being unable to move forward on key issues, it seems that innovations, including on the technology side, will be slow and sometimes painful.

4.4   Who Will Do the Peacekeeping?

The increased polarisation between those countries which pay the bills and those which put their troops in harm's way undermines progress on reforms and a healthy debate about the future of UN peacekeeping. It also dents the legitimacy of UN peacekeeping and could, ultimately, dampen the willingness of member states to contribute either personnel or funding. This, in turn, would naturally have devastating consequences for capabilities, and risk pigeonholing the UN as second-rate with insufficient equipment and standards.

One possible way forward could be to rely more on partners, in the form of bilateral engagements, coalitions of willing states or regional organisations. Parallel deployments of UN peacekeepers and a military operation led by another actor are already on the rise and could continue to evolve, not least if the UN continues to engage in countries with ongoing conflicts. Military missions led by a single country or, for example, a military organisation such as NATO are likely to run more efficiently if closely coordinated with overarching international and regional peace processes. As Tardy writes, for countries that do not necessarily trust the UN command and control system, this is an alternative way to support

peacekeeping efforts without working directly under its command.[170] In such a model the UN could, if seen as separate from a military intervention, focus on the political process and long-term development of conflict-affected countries, with the rule of law and human rights as key components. It seems likely that the UN will continue to rely on cooperation with partners to address conflicts around the world. The demand for peacekeepers and other peace support initiatives is too great for any organisation to handle on its own. Regional organisations have also become more active in peacekeeping, driven by sometimes competing agendas. For the UN, this puts high demand on coordination mechanisms and on strategic dialogues with key partners.

Whether former TCCs will return to UN peacekeeping remains to be seen. Despite the pressures of the financial crisis there is continued interest in investing in UN peacekeeping. The peacekeeping budget has grown substantially in the past decade from just over USD 2 billion in fiscal year 2003–2004,[171] to USD 7.54 billion[172] in fiscal year 2013–2014. Interviews indicated that important funders of peacekeeping missions did not foresee any major cuts in the peacekeeping budget, even though the issue of more efficient missions is always on the agenda of "funders".[173] Draw-downs in Afghanistan further support the notion that cuts in the UN peacekeeping budget are unlikely. UN missions are still deemed the best alternative in several conflict situations. This could derive from the UN's legitimacy, the burden-sharing aspect of the missions or the fact that no other organisation is willing or able to engage in some of the more complex conflicts over long periods of time. Not only are UN missions relatively cheap, but there is now a sense of weariness about interventions after lengthy involvements with dubious results in Iraq and Afghanistan. At the same time, the military withdrawal from Afghanistan is likely to lead armed forces to look for new engagements elsewhere, and these troops are by now well-versed in NATO structures and procedures.

For European countries considering sending troops on UN-led missions, bilateral cooperation within UN missions could be a way forward. Countries or groups of countries with the right capacity and capabilities could assume responsibility for specific components within the missions, such as medical, civil-military coordination (CIMIC) or intelligence roles. This modular solution could increase interoperability and help to ease some countries' fears over the UN's command and control structure. Interviews indicated that the UN would be willing to

---

[170] Thierry Tardy, "Mali: The UN takes over", May 2013.

[171] UN General Assembly, "Budget Committee approves $2.17 Billion for 2003/2004 peacekeeping, as it concludes resumed session", 2003.

[172] UN General Assembly, "Approved resources for peacekeeping operations for the period from 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014", A/C.5/67/19, 2013.

[173] Interviews, New York, October 2013.

accommodate innovative contributions from member states. For Sweden, its focus on Nordic cooperation could provide the lead into joint UN engagements, thereby increasing its impact and influence in UN missions.

There are numerous reasons why a country chooses to contribute troops or police to UN peacekeeping missions, including political, economic, security, institutional and normative interests.[174] While research suggests that domestic political considerations play a larger role in determining whether a country decides to contribute to UN peacekeeping than the UN's current force-generation mechanisms,[175] the Secretariat should familiarise itself with the systems and requirements of returning TCCs and develop a strategic approach. Similarly, returning troop contributors should make themselves aware of and adapt to UN systems.

---

[174] For a more detailed discussion, see e.g. Alex J. Bellamy and Paul D. Williams, "Broadening the Base of United Nations Troop- and Police-Contributing Countries", IPI, August 2012.
[175] Ibid.

5   References

Aning, Kwesi, "Understanding the relationship between the UN, EU & AU in African Peacekeeping", in de Carvalho, Benjamin, Jaye, Thomas, Kasumba, Yvonne and Okumu, Wafula (eds), "Peacekeeping in Africa – The Evolving roles of the African Union and Regional Mechanisms, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs", 2010

Barcikowska, Anna, "EU Battlegroups – ready to go?", European Union Institute for Security Studies, Brief 40, November 2013

BBC News, "Ivory Coast wants drones to monitor Liberia border", 17 April 2013

Belasco, Amy, "The Cost of Iraq, Afghanistan, and Other Global War on Terrorism Operations Since 9/11", Congressional Research Service, RL33110, 29 March 2011

Bellamy, Alex J. and Williams, Paul D., "Broadening the Base of United Nations Troop- and Police-Contributing Countries", International Peace Institute (IPI), August 2012

Bilmes, Linda J., "The Financial Legacy of Iraq and Afghanistan: How Wartime Spending Decisions Will Constrain Future National Security Budgets", Harvard University, HKS Faculty Research Working Paper Series RWP13-006, March 2013

Boutellis, Arthur and Williams, Paul D., "Peace Operations, the African Union, and the United Nations: Toward More Effective Partnerships", International Peace Institute (IPI), April 2013

Boutellis, Arthur, "Driving the System Apart? A Study of United Nations Integration and Integrated Strategic Planning", International Peace Institute (IPI), August 2013

Challenges Forum, "Results of Working Group V: Command and Control: UN and Regional Organizations: Current Issues, Structures and Solutions for the Future?", Geneva Centre for Security Challenges, July 2012

Curran, David, "Rescuing the Functional Legitimacy of the C34", Global Action to Prevent War Blog, 4 November 2013

de Coning, Cedric, "The Evolution of Peace Operations in Africa: Trajectories and Trends", in de Carvalho, Benjamin, Jaye, Thomas, Kasumba, Yvonne and Okumu, Wafula (eds), "Peacekeeping in Africa – The Evolving roles of the African Union and Regional Mechanisms, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs", 2010

Deen, Thalif, "POLITICS: World Peace Precarious, Warns U.N. Chief", *Inter Press Service*, 14 September 1998

Derblom, Markus, Hagström Frisell, Eva and Schmidt, Jennifer, "UN-EU-AU Coordination in Peace Operations in Africa", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), 2008

Dorn, A. Walter, "United Nations Peacekeeping Intelligence", originally published in Loch K. Johnson (ed.), "The Oxford Handbook of National Security Intelligence", Oxford University Press, 2010

Durch, William J., Holt, Victoria K., Earle, Caroline R., Shanahan, Moira K., "The Brahimi Report and the Future of UN Peace Operations", the Henry L. Stimson Center, 2003

Eide, Espen Barth, Kaspersen, Anja Therese, Kent, Randolph, von Hippel, Karen, "Report on Integrated Missions: Practical Perspectives and recommendations", Independent Study for the Expanded UN ECHA Core Group, May 2005

Ekengard, Arvid, "Svensk militär ledningsfilosofi möter samtida fredsfrämjande operationer", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), 2010

Elowson, Camilla and Per Nordlund, "Paradigm Lost? The Joint Africa-EU Strategy: A Study of the Peace and Security Partnership", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), December 2013

European Union External Action, "EU Battlegroups", updated April 2013, http://www.consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/esdp/91624.pdf

Gowan, Richard, "Inter-institutional Cooperation in Peace Operations: United Nations and Regional Organizations Challenges", in "International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations", Challenges Forum Report 2012, 2012

Gowan, Richard, "The Case For Co-operation in Crisis Management", European Council on Foreign Relations, Policy Brief, June 2012

Gowan, Richard and Gleason, Megan, "UN Peacekeeping: The Next Five Years", Center on International Cooperation, November 2012

Gowan, Richard, "Diplomatic Fallout: U.N.'s 'Intervention Brigade' Raises Cost of Interference in DRC", *World Politics Review*, April 8, 2013

Hagström Frisell, Eva and Zetterlund, Kristina, "Getting it Right in Uncertain Times – The Defence Priorities of the United States, the United Kingdom and France", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), July 2013

Hammond, Guy, "Saving Port-au-Prince: United Nations Efforts to Protect Civilians in Haiti in 2006-2007", the Stimson Center, June 2012

Harsch, Michael F. and Varwick, Johannes, "NATO and the UN", *Survival*, 24 March 2009

Hatto, Ronald, "UN Command and Control Capabilities: Lessons from UNIFIL's Strategic Military Cell", *International Peacekeeping*, Apr 2009

Hull, Cecilia, "Integrated Missions – A Liberia Case Study", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), December 2008

InterAction, "A Humanitarian Exception to the Integration Rule", Policy Statement, December 2011

International Peace Institute (IPI), "Enhancing European Military and Police Contributions to UN Peacekeeping Missions", 2013

Kugel, Alischa, "No helmets, just suits – Political missions as an instrument of the UN Security Council for civilian conflict management", Friedrich Ebert Stiftung, March 2011

Kulish, Nicholas and Sengupta, Somini, "New U.N. Brigade's Aggressive Stance in Africa Brings Success, and Risks", *New York Times*, November 12, 2013

Lamont, Carina and Skeppström, Emma, "The United Nations at War in the DRC? Legal Aspects of the Intervention Brigade", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), December 2013

Lynch, Colum, "'We Knew They Were Coming'", *Foreign Policy,* 7 October 2013

MacDermott, Justin and Hanssen, Måns, "Protection of Civilians – Delivering on the mandate through civil-military coordination", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), September 2010

Major, Claudia and Mölling, Christian, "EU Battlegroups: What Contribution to European Defence?", SWP Research Paper 8, June 2011

Mancini, Francesco, "Managing Partnership", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol.18, No.5, November 2011

Metcalfe, Victoria, Giffen, Alison and Elhawary, Samir, "UN Integration and Humanitarian Space – An Independent Study Commissioned by the UN Integration Steering Group", Humanitarian Policy Group and Stimson Center, December 2011

Mills, Claire, "In Brief: International Military Forces in Mali", House of Commons Library, 19 August 2013

NATO, "Allied Command Operations Comprehensive Operations Planning Directive (COPD), Interim Version 1.0", 2010

NATO, "NATO Glossary of Terms and Definitions (English and French)", AAP-06, Edition 2013

Nichols, Michelle, "U.N. urged to consider drones, gunships for South Sudan mission", *Reuters,* 8 July 2013

Nilsson, Claes, Hull, Cecilia, Derblom, Markus, and Egnell, Robert, "Contextualising the Comprehensive Approach – The Elements of a Comprehensive Intervention", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), December 2008

Nilsson, Claes and Wikén, Erik, "Interorganisatorisk samverkan i fredsfrämjande insatser", Swedish Defence Research Agency (FOI), December 2011

Norheim-Martinsen, Per Martin and Aasland, Jacob, "Towards Intelligence-Driven Peace Operations? The Evolution of UN and EU Intelligence Structures", *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 18, No. 4, August 2011

Norwegian Refugee Council, "A Partnership at Risk? – The UN-NGO Relationship in Light of UN Integration", An NRC discussion paper, 16 February 2012

Novosseloff, Alexandra, "United Nations – European Union Cooperation in the Field of Peacekeeping", Global Governance Institute, GGI Analysis Paper No. 4/2012, June 2012

Pietz, Tobias, "The European Union and UN Peacekeeping: Half-time for the EU's Action Plan", Center for International Peace Operations (ZIF), Policy Briefing, October 2013

Raghavan, Sudarsan, "In volatile Congo, a new U.N. force with teeth", *Washington Post*, November 2, 2013

Ramjoué, Melanie, "Improving United Nations Intelligence: Lessons from the Field", Geneva Centre for Security Policy, GCSP Policy Paper No. 19, August 2011

Sage, Alexandria, "U.N. pens deal for unarmed surveillance drones over Congo", *Reuters*, 14 July 2013

Sheikh, Abdi, "Somali Islamist rebels attack U.N. base, 22 dead", *Reuters,* 19 June 2013

SHIRBRIG, "SHIRBRIG Lessons Learned Report", June 2009

Smith, Adam C. and Boutellis, Arthur, "Rethinking Force Generation: Filling the Capability Gaps in UN Peacekeeping", Providing for Peacekeeping No. 2, International Peace Institute (IPI), May 2013

Soderberg, Nancy, "Enhancing U.S. Support for UN Peacekeeping", *PRISM,* Vol. 2, No. 2, March 2011

Statement by Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Hervé Ladsous to the Fourth Committee", 28 October 2013

Steketee, Menno, "Dutch to contribute 370 personnel to UN Mali mission", *IHS Jane's Defence Weekly*, 3 November 2013

Tardy, Thierry, "Robust Peacekeeping: a False Good Idea?", in de Coning, Cedric, Stensland, Andreas Oien and Tardy, Thierry (ed.), "Beyond the 'New Horizon' – Proceedings from the UN Peacekeeping Future Challenges Seminar Geneva, 23–24 June", 2010

Tardy, Thierry, "Building Partnerships in Peace Operations: The Limits of the Global/Regional Approach", GCSP Policy Paper no1, May 2010

Tardy, Thierry, "Mali: The UN takes over", European Union Institute for Security Studies, May 2013

The White House, "National Security Strategy", May 2010

The World Bank, "The World Bank Development Report 2011: Conflict, Security, and Development", 2011

Themnér, Lotta and Wallensteen, Peter, "Armed Conflicts: 1946-2012", *Journal of Peace Research,* July 2013

United Nations Institute for Training and Research, UNITAR, "UNOSAT carries out first UAV mission for IOM in Haiti", 17 February 2012

United Nations, "Charter of the United Nations", 1945

United Nations, "Report of the Secretary General, An Agenda for Peace – Preventive diplomacy, peacemaking and peace-keeping", A/47/277 - S/24111, 1992

United Nations, "Identical letters dated 21 August 2000 from the Secretary-General to the President of the General Assembly and the President of the Security Council", A/55/305–S/2000/809, 2000

United Nations, "Implementation of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations", A/55/977, 2001

United Nations, "Handbook on United Nations Multidimensional Peacekeeping Operations", 2003

United Nations Press Release, "Budget Committee approves $2.17 Billion for 2003/2004 peacekeeping, as it concludes resumed session", June 2003

United Nations, "Note of Guidance on Integrated Missions," January 17, 2006

United Nations, DPKO Policy Directive," Joint Operations Centres and Joint Mission Analysis Centres", July 2006

United Nations, "Overview of the financing of the United Nations peacekeeping operations: budget performance for the period from 1 July 2004 to 30 June 2005

and budget for the period from 1 July 2006 to 30 June 2007, Report of the Secretary-General", A/60/696, 2006

United Nations, "Integrated Missions Planning Process, Guidelines endorsed by the Secretary-General on 13 June 2006", 2006

United Nations, "Report of the Secretary-General, Comprehensive report on strengthening the capacity of the United Nations to manage and sustain peace operations", A/61/858, 2007

United Nations, "Decision of the Secretary-General – 25 June meeting of the Policy Committee, Decision No 2008/24", 26 June 2008

United Nations, "Authority, Command and Control in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations", 2008

United Nations, "Comprehensive review of the Strategic Military Cell", A/62/744, 2008

United Nations, "United Nations Peacekeeping Operations, Principles and Guidelines", 2008

United Nations, "A New Partnership Agenda: Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping", July 2009

United Nations, "Implementation of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations", A/64/573, December 2009

United Nations, "Report of the Secretary-General, Global Field Support Strategy", A/64/633, January 2010

United Nations, The Office of Internal Oversight Services, "Thematic evaluation of cooperation between the Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Department of Field Support and regional organizations", A/65/762, 28 February 2011

United Nations, "The New Horizon Initiative: Progress Report No. 2", December 2011

United Nations, "Security Council Resolution 1973", 2011

United Nations Department of Management, "Peacekeeping Budgets", February 2012, http://www.un.org/en/hq/dm/pdfs/oppba/Peacekeeping%20budget.pdf

United Nations General Assembly Fifth Committee, "Report of the Senior Advisory Group on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and other related issues", A/C.5/67/10, 15 November 2012, http://daccess-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N12/590/30/PDF/N1259030.pdf?OpenElement

United Nations, "Letter dated 11 October 2012 from the Chair of the Senior Advisory Group on rates of reimbursement to troop-contributing countries and

other related issues to the Secretary-General transmitting the report of the Group", A/C.5/67/10, 2012

United Nations, "Report of the Secretary-General, Third annual progress report on the implementation of the global field support strategy", A/67/633, December 2012

United Nations, "Report of the Board of Auditors, Volume II, United Nations peacekeeping operations", A/67/5 (Vol. II), 2013

United Nations, "Troop contributors' views must be reflected in field, at headquarters, Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations told as general debate concludes", Department of Public Information, GA/PK/213, 20 February 2013

United Nations, "Policy of Integrated Assessment and Planning", 9 April 2013

United Nations Department of Public Information, "General Assembly adopts recommendation of Senior Advisory Group on reimbursement rates for peacekeeping troops", 10 May 2013, http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2013/ga11368.doc.htm

United Nations, "Report of the Secretary General, Overall policy matters pertaining to special political missions", A/68/223, July 2013

United Nations, "Approved resources for peacekeeping operations for the period from 1 July 2013 to 30 June 2014", A/C.5/67/19, July 2013

United Nations, "United Nations Peacekeeping Operations", Factsheet 31 October 2013

United Nations, "Monthly summary of military and civilian police contribution to United Nations Operations, 1994-2004 and 2005-2013". DPKO website: https://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors_archive.sht ml

United Nations News Centre, "UN launches unmanned surveillance aircraft to better protect civilians in vast DR Congo", 3 December 2013

United Nations, "Financing peacekeeping", https://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/financing.shtml, December 2013

United States Headquarters of the Army, "US Army Field Manual, FM 3-0", 2001

Webpages

http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/mandate.shtml

http://www.un.org/en/peacebuilding/pbso/pdf/pbso-strategy-2012-2013.pdf

http://peacekeepingresourcehub.unlb.org/PBPS/Pages/Public/library.aspx?ot=2&cat=71&level=2&menukey=_4_5_1#

http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/UNIBAM.Vol.II.pdf

http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/UNIBAM.Vol.I.pdf

http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/sites/police/units.shtml

http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/issues/fieldsupport.shtml

Interviews

Conducted in New York, the US, and Stockholm, Sweden, in October-December 2013.

Gunnar Aldén, Head of Political Section, Swedish Mission to the United Nations

Jens Andersen, Senior Military Strategic Partnership Officer, UN DPKO

Arthur Boutellis, Peace Operations Program, International Peace Institute (IPI)

Mona Fetouh, Inspection and Evaluation Officer, UN OIOS

Richard Gowan, Associate Director, New York University, Center on International Cooperation

Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Center for International Conflict Resolution, Columbia University

David Haeri, Director, UN DPET

Emily Hampton-Manly, Inspection and Evaluation Officer, UN OIOS

Paul Keeting, GFSS Team Leader, UN DFS

Alischa Kugel, Senior Program Officer, New York University, Center on International Cooperation

Sébastien Lapierre, Senior Political Affairs Officer, UN DPKO

Steve Lieberman, Minister Counsellor, US Mission to the United Nations

Mark Maddick, Military Adviser, UK Mission to the United Nations

Edmond Mulet, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping, Office of Operations, UN DPKO

Claes Naréus, Counsellor, Military Adviser, Swedish Mission to the United Nations

Joanne Neenan, First Secretary, Peacekeeping and Conflict Prevention, UK Mission to the United Nations

Staffan Ocusto, Counsellor, Police Adviser, Swedish Mission to the United Nations

Ann-Marie Orler, former Police Adviser, UN DPKO

Mark Pedersen, Chief Evaluation Team, UN DPET

Lisa Sharland, Defence Policy Adviser, Australian Mission to the United Nations

Adam Smith, Research Fellow and Manager, Peace Operations Program, International Peace Institute (IPI)

Anders Svensson, Swedish Armed Forces, Former Military Adviser, Swedish Mission to the United Nations

This study looks at the UN's capacity to lead peacekeeping missions and how this capacity has evolved since the beginning of the 21st century.

In the 1990s sharp criticism was levelled at the UN's ability to lead complex peacekeeping operations after failures in Rwanda and the Balkans. This led to the disengagement from missions by several UN member states. Was the criticism justified, and what is the state of affairs today?

The study looks at some larger reforms which have taken place since 2000, and analyses the UN's current capacity to lead complex peacekeeping missions. Issues such as the UN chain of command, internal coordination, cooperation with external partners, robust peacekeeping and possible future scenarios for the development of UN peacekeeping are discussed.