



INTERNATIONAL FORUM FOR THE
CHALLENGES OF PEACE OPERATIONS

United Nations Peace Operations 2020: The UN Reviews and Their Implications for Tomorrow's Missions



Challenges Annual Forum Report 2016

CHALLENGES FORUM

PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

Argentina: Ministry of Defence in cooperation with Centro Argentino de Entrenamiento Conjunto para Operaciones de Paz

Armenia: National Defence University, Ministry of Defence

Australia: Australian Civil-Military Centre

Canada: Global Affairs Canada

China: China Institute for International Strategic Studies in cooperation with the Peacekeeping Office, Ministry of National Defence

Egypt: Ministry of Foreign Affairs in cooperation with the Cairo Regional Center for Training on Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping in Africa

France: Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development (United Nations, International Organizations, Human Rights and Francophonie Department) and Ministry of Defence (Directorate General for International Relations and Strategy)

Germany: Center for International Peace Operations in cooperation with the German Federal Foreign Office

India: United Service Institution of India

Indonesia: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Japan: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Jordan: Institute of Diplomacy of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Expatriates, and the Jordan Public Security Directorate and Peacekeeping Operations Training Centre

Nigeria: National Defence College in cooperation with the Nigerian Army, Ministry of Defence and Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Norway: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Pakistan: National Defence University in cooperation with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Ministry of Defence

Russian Federation: Center for Euro-Atlantic Security of the Moscow State Institute of International Relations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs in cooperation with the Center for Political and International Studies

South Africa: Institute for Security Studies

Sweden: Folke Bernadotte Academy, the Swedish Armed Forces, the National Police Board, and the National Prison and Probation Service

Switzerland: Geneva Centre for Security Policy in cooperation with the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs and the Federal Department of Defence, Civil Protection and Sports

Turkey: Center for Strategic Research, Ministry of Foreign Affairs in cooperation with the Armed Forces and National Police

United Kingdom: Foreign and Commonwealth Office in cooperation with the Ministry of Defence and Department for International Development

United States: Department of State, Department of Defense, United States Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute in cooperation with the United States Institute of Peace

World Federation of United Nations Associations

International Secretariat: Folke Bernadotte Academy



United Nations Peace Operations 2020: The UN Reviews and Their Implications for Tomorrow's Missions

Challenges Annual Forum Report 2016



Copyright © 2016 International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations

All rights reserved. This work may be reproduced, provided that no commercial use is made of it and the Challenges Forum is acknowledged.

ISBN: 978-91-87927-11-9

Also available at <http://www.challengesforum.org>

Suggested citation: Challenges Forum, *United Nations Peace Operations 2020: The UN Reviews and Their Implications for Tomorrow's Missions*, Challenges Annual Forum Report 2016 (Stockholm, 2016)

Author: Lisa Sharland, Challenges Forum Secretariat and Senior Analyst, Australian Strategic Policy Institute; Annika Hilding Norberg, Director and Founder, Challenges Forum Secretariat; and Kristina Zetterlund, Acting Head of Policy and Best Practices, Challenges Forum Secretariat.

Printed in Sweden 2016 by Allduplo Offsettryck AB

Contents

Preface	v
Abbreviations	xi
Executive Summary	xiii
Summary of Recommendations	xv
1. Introduction	1
Confronting Global Challenges	6
Review, Reforms and Leadership	8
2. Strengthening UN Peace Operations	13
Implementing the Reviews	13
Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace	20
Politics and Partnership	21
The Women, Peace and Security Agenda	23
People and Youth for Peace	24
3. Peacekeeping Summits and Ministerial Meetings	27
Military Personnel and Enablers	29
Police and Rule of Law Capabilities	31
Civilian Capacities, Management and Leadership	35
4. Partnership Between the UN and Regional Organizations	37
Comparative Advantages	39
Finances and Funding	41
Interoperability and Integration	42
5. Safety and Security of UN and Associated Personnel	45
Duty of Care	46
Evolving Role of Intelligence	49
Strategic Communication and Engaging Local Communities	51

6. Effective Implementation of UNSCR 1325	55
Cultural Change, Accountability and Leadership	57
Operationalizing UNSCR 1325	60
7. Development and Implementation of Doctrine and Guidelines	63
Doctrine Development	64
Challenges to Implementation	67
Guidance Gaps and Training Needs	68
8. Capabilities and Capacity-building for Future Missions	73
Emerging Threats: Preparing Peacekeepers	74
Supporting Sustainable Capacity-building	75
Personnel, Skills and the Role of Prevention	76
9. Conclusion: Looking Ahead	79
Appendix 1. Programme	83
Appendix 2. Participants List	87

Preface

The purpose of the Challenges Forum has remained steadfast over its first 20 years. We explore and develop thinking and concepts for better planning, conduct and evaluation of multidimensional peace operations.

The challenges are indeed daunting. War and violence are destroying lives and livelihoods in entire regions challenged by crisis and conflict, from Syria and Yemen, to South Sudan and Mali. When the United Nations Security Council decides to send UN peacekeepers to create a stable and secure environment, to facilitate political processes and to prepare the ground for sustainable peace to take hold, how do we make sure that the mission will be successful, having a lasting positive impact for those it has been sent to protect and support?

In 2014-2015, several major reviews were undertaken related to peace operations, including the Review by the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO), the Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture, and the Global Study on Women, Peace and Security. Challenges Forum Partners, individually and collectively, contributed in various ways to these processes, hosting and participating in consultations. At the Challenges Annual Forum 2014 in Beijing, the requirements for building new capacity for peace operations in response to diversified threats were addressed. In early 2015, the results of a two-year Challenges Forum project on *Designing Mandates and Capabilities for Future Missions* was presented to the UN Secretary-General and HIPPO Members.

All stakeholders need to put their full weight and support behind a systematic realization of the recommendations generated in 2015. A central responsibility for the implementation of the recommendations lies with the UN Member States. As the findings of the various reviews emerged, the Challenges Forum Partnership embarked on exploring what implications they could and should have for the preparation and planning of future missions. Immediately following the release of the HIPPO Report, a Challenges Forum Workshop was hosted in Washington, D.C., which allowed the international community to make a first assessment of the report, paying particular attention to what the new era of peace operations will require in terms of strategic communication.

Shortly thereafter, the 2015 Leaders' Peacekeeping Summit hosted in New York generated an unprecedented number of pledges to strengthen Member State support for UN peace operations. The considerable increase in challenges to peace operations were to some degree matched by an increase in commitments of new capacities and capabilities. Armenia hosted the Challenges Annual Forum 2015 in the days immediately following the Summit, which gave the Challenges Forum Partnership an opportunity to assess the implementation of recommendations of the reviews, while taking into account the pledges made at the Summit. Specific focus in Yerevan was on the implications of the reviews' recommendations on institution- and capacity-building for peace operations.

Bringing the last few years' focus on reviews, reform and capability generation to a culmination, the Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum set out to explore how the results of these complimentary processes could be made even more concrete. What does implementation actually mean and entail? What needs to be done by whom and by which methods and resources? Three policy briefs and one occasional paper were published based on the outcomes of the 20th Anniversary Forum. The present report shares the content of the deliberations in more detail, recognizing that the views expressed in the report do not necessarily represent official governmental positions, but should be seen as a 'smorgasbord' of reflections, ideas, and proposals made by speakers and participants at the event. It is our hope that the conversations reflected herein may inspire positive and concrete exchanges and developments for the betterment of UN peace operations.

The Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum was held immediately prior to, but separate from the General Assembly High-level Thematic Debate on *UN, Peace and Security*. The President of the General Assembly and the UN Deputy Secretary-General participated in the 20th Anniversary Forum during a bridging session between the two events. The synergy of efforts was reinforced by the sharing of the 20th Anniversary Summary Report in time for the opening of deliberations in the General Assembly. The Defence Ministerial Meeting in London on 8 September 2016 will be instrumental in keeping the momentum of the renewed commitment to UN peace operations, as will the General Assembly 71st Session and the next UN Secretary-General assuming leadership in 2017. In November 2016, a Challenges Forum Workshop will be hosted by the Government of Indonesia, contributing to maintaining the momentum of support for UN peace operations.

In order to get the politics of peace operations right, we need to act in partnership and involve the people that can and want to make a difference. One platform for this is the Challenges Forum. Over the past 20 years, a solid cooperative effort has evolved which today includes 22 countries and 48 organizations representing major Troop and Police Contributing Countries, and the five Permanent Members of the UN Security Council. Of the Partner Organizations, more than half are from the Global South. Some 60 per cent are civilian organizations and departments, including police, and 40 per cent are military. The Partner Countries contribute 79 per cent of the total UN peacekeeping budget.¹

Partnerships are built through cooperation between countries, organizations and people. In the end, however, it is down to individuals who are committed to make a decisive and positive difference. The backbone of the Challenges Forum Partnership is the individuals working in the Partner Organizations: the movers and shakers, the dedicated practitioners, academics, and diplomats who have engaged with their Partner colleagues developing new and innovative ideas, projects and perspectives. They have pioneered dialogues on particularly difficult issues. Committed to making a difference, they have taken the lead in different parts of what today and collectively has become the Challenges Forum. The first vote of thanks goes naturally and wholeheartedly to our Partners in the Challenges Forum common endeavor.

A special thanks is extended to our colleagues at the UN Secretariat and in particular the UN Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support. We appreciate our long-term and positive cooperation over the years. We also welcome the broadening of the definition of peace operations and our increasing cooperation with the Department of Political Affairs.

It continues to be a great privilege as well as unique source of inspiration to benefit from the frank, yet friendly and insightful analysis of UN peace operations by Mr Jean-Marie Guéhenno, the Challenges Forum Patron since many years. The support of the Center on International Cooperation of the New York University, which has enabled the Challenges Forum Secretariat to have a foothold in New York, is also particularly valued.

The future of peace operations will depend on future leaders. It was a special privilege to welcome the World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA) as a new Partner Organization of the Challenges Forum and

¹ Based on information compiled by the Challenges Forum based on United Nations Peacekeeping financial contributions as of 31 December 2015 and personnel contributions as of 31 January 2016. For more information see: <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/resources/statistics/contributors.shtml>

the active participation of WFUNA Youth Representatives at the 20th Anniversary Forum. Our deepest thanks are extended to the co-hosts of the 20th Anniversary Forum: the Permanent Missions of Armenia, Indonesia, Nigeria, Sweden and the United States, and all colleagues in these missions involved. Moreover, our thanks go to the chairs, the key note speakers, the facilitators, the speakers, the background paper authors, the senior advisers, as well as participating Member States, academia and civil society organizations.

We are greatly indebted to Lindéngruppen for their support which enabled the Challenges Forum to develop the Exhibition *Mission in Motion: Peace Made Possible* in cooperation with the art foundation Färgfabriken and the Public Affairs Section of the UN Departments for Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support. The exhibition, twice extended at the request of the UN Department for Public Information, was displayed outside the UN General Assembly Hall on 10 May-31 July 2016.

The organizations supporting the coordination mechanism of the Challenges Forum are critical for the productive operation of the Forum. The solid backing of the Challenges Forum by the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs beginning already in the early days of the effort has been invaluable. A special thanks is extended to our co-coordinators and co-sponsoring Partners over the years, i.e. the Swedish Armed Forces, the Swedish National Police and the Swedish National Prison and Probation Service. The Folke Bernadotte Academy has played a key role in hosting the International Secretariat of the Challenges Forum since 2003, providing a space for the Challenges Forum Partnership to develop a common agenda and pursue joint undertakings.

Finally, it is my privilege to draw attention to my formidable colleagues in the Challenges Forum Secretariat: Dr Jibecke Joensson, Ms Kristina Zetterlund, Ms Isabella Björkman and Maj Gen Robert Gordon, without whose professionalism, dedication and deepest commitment, the Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum would not have been possible. Ms Lisa Sharland's important contribution to the initial draft of the present report is especially appreciated.

Concluding, the challenges of current peace operations continue to call for rapid and effective responses by the international community. Committed to an inclusive approach, we seek to develop thinking on how best support the work of the United Nations and its men and women peacekeepers. The aim of this report is to shed light on ways in which the international community may wish to tackle a number of the complexities facing today's and tomorrow's UN peace operations. The Challenges Forum is pleased to offer the present report for consideration and reflection by the international community.

If there is a will, there is a way.

*Ms Annika Hilding Norberg
Director and Founder of the Challenges Forum*

Abbreviations

AAV	Assessment and Advisory Visit	EUTM	European Union Training Mission
AFISMA	African-led International Support Mission to Mali	FGS	Force Generation Service
AMISOM	African Union Mission in Somalia	FPU	Formed Police Unit
ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations	GA	General Assembly
ASIFU	All Sources Information Fusion Unit	HIPPO	High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations
AU	African Union	IED	Improvised Explosive Device
C-34	United Nations Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations	IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority for Development
CAR	Central African Republic	MINUSCA	United Nations Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic
CSTO	Collective Security Treaty Organization	MINUSMA	United Nations Multi-dimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali
DDR	Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration	MINUSTAH	United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti
DFS	Department of Field Support	MISAHEL	African Union Mission for Mali and Sahel
DPA	Department of Political Affairs	MISCA	African-led International Support Mission to the Central African Republic
DPKO	Department of Peacekeeping Operations	MONUSCO	United Nations Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo	MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
DSS	Department of Safety and Security	NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
EOSG	Executive Office of the UN Secretary-General		
EU	European Union		

ONUC	United Nations Operation in the Congo	TCC	Troop Contributing Country
OSCE	Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe	UAV	Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
PBSO	Peacebuilding Support Office	UN	United Nations
PCC	Police Contributing Country	UNAMID	United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur
PCRS	Peacekeeping Capability Readiness System	UN COPS	United Nations Chiefs of Police Summit
POC	Protection of Civilians	UNMISS	United Nations Mission in South Sudan
PSC	Peace and Security Council (of the African Union)	UNSCR	United Nations Security Council Resolution
RDL	Rapid Deployment Level	UNSOM	United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal	UNSAS	United Nations Standby Arrangements System
SEA	Sexual Exploitation and Abuse	UNSOS	United Nations Support Office in Somalia
SGF	Strategic Guidance Framework	WFUNA	World Federation of United Nations Associations
SPM	Special Political Mission	WPS	Women, Peace and Security
SRSO	Special Representative of the Secretary-General		
SSR	Security Sector Reform		

Executive Summary

The Challenges Forum marked its 20th anniversary with an event on 8-9 May 2016 in New York, hosted by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations (UN) of Armenia, Indonesia, Nigeria, Sweden and the United States. Some 250 participants took part in the dialogue over the two days, including policymakers, practitioners and various experts from the UN, Member States, academia and civil society. The theme for the Annual Forum was *United Nations Peace Operations 2020: The United Nations Reviews and Their Implications for Tomorrow's Missions*.

The forum marked 20 years of cooperation in support of UN peace operations, with the Challenges Forum Partnership now bringing together 47 Partner Organizations from 22 countries, including major troop, police, civilian personnel and financial contributing countries, and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. The partner organizations come from six continents and represent governmental, practitioner and academic perspectives from countries of the Global South and North. In addition to discussing the diverse and complex challenges facing UN peace operations, meeting participants reflected on the positive developments and successes that had been achieved over the past 20 years. The 20th Anniversary Forum examined the recommendations from the high-level and expert reviews that had taken place in 2015 as well as other reform initiatives which would benefit UN peace operations. Deliberations also and in particular built on the findings and recommendations that had emerged at the Challenges Annual Forum 2015 hosted by Armenia.

Discussions at the 20th Anniversary Forum focused on recommendations and reforms required to ensure that UN peace operations would be tailored to meet some of the challenges they may encounter more often in the years ahead, whether originating from, for example, the threat of terrorism, transnational organized crime or climate change. The high-level reviews and reports provided a plethora of different recommendations to ensure that peacekeepers are prepared for operating in some of these environments and that peace operations are better able to deliver on their mandates. Yet, as with many of the recommendations, taking them forward will require political will and consensus among Member States. The Challenges Forum

Partnership is one vehicle through which such consensus can be developed.

If UN peace operations are to deliver on their current and future mandates, there is a need for guidance and doctrine to support peacekeepers in those efforts. Discussions explored some of the challenges relating to the development and implementation of guidance in the unique context of UN peace operations, recognizing that Member States have a key stake in those processes and need to be engaged. This is particularly important given that troop and police contributing countries are responsible for making sure that their personnel are prepared before deploying to UN peace operations. Moreover, it is essential that the UN continues to improve its processes for evaluating the operational readiness of personnel deploying to the field to ensure that they are prepared and equipped to deliver on mission mandates.

With UN peace operations deployed into continuously evolving threat environments, the UN has a duty of care to ensure it manages the safety and security of UN and associated personnel. Efforts are underway within the UN system to mitigate risks and develop policies that will improve the safety of personnel. However, a more concerted effort was seen to be required to generate some of the capabilities needed in the field, including intelligence, engineering and medical capabilities. Technology can act as a critical enabler if sourced and applied correctly in these contexts. Peacekeeping missions need to be more proactive in reaching out to host authorities and local communities and develop strategic communication in support of their activities to contribute to peace. Military, policing and civilian capacities all have important roles to play in such two-way communication.

Effective and efficient capabilities in the context of UN peace operations include identifying the right leaders and personnel for missions. Good leadership and effective management are essential ingredients in the successful execution and delivery of peacekeeping mandates on the ground. Capacity-building and training are key to strengthen leadership both in missions and at headquarters, as are well-functioning recruitment and promotion systems. Similarly, there is a need to engage women (including in senior leadership roles) and youth, both through participation and in the development and execution of mission mandates. More stringent frameworks and accountability mechanisms could facilitate some of the cultural change required to ensure that these improvements are made at headquarters and in the field.

Partnerships are essential to the effective delivery of mandates on the

ground. The UN relies on the support and contributions of Member States and regional organizations in undertaking its activities and in advancing peace and security. The commitments made by peacekeeping stakeholders at the 2015 Leaders' Summit on Peacekeeping demonstrated the importance of a range of different partnerships to support the peace operations of tomorrow. The summit also served to catalyse momentum to consider and implement the reforms and recommendations identified in the major reviews throughout 2015. That momentum continues into 2016 with the UN General Assembly High-level Thematic Debate on *UN, Peace and Security* on 10-11 May 2016, and the London Ministerial Meeting scheduled for 8 September 2016.

Summary of Recommendations

Discussions during the Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum identified several recommendations to improve and address some of the challenges of future UN peace operations. The recommendations build on those that emerged from the various high-level reviews in 2015 on UN peace operations and identify specific areas of practical and targeted reforms. The recommendations do not necessarily represent official government positions or a consensus among the participants but rather represent a collection of the diverse views and proposals raised throughout the forum.

For each recommendation, different stakeholders that may be in a position to action or initiate the suggested work have been identified. However, in many instances additional stakeholders—including host authorities, civil society and field personnel—will need to be actively engaged and contribute to efforts in order to take forward these recommendations.

The recommendations address existing gaps in policy, planning, training and coordination. In light of the timing of the report's release, it may be of particular interest to Member States ahead of the 2016 London Ministerial Meeting as well as intergovernmental discussions throughout 2016-17. Many of the recommendations may also be of interest to the new UN Secretary-General when taking up her or his appointment in 2017.

Conversation 1: Strengthening UN Peace Operations

NO	RECOMMENDATION	FOR POSSIBLE ACTION ¹
1	Develop and actively work with platforms and a matrix to track the implementation of HIPPO Report recommendations and other necessary reforms. ²	EOSG Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks
2	Develop and articulate a strategic vision across the UN system for implementing recommendations from the major reviews to prevent departments from prioritizing their own institutional interests.	EOSG Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks
3	Identify Member State 'champions' to progress and catalyse support for some of the recommendations from the HIPPO Report.	DPKO/DFS DPA Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks
4	Continue the work on developing a policy and guidelines on strategic communications for peacekeeping operations.	DPKO/DFS Member States Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks
5	Explore policies to guide the inclusion of youth perspectives in the development and implementation of peace operation mandates.	Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks
6	Ensure that future Challenges Forum activities include the participation of youth representatives.	Challenges Forum Partnership TCCs & PCCs UNSC DPKO/DFS

Conversation 2: Peacekeeping Summits and Ministerial Meetings

NO	RECOMMENDATION	FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
7	Evaluate capability needs of UN peace operations in the next five years to 2020 and engage in a strategic discussion with Member States on how to prepare and develop those capabilities.	DPKO/DFS Member States Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks

² UN Security Council (UNSC), Executive Office of the Secretary-General (EOSG), Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Department of Field Support (DPKO/DFS), Department of Political Affairs (DPA), Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs) and Police Contributing Countries (PCCs).

³ Work which has commenced with the Challenges Forum Occasional Paper by William Durch, Implementing Uniting Our Strengths for Peace: An approach to bench-marking HIPPO recommendations in five key areas, Challenges Forum Occasional Paper No.8 (August 2016). The Occasional Paper is based on William Durch's background paper for the Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum (see note 18).

NO	RECOMMENDATION	FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
8	Analyse and map the different policy and decision-making processes of Member States when determining whether to deploy military and police personnel to UN peace operations.	DPKO/DFS DPA Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks

Conversation 3: Partnerships between the UN and Regional Organizations

NO	RECOMMENDATION	FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
9	Enhance dialogue and lesson sharing among different regional organizations, particularly at the trilateral level among the UN, African Union (AU) and European Union (EU).	DPKO/DFS DPA Respective Regional Organization
10	Assess and map the comparative advantages and contributions of different regional and sub-regional organizations in peace operations, existing and emerging.	Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks
11	Examine efficient and effective ways to institutionalize cooperation between the UN and regional organizations, including determining the best funding arrangements for peace operations.	DPKO/DFS DPA Respective Regional Organization Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks

Conversation 4: Safety and Security of UN and Associated Personnel

NO	RECOMMENDATION	FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
12	Examine how critical enablers, such as engineering and medical capabilities, contribute to overall safety and security in peace operations.	DSS DPKO/DFS DPA Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks
13	Create concepts and a framework to guide missions in the development of their own mission-specific strategic communication plans.	DPKO/DFS DPA Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks
14	Develop a UN system-wide policy on crisis management in the context of UN peace operations.	EOSG DSS DPKO/DFS DPA

NO	RECOMMENDATION	FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
15	Establish a Group of Friends on Safety and Security in UN Peace Operations.	Member States
16	Develop a policy framework that sets out the rationale, methods and use of intelligence in UN peace operations.	DPKO/DFS DPA Member States
17	Develop bridging training programmes for potential female leaders in the context of UN peace operations.	DPKO/DFS Peacekeeping Training Centres Member States
18	Create a position at the level of Under-Secretary-General on Women, Peace and Security to catalyse and coordinate reform efforts emerging on the agenda.	Member States
19	Identify targets for gender-sensitive programming as part of extra-budgetary funding in peace operations and conflict prevention programmes.	Member States DPKO/DFS DPA
20	Examine linkages between UN Security Council resolution (UNSCR) 1325 (women, peace and security) and UNSCR 2250 (youth, peace and security) in order to identify policy options to strengthen peace operations.	Challenges Forum Partnership Think tanks
21	Continue focusing on mainstreaming and institutionalizing a UNSCR 1325 perspective in future Challenges Forum work and activities.	Challenges Forum Partnership

Conversation 6: Doctrine and Guidelines: How Can Implementation be Achieved?

NO	RECOMMENDATION	FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
22	Develop tabletop exercises for the senior mission leadership team on different types of crisis situations in UN peace operations and ensure their systematic and effective implementation.	DPKO/DFS DPA Member States Peacekeeping Training Centres
23	Assess the progress of TCCs and PCCs to integrate new UN training standards and guidance into training programmes and what can be done to accelerate such efforts.	DPKO/DFS Member States Peacekeeping Training Centres

NO	RECOMMENDATION	FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
24	Develop a UN system-wide policy on crisis management in the context of UN peace operations.	EOSG DSS DPKO/DFS DPA
25	Establish a Group of Friends on Safety and Security in UN Peace Operations.	Member States
26	Develop a policy framework that sets out the rationale, methods and use of intelligence in UN peace operations.	DPKO/DFS DPA Member States

Conversation 7: Capabilities and Capacity-building for Future Missions

NO	RECOMMENDATION	FOR POSSIBLE ACTION
27	Assess and map the different types of training and capacity-building activities being undertaken by Member States, regional organizations and the UN.	DPKO/DFS Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks
28	Identify future training needs for UN peace operations and engage TCCs and PCCs in an early discussion around the development of training materials.	DPKO/DFS Member States
29	Assess mediation and programmatic activities included in budgets for UN peace operations against the budgetary support required.	DPA Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks
30	Ensure sufficient support for mission leadership when preparing for and carrying out their responsibilities in carrying out mission mandates, including managerial and cultural diversity training.	DPKO/DFS DPA Member States Challenges Forum Partnership
31	Examine ways to best ensure that leadership performance is regularly assessed, including that efficient and effective accountability mechanisms are in place.	DPKO/DFS DPA Member States Challenges Forum Partnership / Think tanks

1. Introduction

Chair: H.E. Mr Mohammad Taisir Masadeh, Secretary-General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Expatriate Affairs of Jordan, Former Force Commander, UNMEE, Jordan; **Keynote:** H.E. Mr Hervé Ladsous, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations; General Micael Bydén, Chief of Defence, Sweden; **Speakers:** H.E. Mr Dian Triansyah Djani, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the United Nations; Mr Anthony A. Bosah, Chargé d'affaires, Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations, Chair of the UN Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations; Mr Petr Illichev, First Deputy Permanent Representative of Russia to the UN; Ms Victoria Holt, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State, United States; and Ms Annika Hilding-Norberg, Director and Founder, Challenges Forum, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden.

The Challenges Forum marked its 20th anniversary with an event on 8-9 May 2016 in New York, hosted by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Armenia, Indonesia, Nigeria, Sweden and the United States.⁴ Some 250 participants from Challenges Forum Partner Organizations took part in the dialogue over two days, including policymakers, practitioners and various experts from the United Nations (UN), Member States, academia, think tanks and civil society. The theme for the event was *United Nations Peace Operations 2020: The United Nations Reviews and Their Implications for Tomorrow's Missions*.⁵

The Challenges Forum highlighted 20 years of cooperation in support of UN peace operations, bringing together 47 Partner Organizations from 22 countries, including major troop, police, civilian personnel and financial contributing countries, and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council. The Partner Organizations come from six continents, and represent governmental, practitioner and academic perspectives from countries of the Global South and North. It was noted that 59 per cent of

⁴ The co-hosting countries were the most recent and upcoming hosts of Challenges Forum events (United States 2015, Armenia 2015 and Indonesia 2016), the Chair of the UN Special Committee on Peacekeeping (Nigeria) and the Challenges Forum Secretariat (Sweden).

⁵ The Challenges Forum uses the term 'peace operations' since 2000 to encompass missions included in the Brahimi Report definition: conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, as well as more robust interventions under UN Security Council mandates. Further, the Forum convenes discussions with regional organizations, having their own set terminology, thus peace operations is used as an umbrella concept to enable an inclusive multi-organizational dialogue.

the Partner Organizations are civilian (including police), whereas 49 per cent are military. This diverse representation ensures that differing views and perspectives are shared when considering challenges faced by UN peace operations (see Box 1).

Box 1: Challenges Forum Partnership: 20 Years of Cooperation in Support of UN Peace Operations

The Challenges Forum concept⁶ was developed in 1996 as a response to the then lack of an effective mechanism for pursuing an inclusive, frank, but friendly, international dialogue on how to enhance the way in which the international community plans and conducts peace operations. The need to reconsider the international approach to peacekeeping, peace enforcement and other types of operations, had become evident through the tragic developments in Somalia, Rwanda, Srebrenica and former Soviet Union. The first three Challenges Seminars on Challenges of Peace Support: Into the 21st Century were held in 1997-1998 in Stockholm, Moscow and Amman. Subsequently, seven seminars focused on specific aspects of peace operations were organized by Partners in South Africa, the United States, India, Japan, Canada, Argentina, and Australia. Invited by the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), a first-phase concluding report was presented to the UN Secretary-General at a high-level seminar in New York in 2002.

Taking its departure from that report, a second series of seminars on *Meeting the Challenges of Peace Operations: Cooperation and Coordination* was hosted by Turkey, Nigeria, Sweden, China and the United Kingdom, offering an even broader cross-section of views, experiences and expertise. The second concluding report was presented at the UN in 2006, after which the Partnership established the International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations (Challenges Forum) with a first Challenges Annual Forum convened by the French EU Presidency in 2008. It was followed by Annual Fora in Pakistan, Australia, Egypt, Switzerland, Argentina, China, and Armenia. In parallel, Challenges Forum Workshops addressing specialized topics were convened by Germany, Norway and Indonesia in 2016.

The Challenges Forum Partnership has produced some 70 reports and policy briefs, and contributed to the development of major multi-year UN or independent studies/projects, including:

⁶ The Challenges Forum concept was developed by Ms Annika Hilding Norberg in consultation with the Swedish National Defence College, Russian Public Policy Centre, Jordan Institute of Diplomacy, London School of Economics and Political Science and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

- Principles and Guidelines for UN Peacekeeping Operations (Capstone Doctrine)
- *Considerations for Mission Leadership in UN Peacekeeping Operations* (by Challenges Forum)
- Strategic Guidance Framework for International Police Peacekeeping (SGF)
- *Designing Mandates and Capabilities for Future Peace Operations* (by Challenges Forum)
- Consultations with the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) and External Review of the Functions, Structure and Capacity of UN Police Division

During the Challenges Forum 20th Anniversary, the exhibition *Mission in Motion: Peace Made Possible*, developed in cooperation with UN DPKO, Färgfabriken and Lindéngruppen, was launched outside the UN General Assembly. Furthermore, the World Federation of United Nations Associations joined the Challenges Forum as the most recent Partner. As of 2016, the Forum consists of 22 countries and 48 organizations based on six continents. The governing body of the Challenges Forum is the annual or biannual Partners' Meeting where all Partners are represented. The Forum Secretariat is provided by Sweden and is hosted by the Folke Bernadotte Academy in cooperation with the Swedish Armed Forces, National Police and National Prison and Probation Service.

The 20th Anniversary Forum examined results from and recent progress in implementing the recommendations from the many high-level and expert reviews that took place in 2015, including:

- *Uniting Our Strengths for Peace – Politics, Partnership and People: Report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO Report)*,⁷ and the UN Secretary-General's response to that Report *The Future of United Nations Peace Operations: Implementation of the Recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations*,⁸
- *Challenges of Sustaining Peace*, Report of the Advisory Group of Experts for the Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture (Peacebuilding Architecture Review),⁹

⁷ United Nations, *Report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations*, A/70/95-S/2-15/446, 17 June 2015 (hereafter 'HIPPO Report').

⁸ United Nations, *The Future of United Nations Peace Operations: Implementation of the Recommendations of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, Report of the Secretary-General*, A/70/357-S/2015/682, 2 September 2015.

⁹ United Nations, *Challenge of Sustaining Peace: Report of the Advisory Group on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture*, A/69/968-S/2015/490, 30 June 2015 (hereafter 'Peacebuilding Architecture Review').

- *A Global Study on the Implementation of Security Council resolution 1325* (Global Study on UNSCR 1325);¹⁰
- *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Peace*;¹¹ and
- *Performance Peacekeeping – Final Report of the Expert Panel on Technology and Innovation in UN Peacekeeping* (2014).¹²

Discussions throughout the two-day forum canvassed a range of issues drawing on the findings of these major reviews and their ongoing implementation. Background papers (available online),¹³ presentations and interactive conversations considered a range of challenges to UN peace operations, including:

- How can implementation of the reviews' recommendations be systematically followed up on by the broader international peace operations community? What might effective models for benchmarking look like? (See Chapter 1)
- What is required to operationalize and deliver on the commitments made at the Leaders' Peacekeeping Summits in 2014 and 2015? How can the next summit in London in September 2016 support these efforts to generate more capabilities? (See Chapter 2)
- What are the challenges and priorities for peace operation partnerships between the UN and regional organizations? (See Chapter 3)
- What should be done to improve the safety and security of UN and associated personnel in UN peace operations, including through engagement with local communities, in particular women? (See Chapter 4)
- What is required to effectively implement UNSCR 1325 in and by peace operations? (See Chapter 5)
- What is required to develop and effectively implement doctrine and guidelines on peace operations? (See Chapter 6)

¹⁰ UN Women, Preventing Conflict, Transforming Justice, Security the Peace, *A Global Study on the Implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 1325, 2015* (hereafter 'Global Study on UNSCR 1325').

¹¹ For the outcome document adopted by the UN General Assembly, see United Nations General Assembly Resolution 70/1 (2015), A/RES/70/1 (2015), 21 October 2015.

¹² United Nations, *Performance Peacekeeping – Final Report of the Expert Panel on Technology and Innovation in UN Peacekeeping*, December 2014 (hereafter 'Performance Peacekeeping').

¹³ The background papers prepared for the forum are available online via the Challenges Forum website: www.challengesforum.org (accessed 10 July 2016).

- What are the likely required capabilities and capacity-building needs of future missions, including military, police and civilian? (See Chapter 7)

The deliberations built on those that had taken place at a high-level Challenges Seminar hosted in Washington, DC, in June 2015,¹⁴ which had examined the implications of the HIPPO Report on strategic communications in support of peace operations, as well as the 2015 Challenges Annual Forum in Yerevan,¹⁵ which had focused on the implications of the HIPPO Report and the Peacebuilding Architecture Review on institution- and capacity-building for peace. A collaborative exhibition by the Challenges Forum, Färgfabriken and the UN Departments of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and Field Support (DFS) on telling the story of peace operations, titled *Mission in Motion: Peace Made Possible*, was launched during the 20th Anniversary Forum (see Box 2).

Following through on the adoption of the first UN Security Council resolution on 'youth, peace and security' (UNSCR 2250) in December 2015, young future leaders from the World Federation of UN Associations (WFUNA) network were invited to participate in the Forum as part of the newly formed collaboration between WFUNA and the Challenges Forum Partnership.

The Forum was timed to take place just prior to the UN General Assembly High-level Thematic Debate on *UN, Peace and Security* on 10-11 May 2016 (see Box 3). A summary of the discussions held at the Forum event, highlighting key points, was made available in advance of the High-level debate organized by the President of the General Assembly, reflecting the timeliness and relevance of the Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum.

¹⁴ Challenges Forum, 'Strategic Communications for a New Era of Peace Operations', Policy Brief 2015:1 (July 2015).

¹⁵ Challenges Forum, *Institution-and-Capacity-building for Peace: Implications of the UN's Review Panels' Recommendations for Future Missions*, Challenges Annual Forum Report 2015 (Stockholm, 2016).

Box 2: Telling the Story of UN Peace Operations

An exhibition on *Mission in Motion: Peace Made Possible* was launched during the 2016 Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum in New York. The exhibition was developed by the Challenges Forum in collaboration with the art foundation Färgfabriken and the UN Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support. The exhibition was displayed on the outer wall of the General Assembly in the Visitors' Lobby of the UN headquarters in New York from 10 May to 31 July 2016, after having been twice extended at the request of the UN Department of Public Information.

The aim of the exhibition is to tell the story of peace operations without simplifying them. As the introduction to the project states, 'peace operations are often described as moving from one activity and process to another, from keeping peace to building peace, from protecting people from violent physical threats to protecting human rights and socio-economic development'. However, the nature of peace operations is much more dynamic. Missions must constantly adapt to the needs on the ground and changing circumstances. These stories are seldom told.

The exhibition is complemented by a website which includes moving images, impressions and the voices of key actors involved in or affected by peace operations. Many of these actors come from the field and headquarters, from UN personnel and Member States, from civil society and the general public.

The website can be accessed here: www.mission-in-motion.org.

Mission in Motion was funded by Lindénggruppen and the Challenges Forum.

Confronting Global Challenges

The global environment in which peace operations operate and to which they deploy presents several challenges. As noted by a keynote speaker, major armed conflicts have tripled in recent years and peace operations are increasingly operating in high-risk areas. Moreover, peacekeepers are increasingly targeted by armed actors. In contrast to the gradual emergence of multidimensional missions in the 1990s, today's peace operations are trying to implement peace against the emergence of a new, pernicious type of violence across the Middle East and Africa, which questions the very notion of the nation State. The web of connections of armed groups and radical ideologies creates a particularly toxic environment to operate in. When this is mixed further with local grievances and organized crime, there is no tidy continuum to solve these problems. As a consequence, the traditional approaches to address armed conflict have been stretched to the

limit, creating a range of challenges for the deployment and operation of peacekeeping missions today.

Peace operations are routinely deploying into environments where there is no peace to keep. This can present a set of challenges when it comes to prioritizing tasks for the mission, particularly efforts to protect civilians. For example, the UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS) struggles to protect civilians and facilitate the implementation of the peace agreement while having to deal with ongoing efforts to interfere with the ability of the mission to implement its mandate.¹⁶ Terrorist entities in environments where peacekeepers are deployed test the limits of what tasks peace operations can undertake to implement their mandates, particularly in asymmetric and diverse threat environments where blue helmets are often the direct targets of attack. This has been the case in Mali, where the UN Integrated Multidimensional Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) had to innovate and evolve its mandate to respond to the threats posed by terrorist entities, which resulted in a debate in the international community about whether peace operations are the right tool to address threats to peace and security in these environments. Similarly, the intensity and regional dimensions of conflicts across North Africa and the Middle East, in places such as Syria, continue to raise questions about whether the UN may be called upon to deploy peace operations into an every-growing set of complex environments, and whether there are other, more suitable tools available.

While debates continue about the type of environments that UN peace operations should be deployed into, participants agreed that there is a need for more comprehensive and sustained attention on missions throughout their life cycle, particularly at their transition and draw-down phase. This was viewed as particularly important as missions in places such as Liberia, Côte d'Ivoire and Haiti are expected to start drawing down and handing over to the national authorities in the next few years. The Ebola outbreak in Liberia in 2014 demonstrated the importance of ensuring that peace operations facilitate the establishment of strong and resilient institutions that can respond to a wider range of threats and causes of instability, whether they be health crises or natural disasters. Climate change was identified as one of the many strategic risks likely to impact on peace operations in the future.

¹⁶ See also Challenges Forum, 'Capacity to Protect Civilians: Rhetoric or Reality?', Policy Brief 2015:4 (December 2015).

Despite these global challenges, the introductory session identified many areas that provide cause for optimism going forward. Recent developments in the Central African Republic (CAR) were noted as positive. In the month prior to the forum, a new democratically-elected President had been sworn in. Importantly, the defeated candidate accepted his defeat graciously. This was a key milestone considering the country had been on the brink of possible genocide little over two years ago. Furthermore, the commitments that were made at the 2015 Leaders' Summit on UN Peacekeeping demonstrated the willingness of countries to continue to commit personnel, resources and political support to ensure that peace operations are equipped with the tools necessary to confront some of these global challenges.

Reviews, Reforms and Leadership

Throughout 2015, the UN and its stakeholders were engaged in a series of consultations and reviews to improve the conduct and effectiveness of UN peace operations. The HIPPO Report produced a series of important suggestions, focused on four fundamental shifts that were needed to improve peace operations. First, the need to put politics first and ensure that political processes drive the design and deployment of peace operations. Second, the need to employ peace operations as part of a spectrum of tools to respond to different situations. Third, to continue to build strong partnerships. Lastly, fourth, to ensure the UN Secretariat takes a people-centred approach and is responsive to the needs of those in the field.

Within the UN Secretariat, work continues to implement the recommendations that emerged from the HIPPO Report. According to the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping, 23 per cent of the recommendations were nearly fully implemented, while close to 90 per cent were in the process of being implemented. It was noted that efforts to reform peace operations do not need to be limited just to the recommendations from the HIPPO Report. Moreover, it was stressed that a great number of recommendations require the active support of the Member States to secure their implementation and that this focus needs to be enhanced in the coming months and years. Moving forward, it was seen to be important that peace operations are more fit-for-purpose and able to respond to some of the global challenges that they will face.

Several areas of reform were identified as particularly critical to these efforts, including strengthening the performance of UN peace operations. Among the reforms that will be crucial to improving performance are setting clear standards for police and military and ensuring that the UN is able to attract the best people available to deploy into operations. The Strategic Force Generation and Capability Planning Cell—established in 2015 in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)—works to facilitate the generation and deployment of uniformed personnel for peace operations, most notable through the Peacekeeping Capability Readiness System (PCRS) database. The UN has set a goal of having 15,000 troops and police ready to be deployed at very short notice by the end of 2016. If this target is to be met, the UN needs to have a better understanding of the factors likely to influence whether or not countries are willing and able to deploy their military and police personnel to UN missions. At present, it is almost impossible to deploy a unit in less than six months. In the future, the UN aims to be in a position to deploy a unit within 30 to 60 days.

One challenge to effective performance remains the issue of conduct and discipline. There is now a policy in place within the UN system to send units home in cases of insufficient performance. This has already been done on several occasions during the past year, representing a departure from previous practice in this area. The same applies to conduct. As the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping noted, this was the reason why the Office of Peacekeeping Strategic Partnerships had been created, fulfilling a role similar to that of an ‘inspector-general’. The UN Chiefs of Police Summit (UN COPS) in June and the Ministerial Meeting hosted by the United Kingdom in September 2016 would be critical to broadening the base of contributors and ensuring there is a common understanding on the needs and requirements of taking part in UN peace operations. It was noted that an improved evaluation and certification process for units, as well as mobile training teams, can contribute to broader efforts to ensure that contributors meet the required standards ahead of deployment.

It was pointed out that there is a clear need to include a wider range of perspectives in mission planning and the conduct of operations. Integrating women into these efforts is essential to improving mandate delivery – this has been demonstrated in the field time and time again in contexts ranging from Afghanistan to Kosovo to the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC). Engaging civilian components more extensively has the potential to improve mission-wide efforts to protect civilians.

Technology and innovation have a particularly important role in ensuring that peace operations are prepared to meet 21st century challenges. Having the appropriate technology can ensure that peace operations are better positioned to more effectively utilize resources, simplify work processes and have a better grasp of the environments in which they operate to ensure the safety and security of peacekeeping and associated personnel. The use of technology such as Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) and aerostats with balloons have provided much greater situational awareness to peace operations, enabling them to monitor developments on the ground where they may not be in a position to deploy personnel (due to remoteness or inaccessibility). Nonetheless, views differed on whether there is a need to gain the explicit support of the host authorities ahead of deploying these assets, with the acknowledgement that this had not been the case in South Sudan.

Similar progress has been made on the development and use of intelligence in the context of peace operations. Not long ago the word ‘intelligence’ was considered taboo in the UN. However, due to the nature of the areas of operations, such as that in Mali, there has been an evolving realization that UN peace operations can no longer afford to be ‘deaf and blind’ to the threats they face today. The role that for example the Swedish and Dutch troops have had in developing these capabilities in Mali was viewed largely favourably, despite challenges and complexities that need to be addressed. It was acknowledged that this was only one model and that further work is needed to develop a UN approach to effective information sharing and intelligence.

In addition to performance and capabilities, it was agreed that peace operations must become better at managing their relationships with host countries. The ability of operations to deliver is at times challenged by a lack of cooperation with host countries, who may feel that they do not retain enough ownership or engagement in the political process. Relations with the host country are further complicated in contexts where national authorities are fragile or do not exist at all. One approach that was identified in the HIPPO Report as a way to improve the engagement with host countries is the development of compacts to provide a framework of mutual accountability between the host government and the UN. This type of compact is going to be trialled for the first time in the CAR.

Engagement with government and civil society stakeholders is crucial to ensure that the political process remains on track. National ownership also

involves political ownership. It was noted that it is important for peace operations to ensure that host governments retain a degree of sovereignty. Even though the international community may be able to bring about stability in a quicker manner if acting alone, there is a need to ensure that the host country is engaged and actively taking part in the process. Only in this way can sustainable peace be achieved. A truly inclusive approach requires engaging not only with host authorities, but also civil society actors and a cross-section of society, even if at times it can be difficult to identify which actors should be engaged.

Similarly, it was noted that political engagement should not only be strengthened with host governments, but also with the key stakeholders supporting peace operations, including the Security Council and troop and police contributing countries (TCCs and PCCs). These consultations need to be meaningful. However, most consultation processes do not go into enough depth to address some of the real challenges and grievances among stakeholders in the conduct of UN peace operations. Many participants acknowledged the role of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34) as part of that engagement process and commented favourably on the engagement undertaken by the committee in its recent consideration of the HIPPO reforms.

In concluding the session, participants acknowledged that the international community must continue its support and momentum for peace operations reform without waiting until the next Secretary-General assumes office in 2017. The UN needs the assistance of Member States but also has a role itself in driving the direction of the reforms. The challenges faced by peace operations are often unpredictable, requiring agile and flexible responses. Partnerships like the Challenges Forum provide important networks to facilitate the development of ideas and catalyse support for those efforts.

Box 3: UN General Assembly High-level Thematic Debate on Peace and Security

On 10-11 May 2016, the President of the UN General Assembly, Mogens Lykketoft, organized a high-level Thematic Debate of the UN General Assembly on *UN, Peace and Security*. The aim of the event was to identify key threats and reflect on the current challenges to international peace and security.

The high-level debate focused on the trends and synergies emerging from the major reviews that had taken place in 2015, namely, the report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO Report), the Peacebuilding Architecture Review and the *Global Study on the Implementation of Security Council resolution 1325 on women, peace and security*. A series of regional preparatory events had been convened to facilitate input into the debate. It also drew on discussions and conclusions from a range of intergovernmental processes which had considered the reviews, including within the C-34. The debate was intended to coincide with international consideration on how to best implement the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, as well as the Paris Agreement on climate change. Furthermore, the debate was expected to assist in formulating some issues for the consideration of the next Secretary-General in 2017.

Participants included Member States (some represented at the level of Foreign Minister), UN entities, civil society, research institutions (such as think tanks), media and other stakeholders.

Several key conclusions and observations emerged from the two-day debate. Many of these were captured in a letter from the President of the General Assembly to Member States (dated 20 May 2016).¹⁷ Among the main conclusions were: an invitation for the current Secretary-General to brief the membership on relevant aspects of the implementation of the different reviews; a recommendation that the next Secretary-General outlines his or her vision on the future of peace and security in the context of the UN; and a suggestion that Member States consider organizing a similar event in the margins of the next General Debate in September 2016.

The Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum concluding session was convened in the evening prior to the General Assembly (GA) Debate. The GA President and the Deputy Secretary-General participated in this bridging session, while the Summary Report from the Challenges Forum event was circulated in the morning during the opening of the GA Debate.

¹⁷ Letter from the President of the General Assembly, Mogens Lykketoft, addressed to Permanent Representatives and Permanent Observers to the United Nations in New York, 'Conclusions and Observations by the President of the seventieth session of the UN General Assembly', 20 May 2016.

2. Strengthening UN Peace Operations

Background Paper: Dr William Durch, 'Implementing Uniting Our Strengths for Peace: An Approach to benchmarking the HIPPO recommendations in five key areas' **Facilitator:** Dr Sarah Cliffe, Director, Center on International Cooperation, New York University, United Kingdom; **Panellists:** Dr Stephen Jackson, Chief, Policy Planning and Guidance, Department of Political Affairs, United Nations; Lt Gen (Retd) Abhijit Guha, Member, High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, Senior Member, United Services Institution of India, India; Mr Alexander Ilitchev, Member, High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, Russia; Maj. Gen. (Retd) Anis A. Bajwa, Member, Peacebuilding Architecture Review, Pakistan; and Dr William Durch, Senior Adviser, Challenges Forum, Distinguished Fellow, Stimson Center, Former Director, Brahimi Report, United States (background paper).

The major reviews undertaken in 2015 set out a series of recommendations that provide a pathway for the UN and the international community on how to strengthen UN peace operations. Discussions in this session focused on a range of issues and recommendations emerging from those reports and the processes and reforms that will be required to effectively implement them. Particular attention was paid to some of the recommendations from the HIPPO Report, but the session also explored more broadly recommendations which had emerged from all the reviews.

Issues raised in the panellists' remarks and the dialogue that followed included how to improve efforts at conflict prevention and sustaining peace; mechanisms to elevate the primacy of politics; approaches to focus on the role and contribution of people to missions (including engaging women and youth); the broad range of partnerships required to support implementation of the reforms; and delivery of improvements in the field to strengthen peace operations.

Implementing the Reviews

Following the publication of the various reviews throughout 2015, it was agreed that a challenge going forward would be to identify priorities for which recommendations to implement and the processes by which to implement them. As the remarks from the Under-Secretary-General in the

previous session had drawn attention to, many recommendations were in the process of being taken forward. However, responsibility for progressing and implementing the recommendations from the HIPPO Report, for example, rests with various stakeholders (including Member States, the UN Secretariat, the Secretary-General, personnel in peace operations, regional organizations and host countries), as well as processes and bodies such as the C-34, the Fifth Committee, the General Assembly and the Security Council (see Box 4). That list becomes even longer when you consider the Peacebuilding Architecture Review and the Global Study on UNSCR 1325.

The experience from the Brahimi Report provides a good example of some of the challenges in taking forward such major reforms. As was noted, several of the recommendations from the Brahimi Report in 2000 were never implemented. Yet there was clearly a need for reform in those areas, highlighted by the fact that the HIPPO Report identified many of the same recommendations in areas such as rapid deployment and mandating processes.¹⁸ As one panellist noted, the Brahimi Report demonstrated that the international community has a very small attention span. If reforms are not acted on from the start, the sense of urgency will likely dissipate and they will not be implemented. This means that the current window of time to act on the reforms is important, as the opportunity to do so could quickly diminish if momentum is lost.

The background paper prepared for the session provided a framework for how to effectively track implementation of the HIPPO Report's recommendations.¹⁹ The paper considered five substantive areas for reform: women, peace and security (WPS); UN Police; staff safety and security; strategic communication; and financing peace operations. It set out a series of possible benchmarks for measuring and evaluating the reforms in each of those substantive areas. In developing this matrix, the background paper drew on some of the lessons that had been learned from the implementation of the Brahimi Report. As the paper's author noted, the Secretariat was fortunate to have a set of leaders in DPKO who were prepared to continue working on the recommendations year after year. This often meant that the Secretariat was more advanced in carrying out reforms in its areas of responsibility than Member States, while reforms in areas such as standby forces and intelligence lagged behind.

¹⁸ See, for example, HIPPO Report, pp. 61, 65-66.

¹⁹ William Durch, 'Implementing Uniting Our Strengths for Peace: An approach to bench-marking the HIPPO recommendations in five key areas', Background Paper (Challenges Forum, May 2016).

Box 4: HIPPO Report – Where to From Here?

Following the HIPPO Report and the Secretary-General's report in response, the UN General Assembly held a debate on the findings of both reports on 12 October 2015. It subsequently adopted resolution 70/6 on 12 November 2015, stating that it 'decides to give further consideration during the seventieth session of the General Assembly to the recommendations emanating from the initiative of the Secretary-General, in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, the Fourth Committee, the Fifth Committee and other relevant bodies, in accordance with established procedures and in compliance with their respective purview'.²⁰

The Security Council was briefed by the Secretary-General on peace operations on 20 November 2015.²¹ This was the first opportunity for the Council to consider the recommendations from the HIPPO Report. The Secretary-General utilized the opportunity to focus on what role the Security Council could play in strengthening peace operations. A concept note prepared by the United Kingdom for the ensuing debate identified several key recommendations for the consideration of the Security Council relating to pursuit of political settlements; use of force and its limits; protection of civilians (POC); partnerships; prevention and mediation; sequenced mandates; dialogue between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop and police contributors; uniformed capability; caveats; and sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA).²²

On 22 November 2015, the Security Council adopted a Presidential Statement (S/PRES/2015/22) that took note of the recommendations in the HIPPO and Secretary-General's reports. In that Presidential Statement, the Security Council encouraged the Secretary-General to take forward the issues that were within his authority to improve peace operations. The Security Council adopted several products in the months that followed that, while not directly related to HIPPO implementation, address issues emerging from the HIPPO Report incl. triangular consultations with troop and police contributors²³ as well as SEA.²⁴

The C-34 considered several of the recommendations emerging from the HIPPO Report during its 2016 substantive session on issues that were open for negotiation, including military capacities, safety and security, conduct and discipline, gender and peacekeeping, children and peacekeeping, POC, cooperation with troop and

²⁰ United Nations General Assembly, A/RES/70/6 (2015).

²¹ United Nations Security Council, Maintenance of International Peace and Security, Meeting Record S/PV.7564, 20 November 2015.

²² United Nations, Letter dated 5 November from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General, S/2015/846, 5 November 2015.

²³ United Nations Security Council, Statement by the President of the Security Council, S/PRST/2015/26, 31 December 2015.

²⁴ United Nations Security Council, Resolution 2272 (2016), S/RES/2272 (2016), 11 March 2016.

police contributing countries, regional arrangements, field support and financial issues. However, several issues were not available for discussion and will likely be considered during the next C-34 session.

The 12 months that followed the release of the HIPPO Report demonstrated that different actors can take the initiative in progressing certain recommendations, but that many recommendations will require the consensus of a broad range of peace operations stakeholders. It was suggested during the 20th Anniversary Forum that some of the recommendations requiring larger institutional reforms are unlikely to progress much further until a new Secretary-General is in office.

The Challenges Forum Partnership was actively involved in and contributing to the lead-up process to the HIPPO Report release as well as in the follow-up implementation assessments Member States has pursued since its launch.

Member States have a critical role to play in taking forward the reforms recommended in the HIPPO Report and the subsequent Secretary-General's report. As one panellist stated, Member States have the money, the political power and the control. Member States have acted to ensure that the recommendations are considered in the appropriate UN bodies. The General Assembly has taken note of the HIPPO Report and the subsequent Secretary-General's report in response and decided to give further consideration 'to the recommendations emanating from the initiative of the Secretary-General' in the C-34, Fifth Committee and 'other relevant bodies'.²⁵ The Security Council has taken note of the recommendations in a Presidential Statement.²⁶ As discussions in later sessions reflected, the C-34 has made commendable progress in considering some of the issues of reform as part of its work (see Box 17).²⁷ However, it was acknowledged by participants that going forward there will be a need for Member State 'champions' to drive reforms on certain issues and develop consensus among the various stakeholders.

Similar commitment and support are required from Member States to take forward the recommendations of the other reviews, participants said. The process is well advanced in the case of the Peacebuilding Architecture Review, with the Permanent Representatives of Angola and Australia to the

²⁵ United Nations General Assembly, Resolution 70/6 (2015), Strengthening of the United Nations system, A/RES/70/6 (2015), 12 November 2015.

²⁶ United Nations Security Council, Statement by the President of the Security Council, S/PRST/2015/22, 25 November 2015.

²⁷ See United Nations General Assembly, Report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, 2016 Substantive Session, A/70/19, 15 March 2016 (hereafter referred to as 'C-34 Report 2016').

UN having held intergovernmental discussions on the report. This led to the adoption of substantively identical resolutions in the General Assembly and Security Council on 27 April 2016 on the issue of sustaining peace and peacebuilding.²⁸ One challenge regarding the peacebuilding agenda is that even if Member States have agreed on the two resolutions, funding required to implement them is yet to materialize. The role of Member States carrying through the recommendations of the Global Study on UNSCR 1325 is a little less clear. With no deliberative body or convenors having primary responsibility for the implementation, it will be up to Member States to champion many of the reforms through a range of processes, and within their national and regional jurisdictions.

Participants acknowledged the need for unity of effort across the UN Secretariat to bring forward the HIPPO reforms. The UN Secretariat has already demonstrated it is seized and prepared to implement those reforms it can. This was supported by the establishment of a cell in the Office of the Secretary-General early on in the reform process. Nevertheless, one of the key challenges going forward will be an issue of leadership and an identification of priorities across the various reviews. One of the traps that many of the reforms were seen to likely fall into related to institutional loyalties, where different departments and managers are busy pursuing their areas of interest. As one panellist noted, any UN official is capable of providing you with a list of why their issue is more important. With so many reforms on the table for consideration, there needs to be a more coordinated approach and a system to identify priorities and the order in which they should be implemented. This is lacking at present. The appointment of a new Secretary-General can provide some momentum to set out such priorities, although most participants agreed that this might be too long to wait.

Institutional loyalties were also deemed likely to be problematic when it comes to addressing major structural reforms. There is strong language in the HIPPO Report around institutional, financial and structural reforms, including financing for special political missions (SPMs) and the possible appointment of another Deputy Secretary-General. Similarly, it was noted that the Peacebuilding Fund is an agile risk taker in crises, yet it is currently more under-funded than ever since its establishment. There are similar challenges around securing funding for preventative capacities in the Department of Political Affairs (DPA). Issues around structural reform

²⁸ See United Nations Security Council Resolution 2282, S/RES/2282 (2016), 27 April 2016 and United Nations General Assembly, Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture, A/RES/70/262 (2016), 12 May 2016.

and financing are likely to be the most challenging to implement as they involve significant consequences for Member States. Moreover, Member States have set up the system in such a way that it is compartmentalized with different funding streams for different areas of operations. This means there are many forms of fragmentation that impede peace operations, whether they relate to budgeting, oversight, mandating or reporting mechanisms. It was agreed that the next Secretary-General will need to grasp and address this compartmentalized system if recommendations around a more cohesive ‘spectrum of peace operations’ are to be realized.

Ultimately, however, any efforts to reform and improve peace operations will fail to succeed if the UN system does not hold peacekeepers to high standards of accountability. Several participants noted the recent high-profile instances of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) within UN peacekeeping missions, noting that failure to effectively respond, investigate and prosecute these cases will result in impunity. Participants agreed that recent initiatives underway within the UN Secretariat represent a positive step forward. There are already signs that the UN is prepared to repatriate units that are not following up on allegations, in line with Security Council resolution 2272 of March 2016 on the issue of addressing and preventing SEA by UN peacekeepers (see Box 5). Similarly, the appointment of a Special Coordinator on improving the UN’s response to SEA in February 2016 will facilitate further system-wide action on the issue. In the context of peace operations, the UN needs to update local communities and authorities on the actions it is taking to respond to any complaints or allegations of abuse. This is essential to ensure that political and policy decisions result in action on the ground to address these horrific incidents. Otherwise, any efforts to work with local communities (e.g. with the aim to protect civilians) will be diminished by the harm and abuse caused by peacekeepers.

Box 5: Addressing and Preventing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse in Peacekeeping

On 22 June 2015, the UN Secretary-General convened a Panel to undertake an independent external review of the response of the UN to a series of allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) in the UN Multidimensional Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA). The Report of an Independent

Review on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by International Peacekeeping Forces in the Central African Republic was issued on 17 December 2015.²⁹

The report examined the responses and actions undertaken by the UN in response to a series of allegations of SEA that arose in 2014 in the Central African Republic (CAR), primarily against the French military force 'Sangaris' (which were not under UN command, although operating under a UN mandate). The report found that the UN's response to the allegations had been seriously flawed and that 'the UN must recognise that sexual violence by peacekeepers triggers its human rights mandate to protect victims, investigate, report and follow up on human rights violations, and to take measures to hold perpetrators accountable'.³⁰

The report recommended that the UN reframes the lens on sexual violence by peacekeepers so that it is addressed as part of its wider mandate on human rights; establishes a coordination unit with a working group within the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights to develop standard operating procedures and coordinate the response; ensures immediate reporting of any allegations; establishes a specialized investigation team; reviews policies on confidentiality; supports the establishment of a Trust Fund for victims; and revisits the prosecution process.

Several other actions were taken in parallel or shortly after the release of the report. The UN Secretary-General requested the resignation of his Special Representative in the CAR in August 2015, and appointed a Special Coordinator on improving the United Nations' response to SEA in February 2016.

Similarly, the UN Security Council decided to take action on the issue, adopting resolution 2272 in March 2016. That resolution notably requested the Secretary-General to replace military or police units from contributing countries that failed to hold perpetrators of SEA to account.

The Defence Ministerial Meeting in London, scheduled for September 2016, is expected to include focus on what further is required by the international community to step up and more effectively address SEA. The Challenges Forum Partnership has had a particular focus on strategic gender mainstreaming in the last few years. The challenges of SEA has also been part of the Forums ongoing deliberations, and it is foreseen this focus will unfortunately need to continue in the foreseeable future.

²⁹ Report of an Independent Review on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by International Peacekeeping Forces in the Central African Republic, Taking Action on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by Peacekeepers, 17 December 2015.

³⁰ Report of an Independent Review on Sexual Exploitation and Abuse by International Peacekeeping Forces in the Central African Republic, p. ii.

Conflict Prevention, Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace

The development of the concept of ‘sustaining peace’ represents a breakthrough in recognizing the investments required to prevent armed conflict. Conflict prevention is a critical part of that effort. Prevention can in many ways be much more challenging than deploying a peace operation. Conflict prevention struggles to gain attention within the UN system and lacks the mechanisms that are available to deploy a peacekeeping force. Efforts to hinder conflict outbreaks are made all the more difficult by the politics involved, as host countries often do not want to invite the UN or accept a foreign intervention if a conflict has not yet started. Similarly, there are often several Member States and regional organizations that have interests in the situation that may be unfolding, further complicating or influencing any decision-making process around whether the UN should intervene or not (particularly in the Security Council). This often means that the UN is not positioned to intervene until the crisis has evolved into a conflict, often requiring the attention of uniformed personnel in the form of a peace operation.

Moreover, conflict prevention is not just a question of preventative diplomacy but requires addressing the root causes of conflict. It is often these factors that a peace operation fails to pay adequate attention to. Not only can it be difficult to identify the root causes, but there are no mechanisms in the UN system to measure whether they are being effectively addressed, ensuring that a peace operation is actually contributing to sustaining peace in the longer term. Addressing the root causes of conflict is made even more difficult by the fact that different instruments and tools often reside in different parts of the UN system. That root causes often have not been addressed explains, in part, why so often the UN is called in again and again to deploy peace operations in countries which have relapsed into conflict.

Peacebuilding cannot only come into consideration after the conflict but needs to be addressed throughout the whole cycle of peace and conflict. The Peacebuilding Architecture Review acknowledged that sustaining peace is actually a core responsibility of the United Nations, whereas peace operations are tools to discharge that responsibility. The HIPPO Report and Global Study on UNSCR 1325 echoed similar thoughts in emphasizing prevention before military options.

Politics and Partnerships

One of the four essential shifts called for in the HIPPO Report was the need for politics to drive the design and implementation of peace operations. It was an acknowledgement that lasting peace cannot be achieved through military or technical engagements, but only through political solutions. Such efforts require the investment and support of Member States. Yet in many cases, peace operations are deployed into environments where there is no immediate political solution to the conflict or where there has been a relapse into conflict. The drive to deploy in these circumstances is often due to the imperative to protect civilians who have come under threat, in places where the national government or host authorities are not in a position to do so.

As a consequence, peace operations are often faced with the task of facilitating a political solution while deployed within a country. In these circumstances, it is particularly critical that the different components of mission leadership are in agreement and clear on what the mission objectives are. The Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG) needs to be in close communication with the Head of Military Component and Head of Police Component. There also needs to be a unity in purpose in terms of the Security Council's political engagement in the country and the messaging that it sends through the adoption of resolutions, statements and other Council products. Engagement through Security Council visits to field missions can be a valuable tool. Political compacts between the UN and the host country may be another mechanism to facilitate these efforts in a more sustained manner.

Different partnerships can be critical to these efforts. While partnerships are often discussed in the context of those between Member States, regional organizations and different UN bodies (see Chapter 3), they are also important more broadly in terms of developing support within missions and ensuring there are inclusive processes for dialogue and input. This is particularly true in terms of engagement with local communities. In some cases, there is a need for the UN to be a little more careful in its approach to engaging with national authorities and civil society, so that the mission does not come across as perceiving itself as an elite entity, nor one that only engages with elites in the community. Everybody needs to be involved if the political process is to be inclusive. If no one thinks they own the political solution, there will be a limited attempt to sustain it after the peace operation departs.

Box 6: Sustaining Peace and the Resolutions on Peacebuilding

The Peacebuilding Architecture Review was intended as a two-stage process, with the delivery of a report by an Advisory Group of Experts followed by an intergovernmental process (co-facilitated by the Permanent Representatives of Australia and Angola to the United Nations throughout 2015 and 2016).

Following months of consultations with Member States and a range of stakeholders, the Security Council and the General Assembly adopted substantively the same resolutions in April and May 2016.³¹ The resolutions represented wide-ranging consensus across the UN membership on peacebuilding, drawing on many of the recommendations that had emerged from the review.

The resolutions emphasized the importance of the sustaining peace concept in terms of the work carried out by the various UN bodies, covering a wide range of issues from the role of the Peacebuilding Commission to the need for revitalising the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and greater collaboration between the UN and the World Bank when it comes to conflict-affected countries.

The General Assembly in its resolution (as noted by the Security Council) decided to convene a high-level meeting at its 72nd session on 'efforts undertaken and opportunities to strengthen the United Nations work on sustaining peace'. The resolution also invited the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly 60 days prior to that meeting on efforts to implement the resolution, including:

- strengthening operational and policy coherence within the UN system towards sustaining peace;
- improving international United Nations leadership, capability and accountability as part of those efforts;
- ensuring the continuity of relevant peacebuilding programmes;
- strengthening partnerships between the United Nations and key stakeholders;
- providing options on increasing, restructuring and better prioritizing funding to peacebuilding activities;
- providing options for the adequate resourcing of peacebuilding activities across UN country teams, and peacebuilding components in peace operations (peacekeeping and special political missions);

³¹ See UN Security Council, S/RES/2282, 27 April 2016 and United Nations General Assembly, Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture, A/RES/70/262, 12 May 2016.

- strengthening the capacity of senior leadership in UN country teams to absorb peacebuilding functions;
- supporting the participation of women and youth in peacebuilding processes; and revitalizing the PBSO.

The General Assembly (supported by the Security Council in its resolution) also called for a further comprehensive review of UN peacebuilding at its 74th session.

The Women, Peace and Security Agenda

While there is often much talk about increasing the numbers and types of positions that women are deployed to in UN peace operations, minimal progress has been made. The Global Study on UNSCR 1325 acknowledged that women's participation is key to sustainable peace. In other words, no peace operation will succeed if women are not included at the core. Nevertheless, the representation of women in peace operations remains incredibly low, particularly among uniformed personnel. This is despite evidence that women on the ground are for example often better placed to relate to parts of the local community.³² Challenges extend to the integration of gender perspectives in operations, as gender advisers are many times at the bottom of the decision-making chain. It is only now that the UN is starting to consider making gender advisers more prominent by reporting directly to the Heads of Missions (a recommendation from the Global Study on UNSCR 1325).³³

Part of the challenge to improving the overall implementation of resolution 1325 in peace operations requires attention to structural and institutional impediments. These often extend throughout the recruitment, hiring and promotion cycles. The hurdles are particularly stark when considering different Member State security sectors, which often have wide-ranging policies on the roles and functions that women can undertake. However, challenges also exist for civilian women in peace operations, particularly with regard to promotion to more senior levels of mission management.

Equally important is that peace operations engage with women in conflict-affected areas. One type of engagement undertaken by missions with local communities in the field is so called 'Open Days on Women, Peace and Security'. These allow a direct dialogue between women peace activists

³² Global Study on UNSCR 1325, p.141.

³³ Global Study on UNSCR 1325, p.17. See also HIPPO Report, p.79.

and senior UN representation at the country level. Thus far, the ‘Open Days’ are seen as a positive development. One panellist questioned why this approach had not been extended year round, as missions are often perceived as inaccessible by local civil society organizations. Such open engagement would form an important bridge in efforts to improve longer-term conflict prevention efforts, providing missions with a better understanding of some of the challenges faced by local communities.

People and Youth for Peace

Another of the four key shifts called for in the HIPPO Report is the need for peace operations to become more field-focused and people-centred. A constituency that is often overlooked as part of those efforts, or not engaged comprehensively enough is youth.

In December 2015, the Security Council adopted its first resolution on youth, peace and security (resolution 2250).³⁴ That resolution generated increased interest in the importance of engaging young people (aged 18-29) in efforts to build and maintain peace. Such engagement calls for closer interaction with the grass roots of society rather than simply prioritizing engagement with prominent and often much older figures and elites, who have other perspectives and face a different set of challenges (see Box 7). The resolution recognized the possible threat to peace and security posed by radicalization among young people, and therefore urged Member States to ensure youth has a voice in decision-making processes, whether at the national, regional or international level. Accordingly, peace operations should adapt strategies and approaches to engage with young people in areas where they are deployed. It is also critical that youth are represented and engaged in the various discussions taking place around peace operations reform. Participants agreed that young people are a central component in efforts to strengthen peace operations into the future.

Several participants commended the participation of youth representatives from WFUNA in the two-day forum. This prompted a recommendation that the Challenges Forum should continue the inclusion of youth representatives in future forums and events to ensure that their voices are heard in consultations on peace operations – a suggestion that was later endorsed by the Challenges Forum Partnership at its follow-up Partners Meeting.

³⁴ United Nations Security Council, Resolution 2250 (2015), S/RES/2250 (2015), 9 December 2015.

Box 7: Youth, Peace and Security (UNSCR 2250)

On 9 December 2015, the UN Security Council adopted its first resolution on the topic of 'youth, peace and security'—UN Security Council resolution (UNSCR) 2250. The resolution was initiated by Jordan, building on a Security Council open debate during its Presidency in April 2015 on 'The Role of Youth in Countering Violent Extremism and Promoting Peace', which was followed by a Global Forum on youth, peace and security in August 2015.³⁵

Recognizing that youth form the majority of the population of countries affected by armed conflict, UNSCR 2250 affirmed the role that youth could play in preventing and resolving conflicts. It encouraged Member States to 'consider ways to increase inclusive representation of youth in decision-making at all levels in local, national, regional and international institutions and mechanisms for the prevention and resolution of conflict'.

While the resolution did not refer to peace operations in much detail, it did affirm the importance of youth in preventing and resolving conflicts as a key aspect to the success of peacekeeping and peacebuilding activities. It recognized the importance of taking into account the views of youth when negotiating and implementing peace agreements. It stressed the importance of policies that provide youth with opportunities in the context of peacebuilding activities. And it encouraged those involved in planning disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programmes to consider the needs of youth affected by conflict, particularly in terms of employment opportunities and education.

In terms of next steps, the resolution requested the Secretary-General to conduct a progress study on 'youth's positive contribution to peace processes and conflict resolution', although no timeline was provided on when that study should be made available to Member States and the Security Council. It also called for the Secretary-General to report on measures to implement the resolution in the context of issues on the agenda of the Security Council. The Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum for the first time involved Youth Representatives as participants in the Forum deliberations, and including a leading colleague from Liberia. The ensuing Challenges Forum Partners Meeting agreed that representatives of Youth should be regularly invited to participate in the Challenges Forum undertakings.

³⁵ United Nations Security Council, Maintenance of International Peace and Security, S/PV.7573, 9 December 2015.

In closing, the panel identified several conceptual and practical aspects to strengthening peace operations. On the conceptual level, they included the importance of conflict prevention and the primacy of politics. Another more

conceptual issue was that of localization, with a focus on the people-centric approach. On a practical level, three areas were identified that required sustained engagement. First was the issue of regional partnerships (see Chapter 3). Further consideration was seen to be needed to determine the comparative advantages that the UN versus regional organizations can bring to peace operations (which also requires a more engaged and frank discussion on financing arrangements). Second, a number of structural issues need to be addressed to ensure that the system is up to the task of addressing a range of challenges, including implementing the WPS agenda. Third, financing issues need to be resolved, particularly as they relate to conflict prevention measures. It was agreed that the process going forward will be quite iterative, requiring ongoing engagement by Member States, the UN Secretariat and other stakeholders.

3. Peacekeeping Summits and Ministerial Meetings

Facilitator: Ms Victoria Holt, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State, United States; **Panellists:** Lt. Gen. Luiz Paul Cruz, Director for Peacekeeping Partnerships, Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support, United Nations; Mr Kamadrapdipta Isnomo, Minister Counsellor for Political Affairs, Permanent Mission of Indonesia to the United Nations; Commissioner Ann-Marie Orlor, Head of Division for International Affairs, Swedish Police; and H.E. Mr Matthew Rycroft, Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations.

Over the last few years, the demand for UN peace operations has often outweighed the supply of personnel and capabilities available to deploy. In recent years, the Security Council has decided to deploy new peacekeeping missions in Mali and the CAR as well as to increase the number of personnel deployed to the operation in South Sudan. Yet it has taken several months—if not more than a year—for those missions to reach their authorized troop and police ceilings, and to recruit personnel to critical civilian posts. This led some participants to conclude that UN peacekeeping is in crisis and that efforts to turn things around, ensuring that missions meet the needs in the field, will require stronger and more effective collaboration and partnerships.

This ongoing and critical demand for key peacekeeping capabilities is one of the reasons why the United States, along with several partner countries, collaborated with the UN to host two peacekeeping summits in 2014 and 2015 respectively (see Box 8). The most recent UN peacekeeping summit was co-hosted by US President Obama in New York in September 2015. That summit resulted in commitments from more than 50 countries and regional organizations, and included pledges of more than 40,000 personnel. Nonetheless, participants agreed that one of the key challenges moving forward from that summit will be to ensure that countries follow through on their commitments.

During the 2015 peacekeeping summit, the United Kingdom pledged to hold a follow-on meeting in 2016. The aims of that summit are to: invite the Defence Ministers and/or Defence Chiefs of Staff from those countries that made pledges in 2015 (or have since then made peacekeeping pledges);

to follow up on whether they are implementing what they pledged to do; to examine some of the discussion around efforts to improve peace operations following on from the HIPPO Report; and to ensure a particular focus on women and gender issues as an integral part of those discussions. The Ministerial Meeting in London is scheduled to take place on 7-8 September 2016.

Although the pledges made in 2014 and 2015 represent considerable progress, there are still many challenges to ensure that the best-equipped and prepared people are deployed to the field where they are needed. As one panellist noted, it is about making sure that the ‘UN can get the right people to the right places at the right time with the right skills’. Discussion in this session therefore focused on many of the challenges that impede efforts to ensure the right people are deployed to the field, whether they relate to national processes to deploy military personnel, identifying national police who can deploy internationally, or impediments to civilian recruitment processes. The discussion led to substantive deliberations on the role of leadership and management, including the challenges of managing cultural diversity in field missions. In addition to pledges, it was acknowledged that there will need to be a concerted effort to address issues related to enhancing performance, planning, prioritization and phasing of mission mandates.

Box 8: Summits on UN Peacekeeping

Throughout 2013 and 2014, the UN Security Council established two peacekeeping missions in Mali and the Central African Republic (CAR), and significantly reconfigured the existing mission in South Sudan. These developments created historic demand on the international community for more UN peacekeepers, aggravating the ongoing struggle to generate the personnel necessary to fill capability gaps.

Recent summits on UN peacekeeping have attempted to generate high-level political commitments from Member States to contribute personnel and capabilities required to fulfil mission mandates. The first Summit on Strengthening UN Peacekeeping took place in September 2014 and was convened by United States and co-hosted by Rwanda, Bangladesh, Japan and Pakistan. During that summit, more than 30 countries made pledges to UN peacekeeping.

The first summit was followed up in September 2015 with a Leaders’ Summit on UN Peacekeeping, convened by the United States and co-hosted by Bangladesh,

Ethiopia, Indonesia, Japan, the Netherlands, Pakistan, Rwanda and Uruguay. At that summit, more than 50 countries and regional organizations pledged commitments to UN peacekeeping, resulting in pledges of more than 40,000 personnel.

The next meeting will be a Defence Ministerial Meeting hosted by the United Kingdom in London on 7-8 September 2016. This meeting will focus on tracking how countries are operationalizing their pledges to UN peacekeeping, look at future commitments and pay particular attention to women, peace and security.

The Challenges Forum Partnership, collectively and individually, contributed to the process in various ways. For example, the United States took the initial lead while other Partners, like Indonesia, hosted a regional consultation to which the Challenges Forum Secretariat contributed. Partner Countries and the Challenges Forum Secretariat, participated in the Leaders' Peacekeeping Summit in September 2015. It is envisioned that the Partnership will follow up on the outcomes of the Ministerial Meeting assessing what needs to be focused on in the lead-up to 2017.

Military Personnel and Enablers

The process to deploy military personnel and enablers to a UN peace operation is often complex and can vary depending on the nature of the request and the Member State involved. From the outset, each Member State usually has its own national processes for deciding whether or not to commit national military personnel and equipment to an overseas operation. In some instances, this can involve having to seek legislative approval through parliamentary processes, whereas in other situations it may be possible for a government to make the decision to deploy personnel within the executive of government. These decision-making processes often mean there will be a delay from when a government receives a request (or makes a pledge) to the point in time that they are able to deploy personnel. Some panellists proposed that there would be benefit in mapping the internal mechanisms at the national level within countries that need to be addressed before a Member State is able to deploy peacekeeping personnel to a mission. This could assist in clearly identifying timelines for deployment, as well as manage potential risks in the force generation process.

Once personnel have been deployed to a mission, there needs to be an agreement between the Member State sending personnel and the UN in terms of the expected capabilities and performance of the contingent. This is often detailed in the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed

between the TCC and the UN ahead of deployment. Nonetheless, at times there are disputes and disagreements over what might be expected in the field, particularly when it comes to issues such as the use of credible force and the ability to deter threats. The UN needs to ensure that it identifies and deploys TCCs that are willing to use force when required to fulfil the mission mandate.

As one panellist noted, the Office of Peacekeeping Strategic Partnerships in DPKO/DFS was established in part to respond to some of these performance management aspects in peacekeeping. As part of that effort, DPKO and DFS are undertaking field trips to identify some of the systemic issues as they relate to the performance of TCCs, including issues related to guidance and direction, integration, leadership, force generation, compliance and mission support. However, it was noted that if standards are to be adhered to, then guidance needs to be clear, updated and fully understood by all mission personnel, particularly those in leadership positions. If guidance is clear and personnel are still not performing to the appropriate and expected standards, then it was generally agreed that they should be repatriated from the mission.

Another challenge identified in terms of performance pertained to command and control, which is unsatisfactory partly due to a lack of a standard force headquarters structure in peacekeeping missions. It was expected that the development of a new Military Force Headquarters Manual will assist in ensuring greater clarity in terms of staff officer roles (e.g. legal advisers, gender advisers). Such a manual will also ensure that missions are better positioned to identify and recruit military officers with the right skill-sets for different positions. For example, as one participant noted, if someone is deployed as an intelligence officer, then she or he should have a background in intelligence. Similar complications in terms of standardization were noted when it comes to diversity of equipment being used by personnel from different contingents. It was agreed that there needs to be better integration of efforts to ensure that contingents and officers can work more effectively together.

The development of the PCRS was expected to assist in addressing some of the challenges identified in this session as they related to force generation, performance and equipment (see Box 9). The system provides Member States with a certain level of guidance and instructions to identify and match capabilities and mission needs. Although the PCRS is still in its early phases, the system was expected to assist in ensuring that the pledges and

commitments made by Member States are quicker and better matched with the needs of peace operations.

Box 9: Peacekeeping Capability Readiness System

The UN Peacekeeping Capability Readiness System (PCRS) was established in July 2015, replacing the old UN Standby Arrangements System (UNSAS). The PCRS is intended to develop a more predictable and reliable force generation process for military and police commitments to UN peacekeeping missions.³⁶

The system provides four levels of readiness for deployment, based on a clearly defined set of criteria:

- Level 1 is when a country makes a formal pledge of a unit to the UN. Countries that do not meet the basic requirements are not registered as this level, but engaged as part of a process to bring them up to the level required.
- Pledges are elevated to Level 2 after Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) negotiations and an Assessment and Advisory Visit (AAV) from staff at the Force Generation Service (FGS) and Department of Field Support (DFS).
- Countries are only upgraded to Level 3 after passing the AAV and concluding their MOU, demonstrating their preparedness to deploy.

TCCs then have an option to determine whether they want to be registered at the Rapid Deployment Level (RDL), meaning they would be prepared to deploy within 30, 60 or 90 days of a request being made.

In some circumstances, TCCs/PCCs with registered enablers at the Rapid Deployment Level may be eligible for financial premiums.

36 United Nations, United Nations Peacekeeping Capability Readiness System – Overview, available from <https://cc.unlb.org/PCRS%20References/PCRS%20documents/PCRS%20Overview%20Oct%202015.pdf> (accessed on 5 September 2016).

Police and Rule of Law Capabilities

Despite decades of work to raise the profile of police peacekeeping, the UN still struggles to generate qualified and skilled police who can deploy to UN peace operations. Part of the challenge is inherent to the nature of police work, namely that police are trained and recruited to meet domestic needs, meaning there are often not enough personnel to deploy overseas. Nonetheless, many countries have made a concerted effort to ensure that they are able to identify and deploy qualified police to missions. This has contributed to ensuring that UN Police are more professionalized in their approach. Yet the recruitment of police from a diverse range of backgrounds

presents a further problem, as policing doctrine and training often differ from country to country, particularly in terms of the approach to community policing. Furthermore, the police systems of the PCCs are not necessarily the most suitable ones for the host country which needs to develop a model of policing that matches its culture and system of governance.

The UN has been working with the AU, the EU and Member States to develop a Strategic Guidance Framework (SGF) for UN policing (an effort also actively supported by the Challenges Forum³⁷). With so many different models and cultures of policing being deployed into UN peace operations, the SGF is intended to develop a more coherent and consistent approach to UN policing. The second thematic phase of the SGF process was nearing completion at the time of the 20th Anniversary Forum, with the third phase expected to result in the development of practical manuals in a range of critical areas within field missions.

Development of further guidance around a range of capacity-building tasks for police will be critical. Police peacekeepers are generally deployed to develop capacity in the host country, not act as police themselves. This requires a different type of skill set, which often focuses on mentoring and training of host police forces. Building the capacity of the host police forces is a critical part of addressing threats, spoilers and actors involved in organized crime, which often thrive in environments where there is a lack of governance structures or functioning rule of law systems. In light of this policing role, one panellist noted that it is often better to think of police peacekeepers as a ‘police service’ instead of a ‘police force’. In other words, when providing support to police capacity, UN peace operations need to ask from the onset what kind of police is required in that particular society. This requires an important shift in mindset—one that is critical to longer-term efforts to prevent crime and relapses into conflict.³⁸

³⁷ See Challenges Forum, ‘Strategic Guidance Framework for International Police Peacekeeping – Framing the Framework’, Policy Brief 2014:2 (September 2014); and Challenges Forum, ‘Strategic Guidance Framework for International Peacekeeping – Capacity-Building and Development’, Policy Brief 2014:3 (September 2014). See also Maureen Brown, Dr William Durch and Henrik Stiernblad, Principles of International Police Command, Challenges Forum Occasional Paper No. 5 (May 2015); and Mark Andrew Reber, Challenges with Assessing Impact in International Police Reform and Assistance, Challenges Forum Occasional Paper No. 1 (March 2014).

³⁸ For more on this see for example, Dr Marina Caparini, Capacity-building and Development of Host State Police: The Role of International Police, Challenges Forum Occasional Paper No. 3 (May 2014); and Dr William Durch, Police in UN Peace Operations: Evolving Roles and Requirements, Challenges Forum Occasional Paper No. 4 (August 2014).

Box 10: External Review of the Functions, Structure and Capacity of the United Nations Police Division³⁹

In January 2016, the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations appointed an independent review team to undertake a functional review of the United Nations Police Division. The review was prompted by the HIPPO Report and the subsequent Secretary-General's report. The team was tasked to look at the Police Division's role, responsibilities and functions.

The review process included engagement and in-depth dialogue with police components from 10 different DPKO and Political Missions, two field missions to MINUSCA (CAR) and MINUSTAH (Haiti), and interviews with over 300 practitioners at headquarters and in the field. It also engaged host countries through in-depth discussions.

The review proposed a paradigm shift in UN Police's operating model, including: (a) Police must be at the centre of peace, stability and development; (b) Mandates of Police components must be sequenced and flexible; (c) United Nations Police must be field- and results-oriented; (d) Authority must be decentralized to empower Police components to deliver; (e) Recruitment should be results-driven; (f) A culture of accountability must be developed; (g) There must be coordination and coherence in the approach, between the actors and institutions across the criminal justice chain.

In order to implement the new model, the report proposed a number of key recommendations, including, inter alia, making the Police Advisor role an Assistant Secretary-General (ASG); increased staffing levels of the Police Division and recruitment of civilian experts to support police institutional development; finalization and roll-out of the Strategic Guidance Framework (SGF); and the creation of a Police Advisory Committee (PAC).⁴⁰

The Challenges Forum Partnership, collectively and individually, provided input to the review process, including through a contribution at a Groups of Friends of UN Policing meeting hosted by the Permanent Mission of Germany to the UN on 2 December 2015 and by co-chairing and contributing to a consultation workshop with the Review Panel on 27 January 2016 at the Permanent Mission of Switzerland to the UN, with the aim of collecting input from civilian policing experts for the review.⁴¹

³⁹ United Nations, External review of the functions, structure and capacity of the United Nations Police Division, 31 May 2016. Available from <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/policerreview2016.pdf>

⁴⁰ United Nations, External review of the functions, structure and capacity of the United Nations Police Division (2016).

⁴¹ In cooperation with ISSAT/DCAF, which provided the Secretariat for the External Review and its process, the Challenges Forum co-chaired the workshop. The two first opening briefs were given by Dr William Durch, Senior Adviser, Challenges Forum / former Director of the Brahimi Report, and Ms Maureen Brown, Senior Police Adviser, Challenges Forum, who based their input on issues also raised by engaged Partners. See <http://www.challengesforum.org/en/About/News/Workshop-on-The-External-Review-of-UN-Police-Division-Consultation-with-Civilian-Policing-Experts/> (accessed 5 September 2016).

In addition to the development of guidance materials and a framework on the role of UN policing, it was agreed that a more comprehensive understanding among all stakeholders on how policing contributes to the delivery of complex multidimensional peacekeeping mandates is needed. It was noted that the first Security Council resolution on policing—resolution 2185⁴²—codified some of the comparative advantages that police can bring to peace operations, yet it was argued that the resolution is not clearly understood by decision-makers in for example the Security Council and Member States contributing personnel. This presents a challenge, particularly when the UN Security Council is entrusted to mandate the differing range of tasks likely to be undertaken by police peacekeepers. In these circumstances, how do you ensure that a mission is the right fit for the environment that it is being deployed to? This understanding needs to be improved. It was expected that the first meeting among UN Police Chiefs (UN COPS) in June 2016 (see Box 11) would contribute to efforts to raise the profile of international police peacekeeping, as would the Secretary-General’s forthcoming first report on UN Police (requested in resolution 2185).

Box 11: Inaugural UN Chiefs of Police Meeting 2016

The first UN Chiefs of Police Meeting Summit (UN COPS) was held on 3 June 2016 in New York. It was modelled on the approach of the first Chiefs of Defence Meeting which was held in March 2015.

The UN COPS meeting brought together Ministers, Chiefs of Police and Gendarmerie, and police representatives from 110 countries at UN Headquarters in New York. It provided a platform for engagement between senior police officials from Member States at a political level and to examine some of the challenges likely to face policing in the context of peace operations in the 21st century. Discussions explored current and future trends for UN policing, global criminal challenges in the context of UN peace operations, and issues related to policing gaps, opportunities and overall professionalism.

The summit highlighted the growing importance of police to UN peace operations, building on the successful adoption of the first Security Council resolution on the role of police (2185) and the first briefing by the Heads of Police Components to the Security Council in November 2014. The meeting was timely given the work underway on the Strategic Guidance Framework for International Police Peacekeeping, the just launched External Review of UN Police Division Structure, Staff and Function, as well as the forthcoming first report of the Secretary-General on UN policing.

⁴² United Nations Security Council, Resolution 2185 (2014), S/RES/2185, 20 November 2014.

Civilian Capacities, Management and Leadership

Although civilian capacities have not been a focus of the peacekeeping summits, discussions turned to some of the challenges in recruiting, deploying and managing civilian personnel in peace operations. In many peace operations, civilians undertake critical roles in engaging with the local communities, liaising with host authorities, and managing mission functions and offices. They perform essential roles in functions such as community liaison assistants, protection of civilian (POC) advisers, human rights officers, gender advisers, women protection advisers, child protection advisers and civil affairs officers. Civilians are often placed in key leadership positions, where they are required to act as diplomats, engage with the government and the UN Security Council, as well as lead and manage the thousands of staff serving in the peacekeeping mission.

Mission leadership operates in a diverse and challenging environment. One of the biggest challenges is to work with so many different professional and cultural backgrounds, including those of military and police. Such diversity within the mission can create difficulties, particularly when it comes to understanding the requirements and rules that govern what different components in the mission can do. Diversity often also exists in terms of the cultures and nationalities of those working with the UN missions, and in some cases between international and national staff. Ensuring greater civil-military coordination and understanding can be key to overcome possible misunderstandings or disagreements. Several participants noted that a mission needs to have clearly identifiable values that set out what is expected of mission staff in terms of their behaviour and overall performance.

One of the challenges for many civilians (as well as some military and police) appointed to leadership positions in UN peace operations is that they usually do not receive training in the management of diversity. While they may have respect for diversity, they do not always know how to manage it, something which can create problems in terms of the overall operation of a peace operation. Further compounding this is that the leadership team that is deployed to a peace operation usually does not have the opportunity to work together prior to meeting in the field. This can create a series of difficulties when it comes to working together in challenging environments, particularly as a crisis situation unfolds. At some point, it will often be up to the leaders themselves to ensure that they understand how a mission operates and that they are fit for purpose to meet the needs of the organization.

Most importantly, as one participant noted, leadership is about inspiring people and this is a difficult thing to do in any walk of life, but even more so in UN peace operations, partly as they comprise staff from different cultural and professional backgrounds and face unique political and operational challenges. It should be a real honour to serve in the UN. It should be stiff competition to get selected. And ultimately, it cannot be a competition if there are not more qualified people—military, police and civilian—put forward to the UN.

4. Partnerships Between the UN and Regional Organizations

Background Paper: Dr Cedric de Coning, 'Challenges and Priorities for Peace Operations Partnerships between the UN and Regional Organizations – the African Union example'

Facilitator: Mr Amr Aljowaily, Deputy Assistant Foreign Minister for UN Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Egypt; **Panellists:** Dr Cedric de Coning, Senior Fellow, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Senior Fellow, Africa Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes, South Africa (background paper); H.E. Mr El-Ghassim Wane, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations; H.E. Mr Jean-Pierre Lacroix, Director-General, Directorate for UN and International Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France; Dr Uğur Güngör, Centre for Strategic Research, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey; and Dr Benyamin Poghosyan, Deputy Director, Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defence Research University, Armenia.

Partnerships are critical to the overall effectiveness of peace operations. Such arrangements may exist at various levels and stages throughout the deployment of a peace operation. One partnership with great potential is that between the UN and regional organizations. This is why the HIPPO Report identified the need for a stronger global-regional peace and security partnership as one of the four essential shifts that were needed in peace operations.⁴³ As the background paper⁴⁴ for this session noted, three considerations explain why regional approaches and/or organizations are of interest to peace operations. First, today's conflicts are usually not contained within state borders and therefore have a regional or international dimension. Second, those closer to the problem may often be in a better position to understand the problem, and therefore influence it. Third, given their proximity, regional organizations may often have a long-term interest in the outcome. In other words, they have a real and direct stake in ensuring that the conflict is adequately addressed.

Cooperation with regional organizations is, however, not always without hurdles. The multifaceted nature of peace operations creates a particularly unique challenge when it comes to managing the different types of

⁴³ HIPPO Report, p.10

⁴⁴ Cedric de Coning, 'Challenges and Priorities for Peace Operations Partnerships between the UN and Regional Organizations – the African Union example', Background Paper (Challenges Forum, May 2016).

engagement between the UN and regional organizations. Such engagement often varies depending on the regional organization and the unique characteristics it brings to bear in the relationship, including its governance structures, membership, level of interoperability and priorities. The UN has undertaken a range of activities with various regional and sub-regional organizations to enhance engagement or improve cooperation on peace operations. Among the organizations it has engaged with are the Arab League, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the AU, the Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), the EU, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Each of those relationships is at varying stages of development, although it is fair to argue that the most advanced relationships are those with the AU and the EU. This is largely because most UN peace operations are deployed on the African continent (and rely heavily on African contributors), and the EU is engaged in many of those operations as a training partner and/or financial supporter.

The UN is heavily engaged in supporting efforts to establish and maintain peace on the African continent. As the background paper noted, approximately 75 per cent of UN peacekeepers are deployed in Africa, with a similar proportion of the peacekeeping budget going to missions in Africa.⁴⁵ It is also a critical enabler for AU operations, having provided some type of support to all AU peace operations to date.⁴⁶ At the same time, the UN is often reliant on the AU in its regional response to conflicts, as demonstrated most recently by the initial deployment of AU forces to Mali and the CAR, after which the UN took over the operations. Recent debates around the type of operation that may deploy to Burundi required close engagement between the two organizations.

This session accordingly focused largely on the relationship between the AU and the UN, and explored some of the different challenges that will need to be addressed in order to strengthen that partnership. Discussions considered the different comparative advantages of each organization and the strengths they bring to the partnership, as well as how to address the ongoing challenge of securing predictable and sustainable financing for AU operations. Moreover, some areas where interoperability and integration could be strengthened were identified. Several participants also noted the need to consider the relationship between the UN and regional organizations

⁴⁵ de Coning, 2016.

⁴⁶ de Coning, 2016.

in a much broader context than peace operations to ensure the earliest possible engagement in conflict prevention activities.

Comparative Advantages

Over the last decade, the UN has engaged in many different forms of partnerships with the AU when it comes to deploying peace operations, including hybrid, sequential and parallel peace operations (see Box 12).

Box 12: Different Models of AU-UN Cooperation in Peace Operations

Peace operations deployed in Africa have taken many different forms. The decision to deploy various types of peace operations is generally driven by a range of factors, including the willingness of the host country to consent to an operation, the political context, the willingness of the UN Security Council to authorize a mission, and the financial support available. The different models include:

- The United Nations-African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) remains the only UN-AU hybrid mission. The AU deployed a peacekeeping mission to Sudan in 2006 (Darfur), which was then replaced by the joint UN-AU deployment in 2008.
- The AU deployed to Mali (AFISMA) and the Central African Republic (MISCA) in advance of UN peacekeeping missions. In both these contexts, the AU mission transitioned into a UN mission through a 're-hatting' process, where the TCCs and PCCs moved to come under UN command.
- In the context of Somalia, the UN provides logistical support to the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) through the UN Support Office in Somalia (UNSOS) as well as support to the political process through the UN Assistance Mission in Somalia (UNSOM).
- In Mali, the AU deployed a mission for Mali and the Sahel (MISAHEL) to work on the political process in parallel with the UN peacekeeping mission (MINUSMA).

In many of the contexts outlined above, additional regional organizations, most notably the EU, have been involved, for example, by deploying parallel training missions such as the EU Training Mission (EUTM) in the CAR. Similarly, subregional organizations are often engaged at the political level, such as the Intergovernmental Authority for Development (IGAD) in its

monitoring role in South Sudan. This led one panellist to comment that the UN requires a much broader concept of partnerships and that it would be particularly valuable to further explore and deepen the trilateral relationship between the AU, the EU and the UN in this context.

The overly reactive nature to emerging crises often means that the approach and cooperation with regional organizations tend to be ad hoc in nature rather than predictable. In order for this to be effectively addressed, several panellists noted the need for an improved political dialogue between the organizations. The more regular discussions between the UN Security Council and the AU Peace and Security Council (PSC) were a good first step, but the dialogue should be deepened and institutionalized across the different Secretariats and organizations in a more systemic manner. This was seen to be particularly important in contexts where there is a need for an aligned political approach to engagement, for example, in situations where consent of the host country is tacit and wavering (e.g. Darfur). Efforts to institutionalize partnerships require the UN to leverage the strengths of different regional and subregional organizations, particularly in terms of their decision-making processes. Developing a better understanding of the different comparative advantages regional organizations can bring to geographic contexts or conflicts will facilitate such efforts.

Regional organizations such as the AU have several comparative advantages over the UN when it comes to deploying a peace operation. These include the ability to authorize, mobilise and deploy forces to the field quickly (as was the case in Mali and the CAR); at times a greater political acceptability as a local crisis responder in Africa (demonstrated by acceptability as a partner in Darfur, or the role of IGAD in South Sudan); and a willingness to take on more robust operations than the UN (such as that in Somalia). As the background paper noted, ‘the AU has demonstrated that it is willing and able to undertake stabilization and counter-terrorism operations’.⁴⁷ For example, the AU will be expected to continue to lead the effort in Somalia if the threat environment in the country remains unchanged. Nonetheless, as the situation in Somalia has demonstrated, while some of the advantages of the AU are particularly helpful in the short-term and can complement broader international efforts, the AU’s operations are often not self-sustainable in the long run, nor can the organization offer a set of instrument as comprehensive as that of the UN.

⁴⁷ de Coning, 2016, p. 3.

For these reasons, the AU is often reliant on the UN when it comes to maintaining long-term peace operations on the continent. The AU often lacks the broad set of capacities required to fully implement a peace agreement.⁴⁸ Perhaps more importantly, it lacks the sustainable funding and capabilities to manage a peace operation. This was why the operations in Mali and the CAR were 're-hatted' from AU missions to UN missions. Many of the troops that were initially deployed to those missions lacked the required operational capabilities and skills, in part due to the inability of the AU to finance the operations in the same manner the UN could by drawing on assessed financing. This is the same reason why the UN continues to provide a logistics support package to the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM), including the personnel and mission support to deliver those resources. The issue of funding and financing remains one of the most pressing needs for an improved partnership between the UN and regional organizations, particularly the AU.

Finances and Funding

Financing of AU operations remains one of the biggest challenges in the partnership between the AU and UN. The HIPPO Report addressed this by recommending that 'the use of United Nations-assessed contributions be provided on a case-by-case basis to support African Union peace support operations authorized by the Security Council'.⁴⁹ It acknowledged that the lack of sustainable, predictable and flexible funding available to the AU also has an impact on the effectiveness of the UN, particularly in situations where the UN has taken over former AU missions.

The AU argues that it should have access to UN-assessed funding, mainly as it shoulders a role to support global peace and security that the international community is either unwilling or reluctant to undertake. The ever-increasing range of global threats requiring attention have provided some weight to these arguments, as have the increasing levels of engagement by France and the EU in a range of peace operation contexts on the African continent (including Mali and the CAR), suggesting that the UN is unable to handle challenges to international peace and security on its own. At the same time, one of the arguments against providing UN-assessed funding support relates to issues of control. The UN Security Council and Member States

⁴⁸ de Coning, 2016.

⁴⁹ HIPPO report, p. 76.

would likely have much less control and oversight of the manner in which AU operations function as they are not necessarily bound by UN doctrine, guidelines or standards.

The AU has taken some steps to try to develop a more sustainable system of funding for its peace operations. The organization made a commitment in 2015 that it would self-finance at least 25 per cent of the costs of its peace and security activities by 2020. Participants agreed this would be a welcome step, but also challenging. Donor support was identified as another way to bolster funding for AU operations. Previous AU missions, such as the African-led International Support Mission to Mali (AFISMA), have utilized trust funds to support their operations. But this has involved challenges due to restrictions on the use of funds and their disbursement, and lacks the reliability of drawing on assessed funding.

Participants explored other areas of support that could address some of the challenges resulting from the funding gap for AU peace operations. This could include the UN providing some of its DFS capabilities to AU operations, including stockpiles of resources in Brindisi and Entebbe.⁵⁰ It might involve partnerships that would provide strategic airlift to operations, drawing on the PCRS. It could involve facilitating AU access to a range of UN contracts, in order to facilitate improved procurement processes. Or it might look to engage other regional organizations, such as the EU, in deploying specialized capacities alongside the AU. While views differed on the approach to financing AU peace operations, there was agreement that if the AU continues to perform a substantive role in deploying peace operations, the issue will require further attention. This will need to include more extensive exploration of the approaches that can be undertaken to support the AU. The momentum that emerged from the review needs to be sustained.

Interoperability and Integration

Despite the challenges identified throughout the session, most participants acknowledged that there has been considerable progress in furthering cooperation between the UN and regional organizations and that there is no need to start from scratch in developing these processes. Further reflection is required though to ensure that cooperation is optimal and contributes to

⁵⁰ de Coning, p. 5.

improving the effectiveness of peace operations.

One of the main hurdles with regional contributions to peace operations is the lack of interoperability among the various forces. In some instances, different contingents lack the ability to work together. Member States contributing to AU missions, for example, often do not have the same levels of interoperability that are common among EU countries, which mainly operate according to NATO standards. These deficiencies can be observed in many places, but have been striking in AMISOM where many of the contingents struggle to integrate and work together, whether due to differing equipment, communications or preparedness. As some panellists noted, there is a need to harmonise standards within some regional organizations as well as to ensure a greater degree of consistency between operational standards of regional organizations and the UN.

Enhancing investment in capacity-building efforts was identified as one possible approach to address the issue of interoperability. This would ensure that reform efforts are introduced and targeted earlier in the process and in advance of any peace operation deploying. It could also involve more frequent exchanges not only between the UN and regional organizations, but between different regional organizations. The trilateral relationship between the AU, EU and UN was noted as particularly important in these efforts. Similarly, there needs to be a more extensive debate on and understanding of the types of roles that regional organizations want to undertake in supporting global peace and security. Such strategic initiatives are important not only with regard to the AU but also organizations such as the Arab League, and can provide more clarity about the different options that may be available when a crisis situation arises (see Box 13).

In conclusion, participants noted the importance of developing a more consistent and predictable approach to the way the UN engages with regional organizations. This requires a shared vision not only at the institutional level, but also at the political level in each of the contexts where the UN and regional organizations work together or alongside one another. There needs to be a much greater degree of strategic coherence. As one panellist noted, there is a need to move from improvisation to more predictable partnerships. This applies to organizations across the globe, but is particularly central to the UN's collaboration with the AU. As the HIPPO Report notes, 'it is a partnership that should be made deeper and more collaborative'.⁵¹ This requires the UN to take a much more decisive step to invest in the

⁵¹ HIPPO Report, p. 29.

partnership with the AU. It also requires the UN and the international community to consider the spectrum of possibilities available to bolster that collaboration.

Box 13: Chapter VIII and Regional Engagement

The UN Charter recognizes the role of regional arrangements dealing with matters in relation to the maintenance of international peace and security under Chapter VIII. The HIPPO Report expanded on this, noting that the 'United Nations should now strengthen such partnerships and embrace their changing dimensions as part of an increasingly global and regional peace and security architecture'.⁵² The report recognized the relationships that had been established with the AU (via the United Nations Office to the African Union) and European institutions (via the United Nations Liaison Office for Peace and Security in Brussels), and recommended the setting up of a liaison function to the League of Arab States within the proposed regional office for preventive diplomacy for North Africa and West Asia.

Given the operational collaboration between the UN and AU on issues of peace and security, the relationship between the two organizations has developed significantly over the last decade. At the strategic level, the AU Peace and Security Council and UN Security Council have held annual consultative meetings since 2007, alternating between New York and Addis Ababa. The most recent meeting took place on 23 May 2016 in New York, marking the 10th anniversary of consultations between the executive bodies.

Following those consultations, the Security Council held an open debate on UN-AU cooperation: Chapter VIII application and the future of the African Peace and Security Architecture on 24 May during Egypt's Presidency. The objective of the debate was to 'generate renewed momentum for strengthening peace and security cooperation between the United Nations and the African Union, within the remit of Chapter VIII of the Charter'.⁵³ The Security Council adopted a Presidential Statement (S/PRST/2016/8) on the topic during the debate, which inter alia, welcomed the development of the African Peace and Security Architecture Roadmap 2016-2020; noted that the major UN reviews presented an opportunity for cooperation between the two organizations; and encouraged further dialogue on securing predictable, sustainable and flexible resources.

⁵² HIPPO Report, p. 73.

⁵³ United Nations Security Council, Letter dated 9 May 2016 from the Permanent Representative of Egypt to the United Nations addressed to the Security Council, S/2016/428, 9 May 2016.

5. Safety and Security of UN and Associated Personnel

Background Paper: Mr William Phillips, 'The UN Reviews and What Should be Done to Improve Safety and Security of UN and Associated Personnel in UN Peace Operations' **Facilitator:** H.E. Mr Motohide Yoshikawa, Permanent Representative of Japan to the United Nations; **Panellists:** Mr William R. Phillips, Former Chief of Staff MINUSMA, now Integration Project, Department of Safety and Security, United Nations (background paper); Ms Fadzai Gwaradzimba, Assistant Secretary-General, Department of Safety and Security, United Nations; Mr Greg Hinds, Police Commissioner, UNMIL; and H.E. Lt. Gen. (Retd) Javed Zia, Ambassador of Pakistan to Libya.

Peacekeepers continue to deploy into environments which present a range of threats to their safety and security. Such threats are not new to UN peacekeeping. As one panellist noted, over the last seven decades UN peacekeepers have faced several different periods of crisis where safety and security have been of heightened concern. The first deployment of a truly robust peacekeeping mission in the Congo in the 1960s, the United Nations Operation in the Congo (ONUC), resulted in more than 100 casualties. More than 30 years later, UN peacekeepers suffered casualties when deployed by the UN Security Council to places such as Cambodia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Somalia and Rwanda. Close to 15 years after those events, more than 100 peacekeepers lost their lives in the tragic earthquake that struck Haiti. As the HIPPO Report notes, more than 90 per cent of personnel deployed to political missions and two-thirds of peacekeepers are operating in situations where there is ongoing conflict.⁵⁴

The threats to peacekeepers evolve and diversify as security challenges 'continue to increase in complexity and scale'.⁵⁵ As one panellist noted, since 2005, UN peacekeepers have been exposed to a steadily growing range of different threats. Simultaneously, from 2013 onwards, the number of global conflicts has grown. Together, these developments present an increased range

⁵⁴ HIPPO Report, p. 89.

⁵⁵ William R. Phillips, 'The UN Reviews and What Should be Done to Improve the Safety and Security of United Nations Personnel', Background Paper (Challenges Forum, May 2016).

of security challenges to UN and associated personnel. Threats to peace operations may result from armed conflict, terrorism, civil disturbance and criminal activity. The interests and motives of those attacking UN personnel may vary, depending on the nature of the conflict and the activities being undertaken by the peace operation, and whether the individuals and groups consider the work of the UN as potentially detrimental to their interests. The interests and activities of hostile actors are often transnational in nature, extending beyond the borders of where a peace operation is deployed, which can in turn frustrate countermeasures. In some instances, the operational setting may be further complicated by the fact that those engaged in hostile actions against a peacekeeping mission are affiliated with the host authorities. In addition, UN personnel may face threats to their safety and security in less hostile operational settings, where the environment as well as the preparedness and health of personnel can impact on the mission.

This session focused on efforts to improve the safety and security of UN and associated personnel within the context of the evolving security environments into which UN peace operations are deployed. Discussions focused on activities and efforts within the UN organization to address safety and security; issues related to the UN's duty of care; the developing role of intelligence; efforts to engage local communities; the role of women; and the important contribution of strategic communications.

Duty of Care

The evolving nature of the environments into which UN peace operations are deployed has forced the UN system to comprehensively consider its approach to the issue of safety and security. Several reports and reviews throughout 2015 considered this, including the HIPPO Report, the Report of the Secretary-General in response, and the Report of the Secretary-General on the *Safety and Security of humanitarian personnel and protection of United Nations personnel*.⁵⁶ Each of those reports acknowledged the impact of the changing global security environment on the ability of the UN to carry out its operations in the field. These developments present a particularly unique set of challenges in the context of UN peacekeeping missions (in contrast to other UN presences in the field), where responsibility for safety and security of uniformed contingents is divided between the UN Department of Safety

⁵⁶ See United Nations, *Safety and Security of humanitarian personnel and protection of United Nations personnel*, Report of the Secretary-General, A/70/383, 21 September 2015.

and Security (DSS), DPKO and the individual TCCs and PCCs. Issues concerning safety and security are often a primary consideration guiding the decision by Member States as to whether they deploy personnel, placing high expectations on the UN to guarantee that it is minimising the risks to personnel in peace operations. It was suggested at the meeting that the UN community may wish to consider establishing a Group of Friends on safety and security to generate attention on the issue and provide a forum involving different parts of the Secretariat for Member States to engage with on related concerns.

While the UN has in place a Security Management System to guide its consideration of risks and threats in the field, there is still little clarity over the duty of care it owes to personnel serving in the field as part of its 'stay and deliver' approach. This was noted in the Secretary-General's recent report on safety and security which stated that the UN has 'recognized its need to clarify its duty of care towards personnel operating in high-risk and very high-risk environments'.⁵⁷ As such, the High-level Committee on Management established a working group to undertake a comprehensive review of issues relating to the organization's duty of care and its results are in the process of being taken forward. DSS conducted a strategic review in 2015, which was the first of its kind since the department was established a decade earlier.⁵⁸ That review took into account a number of the recommendations that had emerged from the HIPPO Report. Several panellists noted that one of the challenges going forward will be to ensure that resources and financing are made available to implement the recommendations. Processes are underway to integrate the safety and security resources of DPA, DPKO, DFS and DSS under one management authority.

While there is often focus on security concerns, participants noted that attention is also required on other threats to the safety of personnel. These include issues such as infectious diseases, car accidents and suicides. As one panellist noted, further consideration is needed as to whether the UN system has the balance right between addressing security threats and threats related to occupational health and safety. The events that unfolded in Liberia following the outbreak of the Ebola virus in 2014 unfortunately highlighted some of the challenges presented by an infectious disease for a mission to operate and ensure the health and safety of its staff. It was

⁵⁷ UN, A/70/383, p. 12.

⁵⁸ UN, A/70/383, p. 15.

suggested that the UN should consider an all-hazards approach to ensure comprehensive efforts to reduce harm and the likelihood of any death. An all-hazards approach would make the UN better prepared to uphold its duty of care to the personnel that are fulfilling its mandates. Guaranteeing the safety and security of personnel is particularly challenging in peace operations where time is a factor in ensuring that a mission is prepared and able to prevent and respond to a security incident. In the case of the mission start-up or reconfiguration phase, personnel often deploy into environments where there are no facilities and no functioning infrastructure. Yet, as the background paper for this session noted, efforts to invest in developing infrastructure such as lines of communication and security facilities are often underestimated. The start-up phases of recent missions such as MINUSMA and MINUSCA demonstrated these challenges. As a consequence, personnel may be left exposed to threats that could be countered with better planning and preparation to ensure that a mission is deployed in a timely manner. Ensuring that the UN is in a position to generate and deploy capabilities to mission areas as quickly as possible will contribute to a more secure operating environment for personnel. Identifying and developing engineering capabilities within Member States will be essential to supporting these efforts. It was noted that Member States should consider the types of contributions they may be able to provide in rapid start-up contexts as part of the PCRS.

In addition to being able to deploy quickly, missions need to be able to respond to an event, such as an attack which threatens the life and safety of personnel. Early intervention with medical support is critical to these efforts. Yet medical support is often overlooked as a critical component of mission support, with missions being left to develop their own approaches. Ongoing efforts to produce guidance are a step in the right direction, but it was argued that the UN needs to undertake a more comprehensive review of its medical approach and capabilities, particularly in high-risk environments. As the background paper noted, there is also a need to ensure greater accountability and oversight for the delivery of medical services in the field. This issue is of high priority for Member States, which view it as critical that the UN is positioned to respond when their personnel come under attack. It was agreed that enabling capabilities such as engineering and medical units can ensure that the UN is better positioned to meet its duty of care, and that missions are better able to protect their personnel and, by extension, carry out their mandates. Similarly, the provision of situational awareness and intelligence is

essential to these efforts (see below).

Critical to the UN's ability to fulfil its duty of care is the need for a continuous exchange of information between the UN Secretariat, Security Council, TCCs and PCCs regarding developments in the field. If a crisis situation emerges, Member States need information on how the UN responds. Triangular consultations, particularly during crisis situations, are an area that is improving but needs to be developed further to allow a frank exchange of information between all stakeholders. This is particularly important as the UN continues to deploy into more challenging security environments.

Evolving Role of Intelligence

Information analysis and situational awareness are critical to ensure that the UN is better equipped and prepared to address the different types of threats it may face. While it was acknowledged that 'intelligence' has previously been a taboo word in the UN system, several panellists and participants suggested that now is the time for the UN to start developing a professional intelligence framework. As the background paper for this session noted, the 'UN requires a global information analysis and intelligence system, which operates within a policy and guidance framework and is fully integrated through close and effective information-sharing; focused upon support to United Nations field operations; and staffed with professionals in the discipline.'⁵⁹ Such a system would contribute to improve conflict analysis, which would, in turn, ensure that UN peace operations are better prepared and equipped for the environments they deploy into.

Efforts are already advancing in some field missions to develop intelligence capabilities. The deployment of the All Sources Information Fusion Unit (ASIFU) in Mali is one example of such efforts (see Box 14). Yet this progress has highlighted a number of gaps and the need for the UN to have a more comprehensive approach in its work to collect, analyse and disseminate information. Many of the operational aspects and requirements were not fully understood when the TCCs first deployed their units to the ASIFU. For example, the ASIFU's activities were initially disconnected from some relevant processes within the mission. As a consequence, MINUSMA created an internal review board to ensure that the intelligence components were integrated into the mission's work. The Deputy Special Representative of the

⁵⁹ Phillips, May 2016.

Secretary-General for Political Affairs was the chair of that board.

The reform process continues in order to ensure that the ASIFU is fully utilised by the mission. However, as the background paper noted, ‘the deployment of sophisticated units like MINUSMA’s ASIFU into United Nations missions is somewhat like sending a modern 16-cycle washing machine to an organization used to a hand wringer washer.’⁶⁰ In other words, the UN is not prepared to integrate the various stages of the intelligence gathering process into its operations. More effort is needed to identify the types of technologies that may assist in gathering information, such as the introduction of UAVs and other platforms highlighted by the panel report on technology in peacekeeping (Performance Peacekeeping).⁶¹ Drawing on such technology though requires a better policy framework. Similarly, once information is obtained and analysed, there needs to be clear processes to ensure that the information is incorporated as part of the mission’s overall operations. This was considered to be particularly important in the context of asymmetric threat environments, where the UN is still trying to get ahead of the curve in its efforts to not only protect its personnel, but to ensure that it is equipped to carry out its mandate to protect civilians.

One of the challenges to develop a more comprehensive approach to intelligence is that many Member States hold reservations about the generation and use of the information. It is notable that the 2016 report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34) did not make any reference to intelligence, but, nonetheless, encouraged the Secretariat to develop a more comprehensive and integrated system for situational awareness, stretching from the field to headquarters.⁶² In order to address some of these concerns and differentiate potential information-gathering and intelligence processes used by the UN from those that might be more common in Member States, it was argued that the UN needs to develop a clear policy framework on intelligence. Such a policy framework would set out the limits and boundaries of any process to generate and use intelligence in the context of peace operations. This would be a particularly important development to ensure that the lessons learned from setting up of the ASIFU can be applied more broadly across the UN’s peace operations, thereby ensuring peace operations are better equipped to support the safety and security of UN personnel.

⁶⁰ Phillips, May 2016.

⁶¹ UN, Performance Peacekeeping – Final Report of the Expert Panel on Technology and Innovation in UN Peacekeeping, 2014

⁶² C-34 Report 2016, para. 52.

Box 14: Development of Intelligence Capability in MINUSMA

The All Sources Information Fusion Unit (ASIFU) of the United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA) provides an intelligence capacity that is unparalleled in other UN peacekeeping missions. The ASIFU concept was developed in partnership between the UN and European contributors to the mission. Austria, Belgium, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Norway, Sweden and Switzerland are among the countries that have contributed intelligence staff to the ASIFU.⁶³ The unit has a particularly important role in Mali, given the wide range of asymmetric threats faced by MINUSMA and the civilian population.

Nonetheless, ASIFU has highlighted some of the challenges of deploying high-end intelligence capabilities into a UN peacekeeping mission which is not equipped to fully utilise the capability. Shortcomings include a lack of: adequate policy and guidance within the UN system; links to operational planning and coordination; and secure information management processes.⁶⁴ Many of the lessons that have emerged from deploying the ASIFU in Mali will inform efforts within the UN system to develop a more comprehensive approach to intelligence for UN peace operations.

⁶³ Olga Obilova and Alexandra Novosseloff, *Demystifying Intelligence in UN Peace Operations: Toward an Organizational Doctrine* (International Peace Institute, July 2016).

⁶⁴ Phillips, May 2016.

Strategic Communication and Engaging Local Communities

Engaging with local communities is an integral aspect of modern multidimensional peace operations. Different mission components, ranging from human rights and civil affairs to military and police officers, are at times required to engage with communities in areas where they are deployed in order to facilitate their protection. Such interaction is also an important part of implementing other aspects of peace operation mandates as they relate to political processes and peacebuilding activities. For example, engagement with civil society groups is a key component in facilitating political dialogue and reconciliation processes.

In addition to facilitating mandate implementation, engaging with local communities can contribute to improving safety and security of mission personnel. The local population is often best placed with information on local threats, environmental hazards and conflict dynamics—the types

of information that may not be possible to gather from other sources. If the local population trusts the mission, they may be willing to assist in sharing such information. At the same time though, the local population may have expectations in terms of what peacekeepers and the mission are able to deliver, particularly when it comes to their protection. Therefore, peace operations need to ensure they effectively communicate with the local population and authorities on the mission mandate and the types of activities they are undertaking to support peace and stability in the country and region where they are deployed. Yet, this is often where there is a gap, as peace operations are not always well-prepared to proactively communicate why they are deployed, or at least to do so effectively to those that need to know in the community. This is one of the reasons why the HIPPO Report focused on the need for a more comprehensive approach to strategic communication in peace operations.

Participants in this discussion agreed that peace operations require an improved approach to strategic two-way communications. This would not only enhance mandate implementation, but also support efforts to strengthen the safety and security of personnel. External communication needs to explain, in local languages, why the mission is there and how it benefits the local population. In order for the UN to take this forward, further work is needed to develop a comprehensive framework that will guide strategic communications in missions; at the local, national and global levels (see Box 15). It requires the engagement and involvement of a range of personnel, including national mission staff, and particularly women, as well as different tools and platforms, including both traditional communication and social media. Implementing the HIPPO Report's recommendation on developing communications teams could support these efforts.⁶⁵

More strategic and mutual engagement with the local community would contribute to safety and security. However, as several panellists noted, this type of engagement could also be detrimental to the mission's interests in situations where peacekeepers behave poorly, or worse, commit abuses. In addition to causing human suffering, instances of SEA and, in many instances, perceived impunity of the UN create resentment within the community and increase security risks to deployed personnel. These abuses need to be addressed more comprehensively, with a focus on supporting and responding to the needs of victims.

In conclusion, participants were in agreement that, fundamentally, the best mechanism for ensuring the safety and security of personnel is to establish

⁶⁵ HIPPO Report, p. 92.

sustainable peace and security in the country in question. Prioritizing prevention, mediation and political solutions are thus essential to achieve the long-term objectives. In the interim, however, the UN needs to draw on a range of tools to ensure the safety and security of personnel.

Box 15: The Challenges Forum's Strategic Communications Project

The HIPPO Report acknowledged that strategic communications are an essential tool to communicate with the local population and international community about the role of a UN peace operation. It therefore recommended that the UN 'Secretariat and missions put in place strategies for the planning, recruitment and resourcing of mission communications teams aimed at ensuring interactive two-way communications with the local population and ensuring UN peace operations use modern and appropriate communications, approaches and technologies'.⁶⁶

Building on the findings of the HIPPO Report and Expert Panel on Technology and Innovation (Performance Peacekeeping), the Challenges Forum Partnership has continued to take forward work exploring some of the practical challenges relating to strategic communications in UN peace operations. On 23 June 2015, the United States Institute of Peace and Folke Bernadotte Academy, in close consultation with the US Department of State, US Department of Defense, US Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute, and UN DPKO/DFS, co-hosted a Challenges Forum Workshop on 'Strategic Communications for the New Era of Peace Operations'.⁶⁷ Among the key recommendations were: each UN peace operation should develop its own communication strategy; the UN should develop a narrative and branding for peace operations; and the UN and Member States need to commit to digitalisation of communications in peace operations and make available the necessary technical and human resources to strategically communicate.⁶⁸

Furthermore, in November 2015, the Challenges Forum published an occasional paper on *Strategic Communication: A Political and Operational Prerequisite for Successful Peace Operations*.⁶⁹ That paper forms part of the ongoing broader project within the Challenges Forum Partnership on strategic communications in UN peace operations. This project encompasses a range of efforts, including the exhibition *Mission in Motion: Peace Made Possible*, which was launched during the 2016 Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum in New York (See Box 2).

⁶⁶ HIPPO Report, p. 92.

⁶⁷ Challenges Forum, Policy Brief 2015:1.

⁶⁸ Challenges Forum, Policy Brief 2015:1.

⁶⁹ Robert Gordon and Peter Loge, *Strategic Communication: A Political and Operational Prerequisite for Successful Peace Operations*, Challenges Forum Occasional Papers No.7 (November 2015).

6. Effective Implementation of UNSCR 1325

Background Paper: Dr Louise Olsson, 'Leading the Way to a More Equal Peace: Senior Management and Gender Mainstreaming' **Facilitator:** H.E. Mr Michael Grant, Deputy Permanent Representative of Canada to the UN, Chair of the UN Special Committee for Peacekeeping Operations Working Group, Canada. **Panellists:** Dr Louise Olsson, Senior Adviser, Gender and SCR1325, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden (background paper); Ms Riana Paneras, Senior Research, Peace Operations and Peace Building Division, Institute for Security Studies, Former Police Commissioner, UNAMID, South Africa; Ms Gwendolyn Myers, Founder and Executive Director, Messages of Peace-Liberia Inc (MOP) Global Shaper, World Economic Forum, Liberia; and Dr Alan Ryan, Executive Director, Australian Civil-Military Centre, Australia.

While a wide range of aspects of the WPS agenda were raised throughout the forum, this session enabled a focused discussion on how to ensure that some of the high-level political commitments and suggested reforms will be translated into action at the operational level. All three of the major reviews—the HIPPO Report (and subsequent Secretary-General's report), the Peacebuilding Architecture Review and the Global Study on UNSCR 1325—reflected on some of the progress that has been made since the adoption of resolution 1325 on WPS in 2000, but were also in agreement that considerable action is needed to expedite change going forward. As one panellist noted, the issue of WPS is both political and practical in nature. In the context of UN peace operations, this means clear policies and processes must be developed to ensure that high-level commitments are translated into action, from the strategic level down to the tactical level in the field. The effective implementation of resolution 1325 requires ongoing reform at the national, regional and international level. This demands attention not only to improve women's participation in peace operations, including peace and conflict prevention processes and efforts to protect civilians, but also to ensure that gender perspectives are considered and addressed throughout all aspects of a mission's operations.

The background paper for this session identified a range of areas where gender mainstreaming has been translated into operational contexts, drawing on the findings of the HIPPO Report and analysis contained in the Challenges Forum report *Designing Mandates and Capabilities for Future Peace Operations*.⁷⁰ Those areas included measures to deploy a security presence and protect civilians. In these contexts, it might involve analysing the different types of threats faced by men and women and working to ensure that operations address those specific threats. Similarly, on the issue of law enforcement and justice, it might involve working with national counterparts to make certain that the rights of women are upheld in legislation and that there is no impunity for crimes against women. Other areas where gender mainstreaming can be implemented more systematically include disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR); security sector reform (SSR); constitutional processes, human rights protection and public administration. While this list is by no means exhaustive, it highlights that there is a need to consider gender perspectives throughout the course of mandated tasks, rather than simply in isolation or as an add-on (see Box 16). This, in turn, presents a series of challenges for peace operations, which sometimes have a tendency to ‘stovepipe’ certain functions.

Throughout this session, discussions focused on a series of issues related to ensuring that the WPS agenda is effectively operationalized in the context of UN peace operations, by examining the role of senior management, accountability and leadership, preparedness and training at the national level, and the development of skills and experience. The session also focused on the role of youth as it relates to the participation of young women, but also more broadly in consultations around peace and security.

⁷⁰ Challenges Forum, *Designing Mandates and Capabilities for Future Peace Operations* (Stockholm, 2014).

Box 16: UN Security Council Informal Group of Experts on Women, Peace and Security

The UN Security Council's Informal Expert Group on Women, Peace and Security was established with the adoption of resolution 2242 in October 2015. That resolution recognized the need for greater integration of resolution 1325 into the Council's own work and expressed 'its intention to convene meetings of relevant Security Council experts as part of an Informal Experts Group on Women, Peace and Security to facilitate a more systematic approach to women, peace and security (WPS) within its own work and enable greater oversight and coordination of implementation efforts.'

The establishment of the informal expert group followed discussion and analysis of the issue in the Global Study on 1325. The Global Study noted the value of having a working group which could strengthen the Council's implementation of the WPS agenda. It considered examples modelled on the formal working group on children and armed conflict (which had status as a subsidiary body) and the informal expert group on protection of civilians. A mixture of elements of both was proposed—an informal expert group with clearly defined issues to track.⁷¹ The Global Study suggested the group's work could focus on tracking briefings and reports on country situations for gender content; undertaking field visits ahead of Security Council visiting missions; ensuring elements of the WPS agenda were incorporated in all thematic areas; and tracking how the Security Council was implementing aspects of the agenda in peace operations as part of mandated tasks.

⁷¹ Global Study on UNSCR 1325, p. 339.

The Informal Group of Experts on Women, Peace and Security is currently co-chaired by the United Kingdom and Spain. In the first half of 2016, the group convened meetings on Mali (in February), Iraq (in April) and the Central African Republic (in June).

Cultural Change, Accountability and Leadership

Efforts to integrate the WPS agenda into peace operations continue to face several challenges. Despite the UN Security Council having adopted eight thematic resolutions on WPS, and the regular inclusion of language in peacekeeping mandates, issues relating to gender and the participation and protection of women are still not routinely and consistently considered in the context of peace operations. Part of the challenge is the piecemeal approach

to addressing the matter. This is particularly problematic when attempting to undertake gender mainstreaming, which requires comprehensive cultural change and accountability within the UN system to ensure gender perspectives are considered, both in the development of policy and when undertaking operational activities.

The normative progress that has taken place since the adoption of resolution 1325 provides a good basis. The adoption and inclusion of language on gender have become almost routine in the context of peacekeeping mandates. However, that language is often in a template format. As such, it is sometimes perceived as an ‘unnecessary add-on’ rather than essential to the tasks already noted in the mandate.⁷² Furthermore, once a sentence or paragraph is added to the mandate, it often leads those engaged in the process to give no further consideration to how gender perspectives might be relevant to various aspects of the mandate. In other words, the approach is far from comprehensive. In the context of the Security Council, the HIPPO Report acknowledged that there had been an ‘inconsistent application of the agenda’ during the year, with lack of attention to issues related to WPS in briefings and reports to the Council.⁷³ This lack of attention is often compounded in institutional or operational settings, where gender expertise tends to be viewed and established as a separate function from those managing or leading the development of policy, or the planning and execution of operations.

Consequently, it was noted that there is a pedagogical aspect to gender mainstreaming that can be challenging. Education and training are crucial to achieve such change, requiring an investment of resources. There needs to be a push away from thinking that gender mainstreaming is the responsibility of just a small set of people, who may be gender advisers or specialists, to ensuring that it is a shared responsibility across the entire organization. Moreover, as one panellist noted, you cannot just introduce more women and hope to solve the problem; there needs to be a change in the culture.

Shifting the culture on the issue of gender mainstreaming requires a comprehensive approach across the UN system, as well as at the national level in Member States contributing personnel to UN peace operations. Similarly, gender mainstreaming needs to be embedded in all operational

⁷² Louise Olsson, ‘Leading the Way to a More Equal Peace: Senior Management and Gender Mainstreaming’, Background Paper (Challenges Forum, May 2016).

⁷³ HIPPO Report, p. 79.

cultures—civilian, military, police and political. Leadership is essential and individuals need to be held to account within their organizations for implementing relevant policies. As the background paper noted, ‘to succeed with gender mainstreaming requires demanding decisions on mandate interpretation and translation, on organizational capacity (including expert functions and consultations mechanisms), and, hence, on resource distribution.’⁷⁴ Such decisions require leaders who have an understanding of the implications that their decisions will have from a gender perspective.

In order to ensure effective gender mainstreaming, participants suggested there needs to be a more comprehensive approach to ensuring a shared responsibility within the leadership team of peacekeeping missions for adopting a gender mainstreaming approach. Both the HIPPO Report and Global Study on UNSCR 1325 included the recommendation that there should be a Senior Gender Adviser in the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General in a peacekeeping mission. It was agreed that the inclusion of performance indicators relating to gender in the compacts between the Secretary-General and Heads of Mission was a step in the right direction, but that this accountability system needed to filter down throughout the mission, to the various levels of mission management. One further proposal was made to ensure that reports from the Secretary-General were all gender mainstreamed, and it was suggested that consideration should be given to the appointment of an Under-Secretary-General on Women, Peace and Security.

From a policy perspective, one of the most critical measures of accountability is financing. While policies may include requirements for gender adviser or women protection adviser posts, these are often easy negotiables in budget consultations on particular peacekeeping missions. It was seen to be critical that political commitments are matched with the delivery of the required resources in the field. One participant noted the value of linking aid and programme funding with gender sensitive targets as one mechanism that could hold Member States accountable to their political commitments.

It was acknowledged that the UN has to be congruent in displaying these values to convince the host nation on the merits of women’s participation and gender perspectives. Furthermore, if the UN is to implement that responsibility more effectively, then Member States need to take the lead in operationalizing resolution 1325 within their own domestic contexts.

⁷⁴ Olsson, May 2016.

Operationalizing UNSCR 1325

There is no country that is not scrambling to catch up and ensure that gaps are addressed in terms of women's participation and representation both at the national and international levels. If the international community is to have the ability to draw on expertise from uniformed personnel, then it is critical that Member States implement reform initiatives within their national contexts. As one panellist noted, if there are no efforts to reform national institutions, then it will not be possible to implement the WPS agenda at the international level. This is a lesson that has emerged within some Member States as part of military operational exercises.

Despite some of the reforms which have been implemented, women are still hitting the 'glass ceiling' at the mid-level ranks, meaning there are less women than men in leadership positions. If this problem is to be solved within the UN system—particularly with regard to the contribution of uniformed personnel to peacekeeping missions—then Member States also need to address this aspect within their security institutions. That might involve further consideration regarding necessary requirements for promotions and appointments to leadership posts. Should they for example be based on years of experience, or the skills that a person can bring to the role? Women are often at a disadvantage if experience is only measured in years served due to family commitments. To address some of these obstacles and accelerate the participation of women in leadership positions, it was suggested that there may be a need to consider bridging programmes to ensure that women have more opportunities to put their hand up for jobs they may well have the skills for, but do not meet rigidly set criteria. It is only when these issues are addressed that the UN might have a greater pool of potential women leaders to choose from for peace operations.

In addition to reforms at the national level, UN peace operations need to consider the different tools and mechanisms available to ensure that a more comprehensive gender approach is taken in the field at the various stages of the mission cycle. As the background paper pointed out, key areas where reforms are required in order to operationalize gender mainstreaming are organizational capacity, consultation mechanisms and expert support. If efforts are invested in ensuring that missions are able to collect information in a gender-sensitive manner, then there needs to be capacity to process that information and integrate it into operations already from the planning phase. This, in turn, requires qualified and properly trained people.

There also needs to be effective consultation mechanisms with women's organizations. The HIPPO Report noted the importance of senior mission leadership engaging with women, youth, religious and other leaders as part of their activities.⁷⁵ At the same time, for senior leadership to be able to effectively use this two-way communication, they need to have expertise in the missions to draw on. The provision of gender advice here becomes critical.

Member State compliance with the implementation of the WPS agenda is not yet a consideration in selecting TCCs and PCCs for peace operations. However, several participants suggested that maybe the UN should start considering this in their assessments of suitable contributors, given that wider UN credibility is at stake. National Actions Plans could be one way of measuring commitment, although there were some concerns these were often political statements that did not necessarily measure a country's commitment to implement the agenda. Further analysis would be needed to explore the types of criteria that could possibly be considered in assessing which countries were succeeding in operationalizing UNSCR 1325.

If operationalizing the WPS agenda is to be effective, there needs to be concerted efforts to ensure that young women are engaged. As one panellist noted, while there has been extensive analysis of resolution 1325, there has been much less exploration of its implications for young women. Given that many of the contexts where UN peace operations are deployed have substantial youth populations, it was viewed as critical that these aspects are considered. It was suggested that further analysis of the linkages between resolution 1325 and 2250 should be explored.

⁷⁵ HIPPO Report, p. 78.

7. Development and Implementation of Doctrine and Guidelines

Facilitator: Mr David Haeri, Director, Division for Policy, Evaluation and Training, Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support, United Nations; **Panellists:** Mr Stefan Feller, Police Adviser, Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions, United Nations; Capt.(N) Hervé Auffret, Chief, Policy and Doctrine Team, Office of Military Affairs, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations; H.E. Mr Mohammad Taisir Masadeh, Secretary-General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Expatriate Affairs of Jordan, Former Force Commander, UNMEE, Jordan; and Dr Kari M Osland, Head, Research Group on Peace and Conflict, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Norway.

Doctrine is a contested concept in the context of UN peace operations. This is perhaps best demonstrated by the cautionary approach and reaction of Member States to the development of the *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines* (Capstone Doctrine)⁷⁶ in 2008. The Capstone Doctrine is today recognized as the document that ‘define[s] the nature, scope and core business of contemporary United Nations peacekeeping operations’. Yet, as one panellist noted, it was never thoroughly considered by Member States through intergovernmental processes and is still only partially implemented. Instead, the Capstone Doctrine, as other UN guidance, is formally an internal document of the UN Secretariat that the Member States are not bound by but can use for information on how the UN structures, organizes, commands and operates its peace operations. Nonetheless, the Capstone Doctrine is often referred to as the primary document in much of UN guidance.

Aside from the Capstone Doctrine, there are few (if any) references to ‘doctrine’ in the context of UN peace operations. The C-34 report contains a section on ‘doctrine and terminology’, yet no further references to doctrine are made in that section of the report. Still, Member States have recognized the need for consistent standards and guidance and are willing to support the development of a range of policy, procedure and guideline documents, which together could be broadly considered doctrine.

⁷⁶ United Nations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations/Department of Field Support, *United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Principles and Guidelines*, 2008.

Discussions in this session considered some of the progress made and challenges resulting from UN efforts to develop doctrine and guidelines to support the implementation of UN peacekeeping mandates, with a particular focus on what implications the major reviews may have for the development of related guidance. This included an examination of some of the ways in which peacekeeping guidance is developed within the UN system; how it is integrated into preparation and training programmes of Member States ahead of deployment; and what processes and mechanisms are in place to evaluate whether TCCs and PCCs are operationally ready when deployed in the field.

Doctrine Development

The terms doctrine and guidelines have often been interposable in the context of UN peace operations. The Capstone Doctrine is still viewed by many as the best articulation of peacekeeping principles at the strategic level and is often referred to in guidance and policy on UN peacekeeping operations. The processes that have been put in place to develop doctrine and guidelines in the last few years vary, depending on the nature and application of the guidance (including whether the guidance will apply to military, police or civilians, or be at the strategic, operational or tactical levels) as well as the level of Member State support required to implement the final product. The development and application of guidance faces two significant obstacles within the UN system: practice in the field is often more advanced than available guidance (creating challenges when it comes to preparedness and standards) and the process of developing guidance is often as much a political process as a technical one (making it more challenging than in an ordinary national context).

Participants agreed that in many areas the UN is catching up to develop guidance for different aspects of peacekeeping mandates. That was the case on the issue of POC (see Box 17). Despite the Security Council having included POC in peacekeeping mandates since 1999, it was not until 2010 that DPKO developed an operational concept on POC. This was followed by the development of several other pieces of training and guidance, including scenario-based training materials and eventually, a policy on POC which was issued in 2015.⁷⁷ One of the early challenges was that Member States were

⁷⁷ United Nations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support, DPKO/DFS Policy: The Protection of Civilians in United Nations Peacekeeping, Ref. 2015.07, 1 April 2015.

divided on whether the UN should develop guidance on POC. Some TCCs and PCCs were concerned that developing more guidance would place more demands on them in the field. However, lessons from the field had shown that there were significant gaps in how POC mandates were implemented as well as instances where civilians had not been protected. The political process and discussions which then took place during the development of the POC guidance were important in ensuring that Member States would be willing to integrate it into their pre-deployment training. The HIPPO Report subsequently recognized that it was detrimental for TCCs and PCCs not to use force when civilians are under threat, reinforcing the guidance already in place.

The POC example demonstrated some of the tensions inherent in the development of doctrine and guidelines in UN peace operations. Usually at the national level, processes to develop doctrine are left to technical and subject matter experts, who may be a limited group of people. In the context of UN peace operations, there are often hundreds of different views on how particular tasks may be undertaken, drawing on years of experience and different operating procedures of military and police forces around the globe. As a consequence, there is strong Member State interest in ensuring some influence in the process, while not undermining the role of the UN Secretariat in ultimately setting policy and shaping overall guidance in peacekeeping for a consistent approach to the implementation of mission mandates. In addition, the resultant materials must be broadly supported, ensuring that they are eventually implemented. For these reasons, regular briefings and technical consultation workshops are often an important part of the guidance development process. It is one of the reasons why the UN undertook an extensive process of Member State engagement and leadership in the development of 11 military unit manuals throughout 2014.⁷⁸ Similar engagement with Member States is underway to develop the SGF for International Police Peacekeeping.⁷⁹

With the recent push to develop comprehensive guidance on a range of functions and tasks within peacekeeping missions, it was agreed that it is essential that the UN has processes in place to assess and evaluate whether the standards are met by contributors. This is often a challenge for the UN as it is up to Member States to develop their own training programmes

⁷⁸ The UN has developed military unit manuals for aviation, engineering, transport, force headquarters support, logistics, military police, maritime, reconnaissance, riverine, signals and Special Forces.

⁷⁹ See e.g. United Nations, United Nations Chiefs of Police Summit Chair's Note, New York, 3 June 2016.

and determine whether to deploy their personnel. Processes are underway to address some of the related gaps and challenges when it comes to implementation. Implementation is essential if guidance and doctrine are to have an impact on improving peacekeeping performance and delivery of mandates in the field.

Box 17: Protection of Civilians and the Kigali Principles

In the lead up to the delivery of the Report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations (HIPPO) in June 2015, several Member States hosted regional conferences to provide input to the panel and its review. Rwanda hosted one of those conferences in Kigali on 28-29 May 2015, building on its role as a co-host of the 2014 High-level Summit on Peacekeeping.

The theme of the conference in Kigali was 'Protection of Civilians through Peacekeeping: From Mandate Design to Implementation'. The conference resulted in the formation of the 'Kigali Principles on the Protection of Civilians', which outlined a series of commitments by troop and police contributing countries (TCCs and PCCs) on the protection of civilians (POC). The Principles are a set of 18 pledges for the effective implementation of POC mandates and relate to issues of training and preparedness to use force to protect civilians; avoiding caveats that prevent fulfilment of protection responsibilities; and taking disciplinary action if there is a failure to act. They also identify some of the system challenges facing peacekeeping in terms of rapid deployment, capability development and consultation processes between TCC/PCCs and the Security Council.

On 11 May 2016, the Netherlands, Rwanda and the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect co-hosted a conference entitled 'The Future of Civilian Protection in Peace Operations: Endorsing and Implementing the Kigali Principles'. The event was held on the margins of the High-level Thematic Debate on *UN, Peace and Security* hosted by the President of the General Assembly.

At the conclusion of the event on the Kigali Principles, several Member States had endorsed the principles, including Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Burkina Faso, Canada, Djibouti, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Germany, Ghana, Guinea, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Malawi, Montenegro, Netherlands, Niger, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Senegal, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tanzania, Togo, Ukraine, Uganda, United States, Uruguay and Zambia. Member States continue to endorse the Kigali Principles.

Challenges to Implementation

One of the major challenges to implementation of doctrine and guidelines in the UN system has been a lack of consistent assessment processes that are adhered to, ensuring that TCCs and PCCs are prepared and trained for deployment. A series of developments started to change that. These included the issuing of the DPKO/DFS Policy Document on Operational Readiness Assurance and Performance Improvement,⁸⁰ which set out a guidance framework on how to move forward on improving performance. Similarly, the systems being put in place as part of the PCRS will contribute to identifying the preparedness and readiness of peacekeeping contingents, based on performance standards developed on the basis of guidance and manuals. The Office of the Director of Peacekeeping Partnerships also contributes to these processes, assessing the ability of uniformed personnel to deliver on their mandates. These reform efforts have been given further strength with the pledges and commitments that were made at peacekeeping summits, and which provide the potential for more flexibility when it comes to selecting troop and police contributors for UN peacekeeping missions.

With this active development of doctrine and guidance, some participants noted that Member States are facing another challenge. For many TCCs and PCCs, there are concerns that there may be too many guidelines to be absorbed. This is not so much a problem for larger countries, which have extensive training programmes that can integrate these changes. However, it is a struggle for some TCCs that have much more modest pre-deployment programmes. Communication with TCCs and PCCs regarding new guidance will at least ensure some level of awareness about ongoing preparedness requirements.

Member States have the first responsibility for certifying that their personnel are prepared and ready to deploy into a peacekeeping mission environment. From 1 January 2016, Member States are required to certify that personnel have received pre-deployment training in line with UN standards. This means training and capacity-building programmes are essential, recognizing that some countries and regional training centres may have comparative advantages over others when it comes to training on particular issues. It was suggested that there may be value in establishing a small hub of trainers in Entebbe, Uganda, with efforts to identify Member States that would be willing to contribute to such training efforts, particularly on policing.

⁸⁰ United Nations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support, Policy: Operational Readiness Assurances and Performance Improvement, Ref. 2015.16, December 2015.

The international nature of UN peace operations makes training essential to ensure the effective implementation and application of guidance and doctrine. Different methods of training delivery are made available to peacekeepers, whether it be at the pre-deployment or in-mission stage. Given the different types of challenges that peacekeeping missions are likely to face, there has been an increasing emphasis on training for a wide range of possible scenarios. Desktop exercises that enable mission leaders and personnel to consider various decisions that they are likely to be required to make in the event of a crisis or unexpected event can be an effective training tool, and one which builds on the theory and policy provided in guidance. They can ensure that mission leadership are better prepared to deal with a variety of uncertain events and gain understanding on possible UN responses. Desktop exercises can also highlight when there are very different viewpoints to be considered. Before the crisis in South Sudan in December 2013, the UN had run a tabletop exercise with a scenario that involved civilians coming to the UN bases. The exercise had demonstrated that there were very different viewpoints among leadership in terms of how UNMISS should deal with such a situation. Participants at the Challenges Anniversary Forum noted that often there was no time to arrange such exercises and that they did not take place routinely. It was suggested that table top exercises should become a routine part of mission preparation, particularly for senior mission leadership.

Guidance Gaps and Training Needs

For many current peace operations, the lack of political solutions, often tentative consent from the host authorities (which may at times be hostile to the peacekeeping mission) and evolving threat environments mean they have to adapt to a range of potential crises and challenges on an almost daily basis. The emergence of asymmetric threat environments—like that in Mali—continues to push the UN to assess whether the guidance and doctrine available to peacekeepers are adequate. That assessment extends into areas such as intelligence and information-led operations, which are becoming essential to ensure the safety and security of personnel, and their ability to protect civilians. It means identifying and developing guidance and doctrine in areas where the uniformed components might be required to operate more proactively, from the strategic level down to the operational and tactical levels.

Peacekeepers are deployed into environments where they are expected to operate alongside parallel forces and host state security forces that may be engaged in more robust security operations. This has implications for the UN peace operation, which may be perceived as part of a wider international intervention and consequently directly targeted. The use of improvised explosive devices (IEDs) has had a particularly insidious impact on peacekeepers, many who have been deployed without the basic equipment that could minimize injuries from such attacks. Yet addressing these types of threats is not just a question of equipment, but also requires policies, guidance and training in the UN system to prepare the entire mission. It was noted that efforts are underway within the UN to address the issue of IED survivability in peacekeeping operations as part of broader work being undertaken by a DPKO/DFS Uniformed Capabilities Steering Group. That group is overseeing the development of eight projects to address guidance gaps in the field in the areas of rapid deployment, high in-theatre mobility, standing capabilities, medical support, information-led operations, transnational threats, planning and implementation, and IED survivability.

While recognizing the considerable progress recently made in developing guidance for policing and capacity-building activities by peacekeeping missions, participants acknowledged that much work still needs to be done. Efforts are underway to address shortages for policing through the development of the SGF for international policing. The UN Chiefs of Police Summit (UN COPS) in June 2016 was organized partly to raise awareness about the need for Member State input into the development of police guidance, but also to ensure that countries understand the different steps involved to prepare national police for deploying to peacekeeping missions. It is subsequently important that aspects of guidance are integrated into domestic training agendas.

Addressing gaps in guidance requires the UN to think ahead to the types of challenges that peace operations may face in the future. At present, guidance is often only developed after situations and gaps have emerged in the field. That has some benefits, as it allows the UN to draw on practice and lessons learned on the ground. However, it also means that many peacekeepers are challenged to undertake tasks with minimal direction and consistency, and with little preparation. While there has been a concerted effort to address the lack of guidance, further thinking on future needs is required in advance of any new scenarios. That requires ongoing consultation with Member States as it relates to uniformed components and Member States are often best

placed to receive feedback on shortcomings and needs in the field from their returning personnel. Mechanisms such as the C-34 and Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations were seen to be important forums to enable this feedback cycle and ensure that there is an exchange of information between the Secretariat and decision makers.

In addition to guidance gaps at the operational and tactical levels, there was recognition that the UN still has some way to go in developing a more comprehensive strategic approach to issues related to conflict prevention and management. The HIPPO Report recognized that policy developed over the years is better suited to peace implementation tasks than conflict management. Further thinking is needed on the strategic direction of peace operations and the doctrine and guidance required to support them to become more flexible in response to growing challenges. Some core strategic questions that stretch beyond peace operations need to be considered, including issues related to sustaining peace. As one panellist noted, finding the centre of gravity when it comes to guidance for peace operations remains a challenge. The Capstone Doctrine is still as relevant as it was in 2008, but also as incomplete as it was when launched. For now, the HIPPO Report serves as a valuable catalyst for identifying gaps in guidance and areas where peace operations can benefit from further direction.

Box 18: Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34) 2016

The 2016 substantive session of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34) took place from 16 February to 11 March in New York. The session represented the first opportunity for members of the C-34, which includes TCCs and PCCs, to formally consider the recommendations contained in the HIPPO Report.

Consistent with the approach adopted in previous years, the C-34 agreed to only negotiate some sections of the report, leaving the remainder for consideration during the 2017 substantive session. The sections open for negotiations in 2016 were: (D) Safety and Security; (E) Conduct and Discipline; (F) Strengthening Operational Capacity – (1) General and (2) Military Capacities; (G) Strategies for complex peacekeeping operations – (1) General, (6) Gender and peacekeeping, (7) Children and peacekeeping, (10) Other mandated tasks including protection of civilians (POC); (H) Cooperation with troop contributing countries; (I) Triangular cooperation between the Security Council, the Secretariat and troop and police contributing countries; (J) Cooperation with regional arrangements; (K)

Enhancement of African peacekeeping capacities; (L) Developing stronger United Nations field support arrangements; and (O) Financial issues.

As part of the proposals, recommendations and conclusions in the 2016 C-34 Report (A/70/19), the committee:

- took note of the HIPPO Report, the report of the Secretary-General on its implementation, the Global Study on UNSCR 1325 and the Peacebuilding Architecture Review, and encouraged coherence, synergies and complementarities between the reviews;
- recognized the importance of selecting the right leaders and ensuring they have the support to provide political direction and executive management;
- noted that effective mission-wide communication strategies enable missions to build trust with the local community, manage expectations, protect the safety and security of mission personnel and improve awareness of the work of the mission;
- acknowledged the importance of the role of gender advisers in capacity-building and knowledge transfer for gender mainstreaming in peacekeeping missions;
- encouraged the Secretariat to develop a gender-sensitive force and police generation strategy;
- welcomed the Secretary-General's decision to locate a Senior Gender Adviser in the office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, supported by gender expertise in functional mission components;
- took note of the Kigali Principles on the Protection of Civilians;
- noted the use of POC sites and requested the Secretariat to examine the implications for current and future peacekeeping operations;
- encouraged the Secretariat to deepen cooperation with regional arrangements;
- recognized the added value that could be brought by the opening of a liaison office with the League of Arab States and called upon the Secretariat to explore this;
- encouraged the Secretariat to develop a creative and flexible transition toolbox in collaboration with the AU to inform future transition processes;

- recognized the growing threat of improvised explosive devices, noted the mitigation measures to train peacekeepers, and encouraged assessment of their implementation;
- noted work underway to develop a medical performance framework and emphasized the need for timely and reliable medical and casualty evacuation;
- stressed that non-UN forces must convey reports of any allegations of sexual exploitation and abuse to the host government and/or regional organization, as well as Headquarters, and urged non-UN forces under a Security Council mandate to take appropriate steps to investigate and hold perpetrators to account;
- endorsed call for contributors to communicate any and all national caveats regarding the use of their military and police contingents;
- underlined the need to enhance strategic analysis of conflict dynamics at the local, national and regional levels; and noted the ongoing development of requirements for standby units and encouraged Member States to register their pledges with the PCRS.

8. Capabilities and Capacity-building for Future Missions

Facilitator: Dr Almut Wieland-Karimi, Director, Center of International Peace Operations, Germany;

Panellists: H.E. Mr Martin Garcia Moritán, Permanent Representative of Argentina to the United Nations; Dr Carl Ungerer, Head, Leadership, Crisis Management and Conflict Program, Geneva Centre for Security Policy, Switzerland; Mr Andrew Carpenter, Chief, Strategic Policy and Development Section, Police Division, Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations; and Ms Julie Sanda, Head, Department of Conflict, Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Studies, National Defence College, Nigeria.

The scope and operating environment of UN peace operations have evolved significantly since the Brahimi Report was published just over 15 years ago. While peacekeeping is still bound by the same three principles, namely consent, impartiality and non-use of force except in self-defence or defence of the mandate, the interpretation of those principles continues to adjust to ensure that peace operations are fit for purpose and able to respond to the range of environments that they deploy into. The HIPPO Report acknowledged the need for the three principles to remain responsive and flexible to the challenges of modern UN peace operations. Yet peacekeepers also require different capabilities to operate in today's environments than they did a decade ago. Furthermore, they will require additional capabilities to operate effectively in the missions of the future. This presents a challenge for all stakeholders engaged in the peacekeeping partnership, which often focuses on ensuring that missions are fit for today's environments, rather than preparing for future needs and planning.

Discussions in this session concentrated on some of the current and future needs of UN peace operations when it comes to capabilities and capacity-building. The HIPPO Report noted the need for the peace operations to be considered on a spectrum, ranging from light foot-print political missions through to sizeable multidimensional peace operations with military, police and civilian components. Panellists explored some of the likely challenges peacekeepers would face in the future, including emerging threat

environments, the need for qualified and skilled peacekeepers, and the ongoing requirement to deliver on mandates with institution- and capacity-building tasks. The range of challenges was captured in the major reviews, but several aspects require further detailed consideration if the UN is to ensure that its peace operations are fit for purpose and able to deliver long-term sustainable peace also after they have transitioned out of a country.

Emerging Threats: Preparing Peacekeepers

The nature of global security challenges continues to evolve at a rapid pace. In recent years, the Security Council has devoted considerable attention to the need to combat and address international security challenges related to terrorism and, more recently, violent extremism. Peace operations are not immune to these challenges. In fact, many peace operations are on the front line of attempting to counter them, whether through measures to ensure their own safety and security and that of civilians (as in Mali) or supporting broader capacity-building measures that are intended to develop host government capacity, particularly in governance and the security sector (as in Somalia).

One of the more difficult challenges remains determining where the line should be drawn for which types of activities a UN peace operation should undertake. While participants largely agreed with the HIPPO recommendation that UN peace operations should not undertake counter-terrorism operations or kinetic activity in response to violent extremism, many acknowledged that in reality, it is an operational necessity that peacekeepers are able to act if their safety and security are at threat, or if there is a risk to civilians. This means the line is at times unclear. Some participants argued that creating a hard barrier between peacekeeping operations and counter-terrorism operations will not stand the test of time. The nature of modern conflict is largely urbanised, driven by extremism and transnational organized crime, moving across borders. Addressing modern conflict therefore requires coordinated, comprehensive and integrated approaches among a range of actors at the national, regional and international levels. In addition, it requires peace operations to be prepared to work closely with, yet separate from, an array of these actors.

Technology has an important enabling role in many of today's conflict environments. It can assist in the gathering of information and provide

situational awareness in areas where peacekeepers may not be able to deploy due to remoteness or logistical challenges. The data that is developed from the use of technology can be drawn upon to provide a more accurate assessment of some of the threats and protection needs that the mission should incorporate into its operational planning and assessments. Similarly, technology can perform a vital role in mission support, by streamlining processes and safeguarding the well-being of personnel in the field. But if applied incorrectly or simply for the sake of deploying the most modern platform, it may be of limited value to the peace operation. For these reasons, the HIPPO Report recommended that priority should be attached to 'enabling' technologies, which could inter alia improve safety and security, early warning and POC.⁸¹ Identifying and generating new and enabling technology in peace operations needs to be considered as part of wider efforts to secure capabilities and force generation.

Preparing peacekeepers for new and emerging challenges requires broader thinking from the mission outset on what comparative advantages UN peace operations could bring to these situations and where they could complement other actors, including parallel forces and regional organizations. Not all contexts are well-suited to the deployment of UN blue helmets. In some instances, it may for example be more acceptable to parties to the conflict that a regional peace operation is deployed. New models and thinking may be required to ensure that the delivery of capabilities matches the efforts by a peace operation to find a political solution to the conflict (if one has not already been achieved). In many instances, the peace operation will provide life support to a country until it is in a position to take over and manage its own peace and security. The question for the UN and international community is what form should such life support take and what capabilities are required to make it successful.

Supporting Sustainable Capacity-building

Capacity-building in the context of UN peace operations is often limited by the duration of the mission mandate. While many peace operations have been in place for decades, the planning that goes into them is often made on the basis that they will only be in the country for a few years. By contrast, capacity-building and institution-building activities often take many decades to complete. As one panellist noted, police reform can on average take more

⁸¹ HIPPO Report, p. 93.

than 40 years. So in many ways, a peace operation only lays the foundations in the early stages of such efforts. One panellist suggested that an analogy could be drawn with the role of paramedics, who often arrive only to stabilize the patient. Police peacekeeping was like ‘paramedic policing’ in this regard, intended to provide solid foundations so that the host authorities then can take over and further develop their national police services.

Despite the nature of police peacekeeping being guided to a large extent by capacity-building, most personnel who deploy into the missions have limited skills in transferring knowledge or setting up institutions. Few countries have readily deployable police forces that are available for UN peace operations. Furthermore, countries are more likely to invest in making sure that they have their own community policing resources at home. This creates a challenge for the UN in terms of determining what incentives it can provide for Member States to identify and support the deployment of qualified and capable police to peace operations for a set period of time. This is one of the reasons why initiatives such as the UN COPS meeting are important, to raise awareness of these issues within the minds of national police chiefs and ministers.

Sustainable capacity-building requires funding and investment beyond the life cycle of a peace operation. Peace operations need to work closely with host authorities, civil society organizations and UN country teams to ensure that skills are developed among national staff to support a range of functions in governance, justice and administration once a peace operation leaves. Investments need to be maintained for sustainable peace. The departure of a peacekeeping mission should not necessarily be viewed as a ‘success’, but as a milestone towards building resilience and peace in a country emerging from conflict.

Personnel, Skills and the Role of Prevention

For those deploying to peace operations, there needs to be more of an emphasis on sharing knowledge. This is particularly important for those entering into leadership roles. Strong leaders often require a blend of skills and competencies that call for a different form of learning to ordinary training programmes. In addition, there is a need to expose people deploying into peacekeeping missions to information that will help them to better understand the cultural context, mission structures and institutions that they will deal with.

The introduction of more flexible mission approaches will test the thinking and skills of those deploying to peace operations. One example is the recent decision by the Security Council to deploy a political mission to Colombia. Although the UN still awaited the finalization of the peace agreement, it was nonetheless in the early stages of planning the mission and preparing for the almost 150 personnel it would deploy there. The personnel deployed to that mission would require specific skills to operate in a mission context that differed from the multidimensional missions the UN had recently deployed. It demonstrates the need for the UN Secretariat to consider different models and requirements for missions so that they are tailored to particular political situations. It also highlights the need for the UN to assess whether its investment in developing skills to support different models and scenarios for peace operations is adequate or could be improved.

The UN will have the opportunity to learn lessons from the exit and transition of long-standing missions in the next few years, including the draw-down of missions in Liberia, Côte d'Ivoire and Haiti. In each of these contexts, a UN peace operation has been deployed for more than a decade. Some of the recommendations emerging from the reviews around prioritization of mission mandates and sequencing will be essential to ensuring that the missions do not draw down too quickly, risking that the countries relapse into conflict. It will be important that lessons are drawn from the experiences of capacity-building in these contexts, so that such lessons can be applied early on in the process of other peace operations.

Ultimately, if a more comprehensive approach is to be taken to UN peace operations, then some of the significant systemic recommendations in the reviews must be adopted. It was suggested this will need to include the establishment of one peace operation's support account (instead of separate funding accounts and assessments for peace operations and SPMs); the inclusion of budget lines for mediation activities and programmatic activities for the first three years of a peace operation; and the support by multi-partner trust funds for comprehensive efforts to sustain peace beyond the narrow mandate of a peace operation.

In summary, a much broader conception of investing in and funding peace operations is needed if there is to be a more successful long-term effort in sustaining peace in countries where peace operations are deployed.

9. Conclusion: Looking Ahead

Day 1 | Chair: Mr Sven-Eric Söder, Director-General, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden;

Speakers: H.E. Mr Zohrab Mnatsakanyan, Permanent Representative of Armenia to the United Nations; and H.E. Mr Syed Akbaruddin, Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations.

Day 2 | Chair: Mr Anthony A. Bosah, Chargé d'Affairs, Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations, Chair of the UN Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations; **Speakers:** Mr Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Patron, Challenges Forum, President, International Crisis Group; Mr Dmitry Titov, Assistant Secretary-General, Rule of Law and Security Institutions, United Nations; Mr Elizabeth Spehar, Director, Policy and Mediation Division, Department of Political Affairs, United Nations; and Ms Annika Hilding-Norberg, Director and Founder, Challenges Forum, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden.

The Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum provided a timely opportunity to reflect on the progress that has been made in UN peace operations, while considering the many challenges that remain in the decade ahead. Discussions over the two days drew on a range of experiences in the areas of policy, operations, leadership and reform. The conversations highlighted the contribution that the Challenges Forum Partnership has made to reform efforts on peace operations over the last two decades, while also identifying areas where the partners could take forward work emerging from the major reviews of the last 12 months.

Participants agreed that political momentum and support will be essential to implementing the recommendations and reforms that were identified in the reviews. There was seen to be a need to ensure that reforms were sustained and that there was a comprehensive approach across all the reviews. This will require ongoing engagement and leadership from the UN Secretariat. It will also require the drive and partnership of Member States. This is where the Challenges Forum can add real value. As the Challenges Forum Patron Jean Marie Guéhenno noted, the value of the Challenges Forum Partnership in supporting reform efforts has been demonstrated time and time again. It provides a vehicle outside the UN system for consultation and consideration of reform initiatives. The publication *Considerations for Mission Leadership in UN Peacekeeping Operations* has been utilised by the UN, AU, EU, sub-

regional organizations and Member States in their preparations of senior mission leaders and leadership teams. In his view, this was one example demonstrating the value and complementarity that the Challenges Forum Partnership provides to strengthening UN peace operations.

Leadership was identified as an essential factor in overcoming many of the challenges discussed throughout the two days. The leadership role is often the most challenging job but the one that can deliver the most change if conducted wisely. The job of rallying countries and organizations can be like trying to herd a group of very independent cats, but it is an essential skill if peace operations are to succeed. Performing a leadership role in a peace operation in a country where you are not a national requires proficiency in areas such as diplomacy and strategic communication. It also calls for a strategic shift in the mindset of asking not whether things work in theory, but instead focus on the delivery in the field.

Discussions explored whether many of the distinctions that have applied over the last 20 years are still relevant to modern UN peace operations. Many suggested that older thinking around the concepts of peacekeeping and peacebuilding, which considered them as linear and distinct concepts, is no longer entirely applicable. In some instances, such thinking can even be detrimental in terms of resourcing and structures. The approach to peace operations has to evolve so that they are tailored to the contexts where they are deployed. Strategic planning for operations needs to be innovative in addressing the specific needs and requirements in a particular conflict situation. Similarly, there is a need for a more comprehensive approach to conflict and peace, developing thinking and guidance on how to use all the various instruments available to the UN and preventing stove-piping between different parts of the system. Developing a new, all-encompassing approach will entail institutional challenges for the next Secretary-General to consider, but also require some innovative thinking in order to integrate the full spectrum of peace operations tools.

Although discussions did not focus largely on conflict prevention mechanisms or tools, participants agreed that there needs to be greater attention to these efforts. This was seen to be particularly important given that many peace operations are deployed into contexts where there are still active conflicts, or where there has been a relapse into conflict. Envoys and regional offices can play a much greater role in supporting the work of peace operations. Regional organizations are also well placed to facilitate such

political engagement, highlighting the value of the ongoing partnership between the UN and regional and sub-regional organizations. However, in order for there to be a more comprehensive approach, institutional silos within the organization and among Member States need to be broken down and thinking has to evolve. Institutional loyalties must be overcome.

The next Secretary-General will be presented with a range of challenges in terms of reforming UN peace operations. How should they be financed? Should regional organizations take financial ownership of their operations? How should UN peace operations evolve with the ever-expanding counter-terrorism agenda? How can the UN get better at conflict prevention? The questions are endless. Common to all of them is the need for consultation, partnership and engagement. The role of women and youth is essential to those efforts. Providing answers to the questions will require a vision on where the organization is going and how it can complement the range of different international peace and security tools that continue to evolve to address the threats of the 21st century.

Many of the initiatives under discussion during the two days of the forum do not have to be put on hold until there is a new Secretary-General in place. There will be opportunities in the months ahead to progress many of the reforms, including at the upcoming Ministerial Meeting in London in September 2016. There is no doubt that the next Secretary-General will need to tackle some of the proposed institutional reforms and have the vision required to address the challenges facing UN peace operations. This will be decisive in ensuring that UN peace operations are ready to meet the challenges of 2020.

Appendix 1. Programme

Sunday, 8 May 2017

08.00 - 09.00 Registration

09.00 - 10.30 Opening Remarks and Welcome

Chair: H.E. Mr Mohammad Taisir Masadeh, Secretary-General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Expatriate Affairs, Former Force Commander, UNMEE, Jordan

Key Notes: H.E. Mr Hervé Ladsous, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, UN,
General Micael Bydén, Supreme Commander, Sweden

Speakers: H.E. Mr Dian Triansyah Djani, Permanent Representative of Indonesia to the UN
Mr Anthony A. Bosah, Chargé d'affaires, Permanent Representation of Nigeria to the UN, Chair of the UN Special Committee for Peacekeeping Operations, Nigeria
Mr Petr Illichev, First Deputy Permanent Representative of Russia to the UN
Ms Victoria Holt, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State, United States
Ms Annika Hilding-Norberg, Director and Founder, Challenges Forum, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

10.30 – 11.00 Group Photo and Coffee

11.00 - 12.45 Conversation 1 on The Reviews' Findings, Effective Implementation and the Strengthening of UN Peace Operations – What Priorities and Models for Follow Up?

Facilitator: Dr Sarah Cliffe, Director, Centre on International Cooperation, New York University, United Kingdom

Panel: Dr Stephen Jackson, Chief, Policy Planning and Guidance, Department of Political Affairs, UN,
Lt. Gen. (Retd) Abhijit Guha, Member, High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, Senior Member, United Service Institution of India, India
Mr Alexander Ilitchev, Member, High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, Russia
Maj. Gen. (Retd) Anis A. Bajwa, Member, Peacebuilding Architecture Review, Pakistan

Ms Ma Victoria Cabrera Balleza, International Coordinator, Global Network of Women Peacebuilders, Philippines
Dr William Durch, Senior Adviser, Challenges Forum, Distinguished Fellow, Stimson Center, Former Director, Brahimi Report, United States (background paper).

13.00 – 14.45 Working Luncheon – Conversation 2 on The Peacekeeping Summit and Coming Ministerial Meeting: Current Status, Follow Up and Requirements

Facilitator: H.E. Ms Victoria Holt, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Department of State, United States

Panel: Lt. Gen. Luiz Paul Cruz, Director for Peacekeeping Strategic Partnerships, Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support, UN
Mr. Kamapradipta Isnomo, Minister Counsellor for Political Affairs, Permanent Mission of Indonesia to UN
Commissioner Ann-Marie Orlor, Head of Division for International Affairs, Swedish Police
H.E. Mr Matthew Rycroft, Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the UN

15.00 – 16.45 Conversation 3 on The Reviews and What are the Challenges and Priorities for Peace Operations Partnerships Between the UN and Regional Organizations?

Facilitator: Mr Amr Aljowaily, Deputy Assistant Foreign Minister for UN Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Egypt

Panel: Dr Cedric de Coning, Senior Fellow, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Senior Fellow, African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes, South Africa (background paper)
H.E. Mr El-Ghassim Wane, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, UN
H.E. Mr Jean-Pierre Lacroix, Director-General, Directorate for UN and International Development, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France
Dr Uğur Güngör, Center for Strategic Research, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey
Dr Benyamin Poghosyan, Deputy Director, Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defence Research University, Armenia

17.00 – 17.30 Concluding Remarks

Chair: Mr Sven-Eric Söder, Director-General, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

Speaker: H.E. Mr Zohrab Mnatsakanyan, Permanent Representative of Armenia to the UN
H.E. Mr Syed Akbaruddin, Permanent Representative of India to the UN

Monday, 9 May 2017

09.00 – 10.45 Conversation 4 on The Reviews and What Should be Done to Improve the Safety and Security of UN and Associated Personnel in UN Peace Operations?

Facilitator: H.E. Mr Motohide Yoshikawa, Permanent Representative of Japan to the UN

Panel: Mr William R. Phillips, Former Chief of Staff, MINUSMA, now Integration Project, Department of Safety and Security, UN (background paper)
Ms Fadzai Gwaradzimba, Assistant Secretary-General, Department of Safety and Security, UN
Mr Greg Hinds, Police Commissioner, UNMIL
H.E. Lt. Gen. (Retd) Javed Zia, Ambassador of Pakistan to Tripoli, Libya

10.45 – 11.15 Coffee

11.15 – 13.00 Conversation 5 on Effective Implementation of SCR 1325 in and by Peace Operations: Empowering Women in the Field – What Now?

Facilitator: H.E. Mr Michael Grant, Deputy Permanent Representative of Canada to the UN, Chair of the UN Special Committee for Peacekeeping Operations Working Group, Canada

Panel: Dr Louise Olsson, Senior Adviser, Gender and SCR 1325, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden (background paper)
Ms Riana Paneras, Senior Researcher, Peace Operations and Peace Building Division, Institute for Security Studies, Former Police Commissioner, UNAMID, South Africa
Ms Gwendolyn Myers, Founder and Executive Director, Messengers of Peace-Liberia Inc (MOP), Global Shaper, World Economic Forum, Liberia
Mr Alan Ryan, Executive Director, Australian Civil-Military Centre, Australia

13.15 – 15.00 Working Luncheon – Conversation 6 on The Reviews and Their Implications for UN Peace Operations Doctrine and Guidelines – and How can Effective Implementation of Developed Doctrine and Guidance be Achieved?

Facilitator: Mr David Haeri, Director, Division for Policy, Evaluation and Training, Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support, UN

Panel: Mr Stefan Feller, Police Adviser, Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions, UN
Capt. (N) Hervé Auffret, Chief, Policy and Doctrine Team, Office of Military Affairs, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, UN
H.E. Mr Mohammad Taisir Masadeh, Secretary-General, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Expatriate Affairs, Former Force Commander, UNMEE, Jordan
Dr Kari M Osland, Head, Research Group on Peace and Conflict, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Norway

15.15 – 16.45 Conversation 7 on The Reviews and What are the Implications for Capabilities and Capacity-building for Future Missions - Military, Police and Civilian?

Facilitator: Dr Almut Wieland-Karimi, Director, Center on International Peace Operations, Germany

Panel: H.E. Mr Martin Garcia Moritán, Permanent Representative of Argentina to the UN
Dr Carl Ungerer, Head, Leadership, Crisis Management and Conflict Program, Geneva Centre for Security Policy, Switzerland
Mr Andrew Carpenter, Chief, Strategic Policy and Development Section, Police Division, Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, UN
Ms Julie Sanda, Head, Department of Conflict, Peacekeeping and Humanitarian Studies, National Defence College, Nigeria

16.45 – 17.30 Concluding Remarks and Looking Ahead

Chair: Mr Anthony A. Bosah, Chargé d'affaires, Permanent Representation of Nigeria to the UN, Chair of the UN Special Committee for Peacekeeping Operations, Nigeria

Speakers: Mr Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Patron, Challenges Forum, President, International Crisis Group, France
Mr Dmitry Titov, Assistant Secretary-General, Rule of Law and Security Institutions, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, UN
Ms Elizabeth Spehar, Director, Policy and Mediation Division, Department of Political Affairs, UN
Ms Annika Hilding Norberg, Director and Founder, Challenges Forum

18.30 – 20.30 Reception on the Occasion of the Challenges Forum Event on United Nations Peace Operations 2020: *The United Nations Reviews and their Implications for Tomorrow's Missions, the forthcoming General Assembly High-Level Thematic Debate on United Nations, Peace and Security and Launch of the Exhibition on Telling the Story of United Nations Peace Operations*

Venue: Delegates Dining Room, United Nations Headquarters

Host: H.E. Mr Olof Skoog, Permanent Representative of Sweden to the UN, delivering remarks on behalf of H.E. Ms Margot Wallström, Foreign Minister of Sweden

Remarks: H.E. Mr Mogens Lykketoft, President of the General Assembly of the UN
H.E. Mr Jan Eliasson, Deputy Secretary-General of the UN
H.E. Ms Samantha Power, Permanent Representative of the United States to the UN

Appendix 2. Participants List

A

Ms Phillipa Adams, Attaché, Australian Federal Police, Australia

Brig. Gen. (Retd) Masroor Ahmad, Director, Collaboration and Coordination, Institute for Strategic Studies, Research and Analysis, National Defence University, Pakistan

Rear Adm. Patrick Aho, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Benin to the United Nations, Benin

H.E. Mr Syed Akbaruddin, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations, India

Mr Jonas Alberoth, Deputy Director General, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

Mr Ricardo Alday, Political Coordinator, Permanent Mission of Mexico to the United Nations, Mexico

Mr Dmitri Alechkevitch, Policy Adviser, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions, United Nations

Mr Stanislav Aleksaev, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation to the United Nations, Russia

Mr Amr Aljowaily, Deputy Assistant Foreign Minister for United Nations Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Egypt

Mr Ali Almasafa, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Jordan to the United Nations, Jordan

Mr Mohammad Al-Sayaideh, Police Adviser, Permanent Mission of Jordan to the United Nations, Jordan

Mr Jens Andersen, Senior Military Officer, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations

Capt. (N) Herve Auffret, Chief Policy and Doctrine, Office of Military Affairs, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations

B

Maj. Gen. Anis Bajwa, Member, Advisory Group of Experts on the 2015 Review of the United Nations Peacebuilding Architecture, Pakistan

Col. Dallis Barnes, Peace Operations Analyst, United States Army Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute, United States

Brig. Gen. Christian Beau, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations, France

Ms Maria Bedford, Desk Officer, Challenges Forum, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

H.E. Ms Gillian Bird, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations, Australia

Mr Nick Birnback, Chief, Public Affairs Section, Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support, United Nations

Ms Isabella Björkman, Intern, Challenges Forum, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

Mr Anthony Bosah, Chargé d'Affairs,
Chair, Permanent Mission of Nigeria to
the United Nations, Nigeria

Ms Maureen Brown, Senior Adviser,
Challenges Forum, United Kingdom

Gen. Micael Bydén, Supreme
Commander, Swedish Armed Forces,
Sweden

C

Ms Ma Victoria Cabrera-Balleza,
International Coordinator, Global
Network of Women Peacebuilders,
Philippines

Mr Andrew Carpenter, Chief, Strategic
Policy and Development Section, Police
Division, Office of Rule of Law and
Security Institutions, Department of
Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations

Mr Fernando Cavalcante, Coordination
Officer, Departments of Peacekeeping
Operations and Field Support, United
Nations

Mr Pierre-Christophe Chatzisavas, Senior
Adviser, General Assembly, United
Nations

Brig. Gen. Michael Claesson, Deputy
Head, Plans and Policy Department,
Swedish Armed Forces, Sweden

Dr Sarah Cliffe, Director, Centre on
International Cooperation, New York
University, United Kingdom

H.E. Ms Isobel Coleman, Ambassador for
United Nations Management and Reform,
Permanent Mission of the United States
to the United Nations, United States

Mr Tomas Cordeiro, Adviser, Permanent
Mission of Portugal to the United Nations,
Portugal

Col. Edwin Rafael Cosio Melara, Military
Adviser, Permanent Mission of Guatemala
to the United Nations, Guatemala

Mr Zbigniew, Czech, Director, UN and
Human Rights Department, Ministry of
Foreign Affairs, Poland

D

Mr Rafael Dalo Minister Councillor,
Permanent Mission of Argentina to the
United Nations, Argentina

Maj. Pratomo Darwan, Deputy Military
Adviser, Permanent Mission of the
Republic of Indonesia to the United
Nations, Indonesia

Mr Gustavo de Carvalho, Senior
Researcher, Institute for Security Studies,
South Africa

Dr Cedric de Coning, Senior Research
Fellow, Norwegian Institute of
International Affairs, Norway

Mr Jim Della-Giacoma, Deputy Director,
Center on International Cooperation,
New York University, Australia

Mr Markus Derblom, Director, Policy,
Research and Development, Folke
Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

Col. Gregory Dewitt, Director, United
States Army Peacekeeping and Stability
Operations Institute, United States

Mr Joacim Diaz Björk, Board Director,
Färgfabriken Foundation, Sweden

Mr Moustapha Gilbert Diedhiou,
Francophonie Peacekeeping and
Peacebuilding Adviser, International
Organisation of la Francophonie, United
States

Mr Saliou Niang Dieng, Counsellor,
Permanent Mission of the Republic of
Senegal to the United Nations, Senegal

H.E. Mr David Donoghue, Permanent
Representative, Permanent Mission of
Ireland to the United Nations, Ireland

Ms Paula Donovan, Co-Director, AIDS-Free World/Code Blue Campaign, United States

Mr Ryan D'Souza, Advocacy Officer, Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, United States

Dr William Durch, Senior Adviser, Challenges Forum, Distinguished Fellow, Stimson Center, United States

Brig. Gen. Assoc. Professor PhD. Boris Durkech, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Slovak Republic to the United Nations, Slovakia

E

Capt. (N) Ernst Egelid, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations, Norway

Ms Silje Eggestad, Assistant to the Police Adviser, Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations, Norway

Ms Ditte Egnell, Political Adviser to the Supreme Commander, Swedish Armed Forces, Sweden

H.E. Mr Jan Eliasson, Deputy Secretary-General, United Nations

Mr Sebastian Endara, Adviser, Permanent Mission of Ecuador to the United Nations, Ecuador

Ms Patricia Enhörning, Desk Officer, Challenges Forum, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

F

Ms Judith Farnworth, Ambassador

Mr Stefan Feller, Police Adviser, Police Division, Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations

Professor William Flavin, Assistant Director, United States Army

Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute, United States

Chief Supt. Barbara Fleury, Police Adviser, Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations, Canada

Ms Bénédicte Frankinet, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Belgium to the United Nations, Belgium

Ms Anne Kjersti Frøholm, Specialist Director for Peace Operations, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norway

G

H.E. Mr Martin Garcia Moritán, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Argentina to the United Nations, Argentina

Ms Claire Gaudin, Section Head, UN, Ministry of Defence, France

H.E. Ms Natalia Gherman, Former Deputy Prime Minister, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Moldova

Dr Alison Giffen, Senior Peacekeeping Adviser, Department of State, United States

Col. (Retd) Roberto Gil Vargas, Senior Academic Adviser, National Support System for Peace Operations, Uruguay

Brig. Gen. Martin Girard, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations, Canada

Dr Anne Marie Goetz, Professor, New York University, United States

Mr Bonian Golmohammadi, Secretary-General, World Federation of United Nations Associations

Mr Efraim Gomez, Head of United Nations Policy Department, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden

Mr Yotam Goren, First Secretary,
Permanent Mission of Israel to the United
Nations, Israel

Mr Ernesto Granillo, Adviser and
Spokesperson, International Committee
of the Red Cross, United States

Mr Joakim Granit, Creative Director,
Färgfabriken Foundation, Sweden

Ambassador Michael Grant, Deputy
Permanent Representative, Permanent
Mission of Canada to the United Nations,
Canada

Ms Rita Gruenenfelder, Deputy Head of
Section, Federal Department of Foreign
Affairs, Switzerland

Mr Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Patron,
Challenges Forum, President,
International Crisis Group, France

Ms Camille Gufflet, Intern, Permanent
Mission of France to the United Nations,
France

Lt. Gen. Abhijit Guha, Member, High-level
Independent Panel on Peace Operations,
Senior Member, United Service Institution
of India, India

Ms Fadzai Gwaradzimba, Assistant
Secretary-General, Department of Safety
and Security, United Nations

Dr Uğur Güngör, Professor, Center for
Strategic Research of the Ministry of
Foreign Affairs, Turkey

H

Mr David Haeri, Chief, Division for Policy,
Evaluation and Training, Departments
of Peacekeeping Operations and Field
Support, United Nations

Mr Karim Hafez, Researcher, Cairo Center
for Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping
in Africa, Egypt

Mr Muhammad Halima, Third Secretary,
Permanent Mission of Egypt to the United
Nations, Egypt

Ms Saada Hassan, Counsellor, Permanent
Mission of the Republic of Djibouti to the
United Nations, Djibouti

Ms Annika Hilding-Norberg, Director
and Founder, Challenges Forum, Folke
Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

Mr Greg Hinds, Police Commissioner,
United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL),
United Nations

Ms Victoria Holt, Deputy Assistant
Secretary, Department of State, United
States

Ms Kathleen Hunt, United Nations
Representative, CARE International,
United States

I

Mr Petr Iliichev, First Deputy, Permanent
Mission of the Russian Federation to the
United Nations, Russia

Mr Alexander Ilitchev, Member, High-level
Independent Panel on Peace Operations,
Russia

Mr Kamapradipta Isnomo, Minister
Counsellor for Political Affairs, Permanent
Mission of Indonesia to United Nations,
Indonesia

Mr Mats Ivarsson, Second Secretary,
Permanent Mission of Sweden to the
United Nations, Sweden

J

Mr Farid Jabrayilov, First Secretary,
Permanent Mission of the Republic
of Azerbaijan to the United Nations,
Azerbaijan

Dr Stephen Jackson, Chief of Policy Planning and Guidance, Department of Political Affairs, United Nations

Brig. Gen. Jamaludin, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations, Indonesia

Lt. Col. Alexander Jansen, Deputy Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations, Netherlands

Ms Diana Sofia, Jaramillo Galvez, Intern, Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations, Colombia

Ms Lone Jessen, Senior Gender and Political Advisor, Department of Political Affairs, United Nations

K

Lt. Col. Angelor Kalligardis, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations, Greece

Mr Seif Kandeel, Minister Plenipotentiary, Permanent Mission of Egypt to the United Nations, Egypt

Ms Kaisa-Reetta Karhu, Minister-Counselor, Permanent Mission of Finland to the United Nations, Finland

H.E. Ms Dina Kawar, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Jordan to the United Nations, Jordan

Mr Paul Keating, Planning and Analysis, Executive Office of the Secretary-General, United Nations

Lt. Col. Nadeem Khan, General Staff Officer, General Headquarters Pakistan Army, Pakistan

Lt. Col. Taedong Kim, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations, Republic of Korea

Mr Stefan Koeppe, Special Assistant to the Director, Center for International Peace Operations, Germany

Col. Karsten Kolding, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Denmark to the United Nations, Denmark

Ms Tomoko Komago, Officer, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan

Mr Giorgi Kvelashvili, Minister Senior Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Georgia to the United Nations, Georgia

Brig. Gen. Mongezi Kweta, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Republic of South Africa to the United Nations, South Africa

L

Ms Benedetta Lacey, Head of Peacekeeping Team, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, United Kingdom

H.E. Mr Jean-Pierre Lacroix, Director of the Bureau for the United Nations, International Organizations, Human Rights and Francophonie, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France

H.E. Mr Hervé Ladsous, Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations

Col. Matti Lampinen, Military Adviser, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Finland to the United Nations, Finland

Mr Moonhee Lee, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations, Republic of Korea

Ms Jennifer Lee, Youth Representative, World Federation of United Nations Associations

Mr Volker Lehmann, Senior Policy Analyst, Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, Germany

Mr Stephen Lewis, Co-Director, AIDS-Free World/Code Blue Campaign, Canada

Ms Katechis Liliana, Youth Representative, World Federation of United Nations Associations

Ms Jenny Lindén Urnes, Chairman, Lindéngruppen AB, Sweden

Ms Ellen Lindén Urnes, Youth Representative, World Federation of United Nations Associations

Ms Amanda Lucey, Senior Researcher, Institute for Security Studies, South Africa

H.E. Mr Vlad Lupan, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Moldova to the United Nations, Republic of Moldova

H.E. Mr Mogens Lykketoft, President, General Assembly, United Nations

M

Dr Katarina Mansson, Associate Political Affairs Officer, Executive Office of the Secretary-General, United Nations

Mr Ahmed Marii, Head of Operations and Coordination, League of Arab States Mission to the United Nations, League of Arab States

Mr Ian Martin, Executive Director, Security Council Report, Member, High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, United Kingdom

Mr Adam Mausner, Policy Advisor, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, United States

Ms Delphine Mechoulan, Policy Analyst, International Peace Institute, United States

Maj. Gen. Ubaya Medawela, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Sri Lanka to the United Nations, Sri Lanka

Mr Alban Mendes de Leon, Officer, Public Affairs Section, Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support, United Nations

Ms Yvonne Mewengkang, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Indonesia to the United Nations, Indonesia

Col. Abdelhaq Mhansi, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of Morocco to the United Nations, Morocco

Ms Larisa Miculet, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Moldova to the United Nations, Republic of Moldova

Col. Mitja Miklavec, Military and Police Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Slovenia to the United Nations, Slovenia

Mr Craig Mills, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations, United Kingdom

Lt. Col. Stéphane Minart, Deputy Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations, France

H.E. Mr Zohrab Mnatsakanyan, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations, Armenia

Col. Norbert Moerkens, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations, Netherlands

Ms Clarita Montant, Intern, United Nations Association of New York

Ms Karen Mosoti, Head of Office, International Criminal Court Liaison Office to the United Nations, United States

Group Capt. Kevin Murray, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations, Australia

Ms Gwendolyn Myers, Founder and Executive Director, Messengers of Peace-Liberia Inc, Global Shaper, World Economic Forum, Liberia

N

Col. Claes Naréus, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations, Sweden

Ms Jo Nickolls, Senior Program Officer, Political Unit, Executive Office of the Secretary General, United Nations

Dr Alexandra Novosseloff, Senior Visiting Fellow, Center on International Cooperation, New York University, France

O

Ms Deborah Odell, Foreign Affairs Officer, Department of State, United States

Ms Madalene O'Donnell, Senior Political Affairs Officer, Department of Political Affairs, United Nations

Mr Yoshibumi Ogura, Military Adviser, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations, Japan

Ms Emmi Oikari, Deputy Director, United Nations Unit, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Finland

Mr Michael Okwudili, Senior Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Nigeria to the United Nations, Nigeria

Rear Adm. Anders Olovsson, Military Adviser, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Sweden

Dr Louise Olsson, Senior Adviser, Gender, Peace and Security, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

Mr Enrique Oribe Van Bylandt, Chief, Training and Development Section, Department of Safety and Security, United Nations

Comm. Ann-Marie Orlér, Head of Division, International Affairs, Swedish Police Authority, Sweden

Dr Kari M. Osland, Head, Research Group on Peace and Conflict, Senior Researcher, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Norway

P

Mr Jangho Park, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations, Republic of Korea

Lt. Gen. Luiz G. Paul Cruz, Director, Office for Peacekeeping Strategic Partnership, Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support, United Nations

Ms Savita Pawnday, Deputy Executive Director, Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, India

Mr Mark Pedersen, Chief, Integrated Training Service, Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support, United Nations

Ms Lourdes Pereira, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of Ecuador to the United Nations, Ecuador

Maj. Patric Persson, Aide-de-camp (ADC), Swedish Armed Forces, Sweden

Dr Mateja Peter, Senior Research Fellow, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, Norway

Chief Supt. Dan Peterson, Police Adviser, Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations, Sweden

Ms Semhar Petros, Adviser, Permanent Mission of Eritrea to the United Nations, Eritrea

Mr William R. Phillips, Integration Project, Former Chief of Staff MINUSMA, Department of Safety and Security, United Nations

Dr Benyamin Poghosyan, Deputy Director, Institute for National Strategic Studies, National Defence Research University, Armenia

Mr Mirian Popkhadze, Defense Adviser, Permanent Mission of Georgia to the United Nations, Georgia

H.E. Ms Samantha Power, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the United States to the United Nations, United States

R

Maj. Gen. Rezanur Rahman Khan, Commandant, Bangladesh Institute of Peace Support Operation Training, Bangladesh

Col. Milan Rankovic, Senior Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Serbia to the United Nations, Republic of Serbia

Col. Michael Rauhut, Chief of Staff, Military Staff Committee, Permanent Mission of the United States to the United Nations, United States

Dr Florian Reindel, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Germany to the United Nations, Germany

Ms, Diana Lucia Rengifo Vargas, Second Secretary, Permanent Mission of Colombia to the United Nations, Colombia

Ms Samantha Rodrigues, Youth Representative, World Federation of United Nations Associations

Mr Nikolai Rogosaroff, Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary-General for Rule of Law and Security Institutions, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations

Col. Florin Roman, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Romania to the United Nations, Romania

Mr Jim Ruf, Senior Program Officer, United States Institute of Peace, United States

Dr Alan Ryan, Executive Director, Australian Civil-Military Centre, Australia

H.E. Mr Matthew Rycroft, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the United Kingdom to the United Nations, United Kingdom

S

Brig. Gen. Khalid Saeed, Director, Military Operations, Military Operations Directorate, General Headquarters Pakistan Army, Pakistan

Mr Daniel Safran-Hon, Planning Officer, Executive Office of the Secretary-General, United Nations

Ms Esraa Said, Program Officer, Cairo Center for Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping in Africa, Egypt

H.E. Mr Mahmoud Saikal, Ambassador, Permanent Mission of Afghanistan to the United Nations, Afghanistan

Ms Natsuko Sakata, Director, International Peace Cooperation Division, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan

Dr Rima Salah, Member, High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, Jordan

Ms Anna Salovaara, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Finland to the United Nations, Finland

Ms Hedda Samson, Head, Political Department, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations, Netherlands

Mr Tigran Samvelian, Deputy Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Armenia to the United Nations, Armenia

Ms Julie Sanda, Principal Research Fellow, Centre for Strategic Research and Studies, National Defence College, Nigeria

Ms Saima Sayed, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations, Pakistan

Col. Samrithpiseth Sdan, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Cambodia to the United Nations, Cambodia

Mr Yutaka Sekito, First Secretary, Political Adviser, Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations, Japan

Ms Bianca Selway, Policy Adviser, Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations, Australia

Col. Naseer Shahzad, Military Adviser, Permanent Mission of Pakistan to the United Nations, Pakistan

Ms Lisa Sharland, Senior Analyst, Australian Strategic Policy Institute, Australia

Mr Jake Sherman, Special Adviser, Permanent Mission of the United States to the United Nations, United States

Ms Aishwarya Singaravelu, Youth Representative, World Federation of United Nations Associations

Lt. Gen. P K Singh, Director, United Service Institution of India, India

H.E. Mr Olof Skoog, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations, Sweden

Mr Ugo Solinas, Senior Political Affairs Officer, Political, Peacekeeping, and Humanitarian Affairs, Executive Office of the Secretary General, United Nations

Ms, Elizabeth Spehar, Director, Policy and Mediation Division, Department of Political Affairs, United Nations

Dr Daniel Stauffacher, President, ICT4Peace Foundation, Switzerland

Col. Jacek Stochel, Adviser, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Poland to the United Nations, Poland

Mr Jordan Street, Peace and Disarmament Officer, World Federation of United Nations Associations, United Nations

Ms Sonia Sughayar, Counsellor, Permanent Mission of Jordan to the United Nations, Jordan

Mr Rahul Sur, Chief of Peacekeeping Section, Office of Internal Oversight Services, United Nations

Ms Ayaka Suzuki, Chief of Staff, Departments of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support, United Nations

Mr Ashraf Swelam, Director, Cairo Center for Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping in Africa, Egypt

Mr Sven-Erik Söder, Director-General, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

T

Mr Gevorg Terteryan, Second Secretary, Arms Control and International Security Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Armenia

Mr Davit Tonoyan, First Deputy Minister of Defence, Ministry of Defense, Armenia

Dr Alexander Tsinker, President, International Expert Center for Electoral Systems, Israel

U

Dr Carl Ungerer, Head of Leadership, Crisis Management and Conflict Program, Geneva Centre for Security Policy, Switzerland

Mr Daniel Urey, Project Leader, Färgfabriken Foundation, Sweden

Professor Ali Resul Usul, Chairman, Centre for Strategic Research, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey

W

Ms Catharina Wale Grunditz, Senior Adviser/Head of Division for Euroatlantic Affairs, Department for Security Policy and International Relations, Ministry of Defence, Sweden

Ms Leonoor van Munster, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations, Netherlands

H.E. Mr El-Ghassim Wane, Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, United Nations

Mr Joakim Vaverka, Minister Counsellor, Political Coordinator, Permanent Mission of Sweden to the United Nations, Sweden

Ms Helena Vazquez, Director, Education, Training and Exercises, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

Dr Almut Wieland-Karimi, Director, Center for International Peace Operations, Germany

H.E. Mr Boguslaw Winid, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of the Republic of Poland to the United Nations, Poland

Mr Trond Egil With, Police Adviser, Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations, Norway

Ms Anne Witkowsky, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, United States

Mr Daniel Wo, Youth Representative, World Federation of United Nations Associations

Ms Lauren von Eckartsberg, Localization and Peacebuilding Policy Specialist, Global Network of Women Peacebuilders, United States

Ms Sandra Vukotic Djuric, Head, Policy and Analysis Unit, International Department, Swedish Police Authority, Sweden

Y

H.E. Mr Motohide Yoshikawa, Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations, Japan

Z

Mr Piotr Zawieja, Expert, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Poland

Mr Rene Zeleny, First Secretary, Permanent Mission of the Czech Republic to the United Nations, Czech Republic

Ms Kristina Zetterlund, Head (Acting), Policy and Best Practices, Challenges Forum, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

H.E. Lt. Gen. (Retd) Javed Zia, Ambassador of Pakistan to Libya, Embassy of Pakistan Tripoli, Pakistan

Ms Fatemeh Ziai, Chief of Staff, Office of the Deputy Secretary-General, United Nations

Ms Ruba Zinati, Head of International Cooperation, Jordan Institute of Diplomacy, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Jordan

Ö

Col. Peter Öberg, Military Adviser,
Ministry of Defence, Sweden

INTERNATIONAL FORUM FOR THE CHALLENGES OF PEACE OPERATIONS

The Challenges Forum is a strategic and dynamic platform for constructive dialogue among leading policy-makers, practitioners and academics on key issues and developments in peace operations. The Forum contributes to shaping the debate by identifying critical challenges facing military, police and civilian peace operations, by promoting awareness of emerging issues, and by generating recommendations and solutions for the consideration of the broader international peace operations community. The Challenges Forum is a global endeavor, with its Partnership encompassing Partners from the Global South and North, major Troop and Police Contributing Countries as well as the five Permanent Members of the UN Security Council.

www.challengesforum.org



Challenges Annual Forum Report 2016

United Nations Peace Operations 2020: The UN Reviews and Their Implications for Tomorrow's Missions

The Challenges 20th Anniversary Forum was hosted on 8-9 May 2016 by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Armenia, Indonesia, Nigeria, Sweden and the United States. The event marked 20 years of cooperation in support of UN peace operations and focused on United Nations Peace Operations 2020: The United Nations Reviews and Their Implications for Tomorrow's Missions. The Challenges Forum Partnership, consisting of 22 countries and 47 organizations, including major troop, police, civilian personnel and financial contributing countries, and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, convened a global dialogue on how to enhance the planning and conduct of modern peace operations, based on the findings of the 2015 high-level and expert reviews related to UN peace operations.

The current 'post-Reviews phase' calls for intensified and systematic follow-up, action and implementation of the reviews' findings. This report is offered for consideration and inspiration to ensure that UN peace operations are ready to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. The report comprises a comprehensive summary of the presentations and discussions held, and includes recommendations derived from speakers' and participants' views and proposals raised during the deliberations. Furthermore, brief summaries of recent key developments pertaining to UN peace operations are provided.