

A NEW PARTNERSHIP AGENDA

CHARTING A NEW HORIZON FOR UN PEACEKEEPING



Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support

New York, July 2009

A NEW PARTNERSHIP AGENDA

Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping

FOREWORD

A year from the tenth anniversary of the 'Brahimi report' and with peacekeeping deployed at historic levels, the United Nations peacekeeping partnership stands at a crossroads. This non-paper is a contribution to an ongoing discussion about the future direction of UN peacekeeping and how this unique instrument can continue to serve the international community and the millions of people that look to it for support.

The United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support are committed to delivering on earlier reform objectives and to pursuing continuous improvement. This non-paper is issued unofficially, in a transparent and consultative spirit, to help us work through the dilemmas facing peacekeeping – some new, many not so new – together.

The proposals contained in this non-paper continue a dialogue already underway with our peacekeeping partners. We welcome your comments on the issues presented herein and additional or other perspectives. We will engage actively with Member States who own and support this instrument, with the staff serving at the front lines in UN missions and with the many UN, regional and international partners with whom we work in the field and at headquarters.

Alain Le Roy

Under-Secretary-General for
Peacekeeping Operations

Susana Malcorra

Under-Secretary-General for
Field Support

This non-paper has been prepared by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support as a consultation document. Its comments, analysis and proposals are for discussion purposes only and should not be taken in any way as expressions of United Nations official policy or as indicating an official commitment by the Secretary-General to undertake or implement any or all of the options, preferred positions or dispositions discussed in this non-paper.



CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	i
SECTION I	
The need for a new UN peacekeeping partnership	1
Peacekeeping today: Building on past lessons and reforms	3
Peacekeeping at overstretch	4
Critical operational challenges	5
Looking ahead	6
Meeting the challenge: A renewed global partnership	6
SECTION II	
Partnership in purpose: Establishing and managing missions	8
Political strategy and direction	9
Considering a new mission	9
Setting mission objectives and strategy	10
Generating and maintaining political and other support	11
Planning and managing missions	13
Translating mission objectives into tasks	13
Authority, command and control	14
Communicating locally and internationally	15
Reviewing and reporting on progress	15
SECTION III	
Partnership in action: Delivery in the field	17
Faster deployment	18
Clarifying and delivering on critical roles	19
Protection of civilians	19
A robust approach to peacekeeping	21
Peacebuilding tasks	22
Planning for contingencies and managing crises	24



SECTION IV

Partnership for the future: Building capacity 26

Defining future needs 27

Projecting supply and demand 27

A capability-driven approach 29

Defining operational standards 30

Attracting and retaining the right personnel 31

Training and equipping 31

Sustaining morale and good conduct 33

Expanding the peacekeeping partnership 33

Growing the contributor base 33

Building future capacity 34

Interoperability and pooling resources 34

A new field support strategy 35

CONCLUSION

Way forward: The new horizon for UN peacekeeping 37

ANNEXES

Summary of main recommendations 39

List of current UN peacekeeping missions 44

A NEW PARTNERSHIP AGENDA

Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

United Nations peacekeeping is a unique global partnership. It draws together the legal and political authority of the Security Council, the personnel and financial contributions of Member States, the support of host countries and the accumulated experience of the Secretariat in managing operations in the field. It is this partnership that gives UN peacekeeping its legitimacy, its sustainability and its global reach.

Since 1948, UN peacekeeping has contributed to preventing and managing violent conflict between and within States and supporting national actors in protecting and building peace after conflict. The landmark Brahimi report of 2000 charted a renewed vision for UN peacekeeping that helped make peacekeeping stronger, more effective and comparatively cost-efficient. These reforms enabled a five-fold growth in operations over the past decade. But United Nations peacekeeping is now at a crossroads. The scale and complexity of peacekeeping today are straining its personnel, administrative and support machinery. New political, military and financial challenges threaten to erode the unity of vision and purpose of the global peacekeeping partnership. A renewed partnership and a shared agenda are essential to ensuring that UN peacekeeping can meet the challenges of today and tomorrow.

Dialogue on the future direction for peacekeeping is already underway among Member States. This non-paper, jointly prepared by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Department of Field Support (DFS) is a contribution to this dialogue. It seeks to further stimulate concrete and constructive discussions leading up to and during the next General Assembly session and to renew the collective determination to strengthen UN peacekeeping for tomorrow.

THE CHALLENGES OF TODAY AND TOMORROW

With over 116,000 deployed personnel across 15 missions, the scale of UN peacekeeping today is unprecedented. The diversity of mission mandates stretches the UN's capacity to deliver on all tasks. Personnel, logistics, finance and administration systems are struggling to support operations in some of the world's most inhospitable terrain. The necessary military capabilities are increasingly scarce in the face of rising global demand. New peacekeeping tasks require high numbers of police and civilian specialists, experts that are in limited supply both at home and abroad. The budget has soared to nearly \$7.8 billion a year at the same time as the global economic crisis has diminished overall available resources. And there is no sign that the need for peacekeeping will diminish. Threats such as environmental changes, economic shocks, transnational crime and extremism threaten many States and contribute to growing political and security instability.

Missions today face varied challenges. Several have made good progress in providing security and stability but face obstacles in designing and implementing peacebuilding strategies that can facilitate responsible transition and exit. Others depend on revitalized political processes to help them succeed and eventually depart. The sustained attention and specialized resources required risk being undercut by the demands of the largest and most expensive missions



today. For example, in Darfur, in north-south Sudan, in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in Chad, scale and politics multiply the challenges and dilemmas that peacekeepers face. Across vast terrains and amidst ongoing conflict, the UN is called upon to protect civilians and provide stability, often without critical capabilities at hand. The political processes that these missions accompany are troubled, stalled or simply absent, and in some cases missions operate with limited consent from key parties on the ground.

BUILDING ON BRAHIMI

Though formidable, these challenges are not entirely new. The Brahimi report tackled many of these dilemmas and the principles it set down remain central to modern peacekeeping. They have been carried on through the *Peace Operations 2010* agenda, the restructuring of DPKO and the creation of DFS in 2007. Why then, does UN peacekeeping need a new agenda? What is different about today's demands?

Simply put, the scale and complexity of peacekeeping today are mismatched with existing capabilities. The demands of the past decade have exposed the limitations of past reforms and the basic systems, structures and tools of an organization not designed for the size, tempo and tasks of today's missions. Political strains are also showing. Divisions within the international community impact the ability of some missions to act effectively on the ground, and Member States' attention is at times spread thin among competing peace and security priorities. Each new operation is built voluntarily and from scratch on the assumption that adequate resources can be found and is run on individual budget, support and administrative lines. Peacekeeping in its current form requires more predictable, professional and adaptable capacities. It needs a global system to match the global enterprise it has become.

Peacekeeping is a core function of the United Nations. Continuous improvement is essential but a piecemeal approach is not an option. The global resources available for UN peacekeeping are finite. Political strains in one context can reverberate as weakened consensus in another context. The resource demands of one operation can mean diminished personnel, equipment and funding for others. Perceived weakness or capitulation in one environment can lead to increased provocation of UN peacekeepers in another. A new and comprehensive way of doing business is required.

A NEW AGENDA FOR PARTNERSHIP

This DPKO/DFS non-paper calls for a renewed UN peacekeeping partnership to set a new horizon – a set of achievable immediate, medium and long term goals – to help configure UN peacekeeping to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. This partnership rests on a shared understanding among all stakeholders of the objectives of UN peacekeeping and the role that each plays in their realization: those that authorize peacekeeping, those that implement, those that contribute, those that receive and those that partner with UN peacekeepers. Each partner has



a perspective and a contribution to make and each depends on the others for success. A common vision and mutual accountability of all peacekeeping partners are the basis for unity of purpose and effective action. This partnership is the foundation for building capacities for the future.

This non-paper reaffirms the commitment of DPKO and DFS to the global partnership and offers a potential agenda for its renewal. It identifies some the critical elements that DPKO and DFS must deliver and the contributions that Member States and partners can make to strengthen a global partnership in purpose, in action and in the future.

Partnership in purpose

A shared vision of the purpose of UN peacekeeping is a prerequisite for capable and effective action on the ground. To strengthen the direction, planning and management of UN peacekeeping, we need a renewed partnership in purpose based on the unity and cohesion of all stakeholders. This partnership can be strengthened through:

CLEAR POLITICAL STRATEGY AND DIRECTION. Peacekeeping is part of a political solution, not an alternative. It is one of a range of international peace and security tools and its use must be considered against other available response options. It must be engaged only as an accompaniment to an active political strategy. Where UN peacekeeping is the best choice, essential support and consensus can be built, when possible, through a phased and consultative process that seeks to align mandates with objectives and available resources. The establishment of informal mission-specific coalitions of Member States can help to maintain unity of purpose and sustain the necessary support for each mission.

COHESIVE MISSION PLANNING AND MANAGEMENT. Sustained dialogue and exchange between the Secretariat and Member States and between the field and headquarters are central to sound mission planning and management. Meaningful consultation rests on recognition of the role, responsibility and mutual accountability of each. During mission planning and review, strengthened consultation mechanisms and clarification of information and reporting requirements can enhance accountability and clarity in purpose. At the same time, the impartiality of Secretariat planning must be retained, as must the integrity of UN command and control. Once a mission has deployed, the establishment of relevant and realistic benchmarks on the ground at an early stage in the mission can facilitate management and monitoring.

Partnership in action

Successful UN peacekeeping depends on the ability to deliver timely and practical results on the ground. To enhance delivery and confidence in UN peacekeeping to implement the tasks it has been assigned, we need a renewed partnership in action. This partnership can be strengthened through:



FASTER DEPLOYMENT. Rapid deployment, which is critical to the early establishment of security and to the credibility of a peacekeeping mission, is ultimately a function of political will. The speed and efficacy of deployment can, however, be enhanced by focusing on the early establishment of mission Headquarters, a sequenced roll-out and prioritization of tasks. This can facilitate a faster response and greater focus on immediate priorities and needs on the ground.

CLARITY AND DELIVERY ON CRITICAL ROLES. The future of UN peacekeeping depends on its ability to manage volatile environments, to take on varied tasks to support States and populations in managing threats to peace, and to help put in place the critical early foundations for sustainable peace. Consensus on policy and requirements for robust peacekeeping and protection of civilians are central to the success of current and future UN peacekeeping operations. Critical peacebuilding roles of UN peacekeepers must be clarified. So too, recurrent gaps and challenges to transition and exit for peacekeeping missions must be addressed. Support to national actors in providing for their own security through early security sector reform (SSR) is critical in this regard.

CRISIS MANAGEMENT. When put to the test, peacekeeping missions must be prepared to respond. Timely, accurate and detailed security risk assessments can provide early warning of an emerging threat and help ensure the safety and security of missions and personnel. Scenario-planning in the field is critical. In moments of crisis, reliable reserve capacities remain a vital and as of yet unfulfilled requirement for UN peacekeeping.

Partnership for the future

UN peacekeeping requires dependable and sustainable capabilities in order to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. To build the capacity of UN peacekeeping to continue to serve as a global peace and security instrument, there is a need for a partnership for the future. This partnership can be strengthened through:

PROJECTING FUTURE NEEDS. Unknown future demands and uncertainty about available global resources render the task of defining the future needs of UN peacekeeping inherently difficult. UN peacekeeping remains a comparatively inexpensive provider of post-conflict security and demand for the tool is unlikely to falter. But critical shortages are already manifest across many missions. Future requirements will need to be considered in the context of a constrained financial environment. Meeting these demands will entail a new and comprehensive approach to resource generation and incentives required to deliver results in the field.

A CAPABILITY-DRIVEN APPROACH. Current and likely future demands for UN peacekeeping require a high degree of mobility and specialization of military, police and civilian capabilities. Identifying, recruiting and retaining diverse police and civilian specialists for newer peacekeeping tasks are particular challenges. To match personnel and equipment to the tasks they are required to perform, and to provide appropriate incentives to contributors,



we need to move from a quantitative focus on numbers to a qualitative approach emphasizing the generation of capabilities. This demands the development of standards and their systematic linkage to training, equipping and delivery on the ground.

EXPANDING THE PEACEKEEPING PARTNERSHIP. UN peacekeeping cannot rely heavily on a small number of significant contributors. An expanded base of troop- and police-contributing countries is required to enhance collective burden-sharing and to meet future requirements. Capacity-building support, such as UN support to the African Union, is an important priority and can help build capability for the future, while an emphasis on reinforcing interoperability with key partners, *inter alia*, the African Union and the European Union, can enhance cooperation and ensure that we maximize finite global peacekeeping resources.

A NEW FIELD SUPPORT STRATEGY. The complex, fast-paced nature of UN peacekeeping today requires a new approach that emphasizes innovation, flexibility and accountability in support systems. Development of a new field support strategy is already underway and will seek delivery and management improvements at global, regional and mission levels. This strategy includes the shared use of assets and the creation of regional service centres; a better use of technology to support lighter, more agile deployment; and improved financial arrangements for greater operational flexibility.

DPKO and DFS believe that real improvements can be made on all these levels. But they can only take place through the active and sustained engagement of all partners. Many of the issues identified will require the leadership of Member States; others will require further development by the Secretariat. Some were raised as part of earlier reform efforts but have suffered in their implementation in the face of operational demands or political constraints. Others are new issues and must be seized upon to strengthen peacekeeping for the future.

With this non-paper, DPKO and DFS offer their vision of the contribution that the Secretariat can make as part of the global peacekeeping partnership. They reaffirm their commitment to realizing these efforts together with Member States, UN, regional and other partners.

A NEW PARTNERSHIP AGENDA

Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping

SECTION I

**The need for a new
UN peacekeeping partnership**



The need for a new UN peacekeeping partnership

United Nations peacekeeping is one of many tools to help address diverse threats to international peace and security. UN tools include the Secretary-General's good offices and other conflict prevention and mediation capacities which help parties avoid or resolve conflict. They include peacebuilding assistance provided by dedicated offices as well as the UN agencies, funds and programmes that assist national actors to build and sustain peace after conflict. The United Nations can and should continue to review and strengthen all these tools. The Security Council also has coercive tools such as sanctions and enforcement at its disposal. It can call upon regional, bilateral and multinational actors and their various instruments to assist in implementing its decisions. In their independent capacities, these partners are also critically important contributors to international peace and security.

United Nations peacekeeping, as a flagship activity of the Organization, is a unique instrument that is built on a global partnership. It is also remarkably diverse. Peacekeeping operations range from large military deployments to small observer forces, from complex integrated missions to specialist police, rule of law and other civilian operations. The flexible manner in which the Security Council has employed UN peacekeeping prevents easy definition or categorization. But UN peacekeeping operations do share some key features. Each operation takes place at the request of the Security Council and in accordance with the **basic principles of peacekeeping – consent, impartiality and the non-use of force except in self-defence and in defence of the mandate**. UN peacekeeping missions provide a transitional security presence to which different political, police and civilian components can be integrated. Every operation is assembled from uniformed personnel provided voluntarily by currently 118 countries, along with civilian staff, and with financing from all 192 Member States. Each operation provides an international framework through which a wide array of partners can act with legitimacy and in coordination.



SUCCESS FACTORS IN UN PEACEKEEPING

The DPKO publication *United Nations Peacekeeping: Principles and Guidelines* (2008) discusses lessons learned and operational guidelines for the conduct of successful operations. In addition to the describing application of the basic principles of UN peacekeeping, it outlines several important factors that help to drive success in UN peacekeeping, including, *inter alia*:

- **Genuine commitment to a political process** by the parties to work toward peace
- **Clear, credible and achievable mandates**, with matching resources
- **Unity of purpose in the Security Council**, with active diplomacy in support
- Supportive **engagement by neighbouring countries** and regional actors
- **Host country commitment** to unhindered operations and freedom of movement
- **Integrated UN approach**, effective coordination with other actors and good communication with host country authorities and population
- Missions need to demonstrate their **credibility**, strengthen their **legitimacy** and promote **national and local ownership**



PEACEKEEPING TODAY: BUILDING ON PAST LESSONS AND REFORMS

In over 60 years of experience and 63 missions there have been important successes for UN peacekeepers. 'Traditional' operations deployed to observe and monitor a ceasefire have helped deter relapse to violence in the absence of a peaceful settlement, for example, in Cyprus, the Middle East and Western Sahara. In countries such as Burundi, Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Namibia, Mozambique and Sierra Leone, UN peacekeeping operations has protected political processes and helped national actors take the first steps toward a durable peace. In so doing, UN peacekeeping has developed a range of skills, from disarming former combatants and helping them to re-enter civilian life to bringing order and safety to public places, from protecting human rights and enabling refugees to return to their homes, to helping organize elections and the establishment of national political, rule of law and security institutions.

At times, peacekeeping missions have failed - sometimes dramatically so. The inability or unwillingness of the international community to respond in Rwanda and Srebrenica revealed the limits of UN operations. So too did the failure of UN peacekeepers to contain violent attacks in the Congo in the 1960s, Somalia in the 1990s and Sierra Leone in 2000. Elsewhere, peacekeepers may have succeeded in a narrow sense, while failing in the broader international response to conflict. In earlier missions in Haiti, Liberia and Timor-Leste, for example, UN peacekeeping deployed alongside international assistance that was poorly adapted to creating the conditions and structures for a sustainable peace. Peacekeepers departed, perhaps too early, only to return.

The 2000 Brahimi report was a turning point in setting out a renewed vision for UN peacekeeping and putting in motion major reforms to make peacekeeping faster, more capable and more effective. Subsequent reform initiatives have maintained the momentum for improvement and for adapting UN peacekeeping to changes in the strategic environment. These changes include unanticipated levels of peacekeeping demand and activity, new sources of insecurity, significant new peace and security actors, and an international community that finds itself under greater political and resource strain.



UN PEACEKEEPING: A DECADE OF LESSONS AND REFORMS

1999 *Report of the Secretary-General on the Fall of Srebrenica (Srebrenica Report); Independent Inquiry into the Actions of the United Nations during the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda (Carlsson Report)*

2000 *Report of the Panel on UN Peace Operations (Brahimi Report)* and subsequent implementation reports of the Secretary-General in 2000 and 2001

2005 *Peace Operations 2010* (DPKO internal professionalization process to improve performance in the areas of personnel, doctrine, organization, partnership and resources)

2007 *Report of the Secretary-General on Strengthening of the Capacity of the Organization on Peacekeeping Operations* (creating DFS, restructuring DPKO)



Peacekeeping reform is an unfinished business. Some critical aspects of past reforms have yet to be tackled by Member States, such as the provision of additional capacity to reinforce missions during crises. Other reforms have been only partially implemented by the Secretariat, such as a global logistics strategy or effective integrated planning mechanisms. Still others have been outpaced by the growth of UN peacekeeping. There were 20,000 peacekeepers in the field in 2000, when the Brahimi report was issued; today that number is more than five times as large. Since 2003, UN peacekeeping has deployed no less than eight complex operations, often in parallel. The ready stocks and funds to deploy missions remain at levels agreed following the Brahimi report and have not been adjusted to keep pace.

PEACEKEEPING AT OVERSTRETCH

UN peacekeeping today is global in scale and in scope. With over 116,000 deployed personnel, the scale of today's operations is unprecedented and the diversity of mission mandates stretches the UN's capacity to deliver on all tasks. The budget has soared to nearly \$7.8 billion a year. Yet UN peacekeeping operates within a system that is largely *ad hoc*. Every operation is assembled and funded individually. Administrative practices and financial management systems designed for a stable civil service secretariat now manage massive, complex field operations in some of the most difficult and remote environments in the world. The mismatch between the scope of modern peacekeeping and its tools is creating serious strains for UN peacekeeping at a time when it is being asked to do more.



PEACEKEEPING IN NUMBERS*

Total deployed peacekeepers	116,413
Military personnel	82,223
Police personnel	10,993
International civilian personnel	6,683
National civilian personnel	14,254
United Nations Volunteers	2,260
Countries contributing uniformed personnel	118

*Numbers current as of 30 June 2009



Critical operational challenges

The challenges facing United Nations peacekeeping are spread across five important areas of activity:

SUPPORTING A CEASEFIRE AGREEMENT BETWEEN TWO OR MORE PARTIES: Long-standing monitoring and observation missions in Cyprus, the Golan, Jammu and Kashmir, and Western Sahara continue to help deter violence. These missions are limited in size, mandate and cost. But in some cases their presence may encourage Member States to divert attention away from finding a political solution. The UN mission in Lebanon illustrates how resource-intensive and challenging such operations can be in a volatile environment.

SUPPORTING A PEACE PROCESS AND NATIONAL AUTHORITIES AFTER CIVIL CONFLICT: In some countries, UN peacekeepers face distinct challenges in helping to lay the foundations for sustainable peace. A troubled transition in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and a difficult peace process between northern and southern Sudan are straining these two large missions. These missions are struggling to strengthen political processes, which depend on regional and international support. Deterring and containing violence and protecting civilians are critical and demanding parts of their task that are complicated by both gaps in capabilities and differences of view on what robust peacekeeping can and should be expected to accomplish in the face of ongoing conflict. The large and remote territories in which these missions operate increase their difficulty as well as cost.

EXTENDING INITIAL SECURITY AND STABILITY GAINS INTO LONGER-TERM PEACEBUILDING: Many UN peacekeeping missions also serve as early peacebuilders. In Haiti, Liberia and Timor-Leste, UN peacekeepers have succeeded in establishing basic security and supporting political processes. The conditions for sustainable peacebuilding are in place. National governments, supported by the UN, international financial institutions and other partners must lead in setting strategies to deliver tangible peace dividends and economic development. UN peacekeepers must improve their ability to contribute to peacebuilding and, where called upon, to coordinate a broader effort. Peacekeeping transition and exit strategies depend on countries providing for their own security, and the UN will need to find effective ways to support this goal through better rule of law and security sector reform (SSR) assistance.

PROVIDING SECURITY AND PROTECTION IN RESPONSE TO CONFLICT: In Chad and Darfur, Sudan, UN peacekeepers are trying to minimize the effects of ongoing conflict. Their activities are focused on protecting civilians and providing security for humanitarian efforts. The willingness of major parties to these conflicts to accept and cooperate with peacekeepers is critical. The scale and remoteness of the territory make these two missions among the most expensive and difficult UN operations ever. In the absence of an agreed political solution, mitigating the conflict and preventing mission failure are the only viable strategies. These missions will likely continue to require major investment of capacity and resources for years to come.



SUPPORTING OTHER PEACE AND SECURITY ACTORS, INCLUDING THROUGH CAPACITY-BUILDING: In recent years, UN peacekeepers have been tasked to contribute to the capacity of other partners to respond to conflicts. The United Nations provides technical and capacity building support to African Union (AU) peacekeeping, which includes support to AU deployments in Darfur, Sudan and in Somalia. DPKO offers military, police, judicial, prison, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), SSR and mine action expertise to different parts of the UN system, in particular special political missions. The 2007 creation of the Department of Field Support was designed to enhance logistics, personnel and communications support to a variety of UN field presences. UN peacekeeping is currently not configured to consistently deliver comprehensive support to others. Without viable financial arrangements and technical frameworks, its ability to fulfill a capacity-building and support role will remain limited.

Looking ahead

Taken together, the challenges described above have stretched UN peacekeeping to its limits. Yet demands could well continue to increase. Volatile commodity prices and financial markets, transnational organized crime and environmental changes may lead to political and security instability where societies lack the resources to cope with such shocks. Countries emerging from conflict are particularly vulnerable. The risk that these threats will be met with limited or partial responses is real. The global economic crisis is forcing many governments and organizations to scale back conflict management, humanitarian and development assistance. Military and police capabilities globally are in greater demand. Stretched bilateral and regional capacities increase the likelihood of UN peacekeeping being called upon to act as an instrument of last resort, yet with fewer resources and diminished support.

MEETING THE CHALLENGE: A RENEWED GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP

The current strains on the peacekeeping partnership are showing in different ways: Lack of consensus on the role of UN peacekeeping and on how peacekeepers should implement the tasks that they are assigned; increasing political and security challenges to missions and peacekeepers in implementing mandates; and difficulties of Member States and the Secretariat in meeting required needs as well as managing concern over costs.

Success in coping with these strains and meeting future demand requires a new way of doing business. UN peacekeeping must be ready to act in ways that are more flexible, effective and efficient. Piecemeal approaches are not an option. A global approach is required. The foundation of this is **a renewed global partnership** among the Security Council, the contributing Member States and the Secretariat. The Security Council must adopt achievable and credible mandates and must continue to support those mandates by exerting, as much as possible, unified political efforts to keep parties on the path to peace and to encourage support for its operations from other Member States. The Secretariat must provide appropriate information and advice and ensure its systems for planning and managing operations meet the highest standards, so as to retain the confidence of the Member States. The



Member States must provide the resources – the troops, police and finances – that only they have, in a timely manner and to the levels required to fulfill established mandates.

All peacekeeping partners need to address these commitments through a shared dialogue and coordinated effort, a dialogue that engenders a better understanding of the perspectives and the constraints of every partner, and a coordinated effort to optimize the contribution of each. The agenda of a renewed global partnership should be to:

- Strengthen the unity and cohesion of all stakeholders in the direction, planning and management of UN peacekeeping – by building a **Partnership in Purpose**
- Enhance the credibility of UN peacekeeping, and thus the confidence in the instrument, to implement the tasks it has been assigned – by fostering a **Partnership in Action**
- Build the capacity of UN peacekeeping to continue to serve as a global peace and security instrument – by developing a **Partnership for the Future**

These three elements reflected the core of the Brahimi report's vision for UN peacekeeping. They are as relevant and vital today as they were almost ten years ago. The sections that follow propose how a stronger global peacekeeping partnership can meet this agenda and, in so doing, chart the horizon for UN peacekeeping in the 21st century.

A NEW PARTNERSHIP AGENDA

Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping

SECTION II

PARTNERSHIP IN PURPOSE: Establishing and managing missions



PARTNERSHIP IN PURPOSE: Establishing and managing missions

This section examines some of the ways in which a strong, inclusive and sustained partnership can strengthen the planning and management of UN peacekeeping missions.

POLITICAL STRATEGY AND DIRECTION

The single most important finding of the Brahimi report was that UN peacekeeping can only succeed as part of a wider political strategy to end a conflict and with the will of the parties to implement that strategy. As peacekeeping expands in scope and tasks, it depends more and more on active political support for success - support that is tested every time a peacekeeping mission is deployed. Strengthening the cohesion of all partners in UN peacekeeping requires clear political strategies and support for every mission. This is all the more important in contexts where there is no formal peace agreement among parties, such as Haiti or Timor-Leste. In all peacekeeping contexts, the Security Council must lead in defining credible political strategies to achieve the goal of helping countries establish and maintain peace.

Considering a new mission

Peacekeeping is not always the right answer. In situations of high political tension, or in contexts where regional or national support is lacking, prevention, mediation, peacebuilding and conflict-sensitive development activities may be more effective. In active conflict, multinational coalitions of forces or regional actors operating under UN Security Council mandates may be more suitable. Successful crisis management rests on choosing the right tools and bringing them together in ways that maximize their respective strengths. As part of the UN's integrated approach, the Secretariat has developed a strategic assessment tool to better advise the Council on the conditions and risks of a particular crisis and the range of potential responses. UN peacekeeping may be one of these options as conditions dictate.

In establishing a new UN peacekeeping mission, it is important to consider the additional instruments that may be needed – UN and non-UN. These instruments may include advance missions, mediation and diplomatic efforts or the parallel deployment of bilateral, regional or multinational operations. In complex situations, the deployment of a UN mission may depend on logistical support from external partners.



When the Security Council is considering the deployment of a new mission in complex situations, DPKO and DFS will:

- **Present to the Security Council proposals on the full range of supporting actions that Member States and regional partners might provide to expedite mission deployment, including political measures as well as strategic lift, logistics and other operational support.**



Multi-actor operations require coordination and sequencing arrangements, which the Council must take into account in considering and establishing a peacekeeping mission. Delays in deployment or difficulties experienced by one actor impact the success of others. Where UN peacekeeping operates alongside or follows a regional or multinational peace operation, it must be able to function as a reliable partner. Advance planning and, where appropriate, joint coordination arrangements, are essential to anticipating and pre-empting obstacles to effective deployment, as well as facilitating coordination and/or a smooth transition.



Where UN peacekeeping follows an existing operation carried out by a partner, DPKO and DFS propose that members of the Security Council:

- **Mandate a UN peacekeeping mission at least six months in advance of the envisaged transfer of authority to enable coordinated planning and start-up.**
- **Authorize, where conditions on the ground permit, the deployment of advance planning capacities so as to facilitate the deployment of the future mission.**

Setting mission objectives and strategy

Clear and achievable mandates are the foundation of an effective mission strategy. In the past decade, members of the Security Council have worked to provide clearer and more precise direction to UN peacekeeping operations. At the same time, mission tasks have proliferated. The mandate of the UN mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, for example, lists no less than 45 different tasks. While strategic direction is critical for mission planning, multiple, detailed tasks can obscure the overall objectives that the Council expects peacekeepers to achieve, particularly in the initial phase. As the situation on the ground evolves, subsequent mandate renewals could consider the phased expansion of tasks on the basis of advice from the Secretariat.

Complex missions often struggle to clarify the tasks for which peacekeepers are responsible and those which other UN partners are meant to perform as part of an integrated approach. Today, the coordination mandates of missions often extend beyond the UN system and include facilitating a coherent approach among all international actors – bilateral, regional and multilateral – in support of national efforts. Successful international coordination requires clarity among partners on respective responsibilities and on the role of the peacekeeping mission in supporting broader political and peacebuilding strategies.



DPKO and DFS suggest that members of the Security Council consider:

- **Crafting mission mandates to reflect clearly achievable objectives and to specify those activities for which the mission is responsible.**



The Secretariat can assist the Security Council in setting mission objectives by providing an accurate and comprehensive assessment of the situation on the ground. Progress has been made in improving technical assessments through the participation of UN political, humanitarian, development, human rights and peacebuilding partners. However, the short duration of these complex assessments as well as political, security and other constraints remain obstacles to the Secretariat's efforts to consistently produce high-quality integrated conflict assessments within which the role of a potential mission can be defined. The strengthening of system-wide conflict assessment must be a priority of ongoing UN integration efforts. Early dialogue between the Secretariat and the Security Council can also assist in better defining the objectives and the focus of a technical assessment and can enable members of the Security Council to share relevant information with planners. Once troop and police contributors deploy, they should be included in dialogues on subsequent assessments.



To strengthen Member State confidence in assessments and early planning for complex missions, DPKO and DFS propose to:

- **Consult systematically with Member States in advance of a technical assessment mission on its objectives and broad parameters and debrief Member States on its main findings.**

Generating and maintaining political and other support

The Brahimi report recognized the importance of matching mandates to available support and resources. It called for a two-staged approach to the establishment of peacekeeping missions to allow the Security Council and the Secretary-General to build the political and resource support necessary to launch a successful mission. The more complex an operation the Security Council envisages, the more critical this support becomes. Although the Brahimi recommendation was not accepted by Member States, recent Security Council actions with regard to Somalia offer a potential example of the application of a phased approach.

A phased approach creates a window for dialogue among partners. Early informal consultation among the Security Council, the Secretariat and potential troop and police contributing countries and, as appropriate, with regional partners, can help define the political, security and humanitarian case for a mission. Bilateral engagement with the parties to the conflict can help create the conditions for mission entry and a more detailed understanding of priorities and needs. Through these consultations, the Security Council and the Secretary-General can be better placed to establish a clear peacekeeping strategy that is matched with resources for implementation.



DPKO and DFS suggest that members of the Security Council consider ways they can help ensure that new missions receive the capabilities they require to carry out the will of the Council, including:

- **Adopting, when possible, a phased approach to the establishment of future UN peacekeeping missions to enable consultation, through existing forums or troop and police pledging events, with potential contributing countries and key partners prior to mandate authorization on (i) mission objectives and (ii) available resources.**

Maintaining political support throughout the life of the mission is equally essential. Active and supportive diplomacy by Security Council members in the 'Friends of' or *ad hoc* groups that accompany many peace processes and post-conflict transitions can help produce the breadth of activity and support required to achieve a comprehensive political solution. It is critical that these broader political efforts are aligned with the peacekeeping mission's objectives and that the mission can benefit from the knowledge and engagement of bilateral and regional envoys.

To help achieve this alignment, Security Council members, with the support of other Member States, have at times set up informal Headquarter-based groups of contributing States, host States, regional actors and other key partners to assist and support a peacekeeping mission. The more systematic use of such informal coalitions for specific missions can help maintain unity and cohesion among key stakeholders. Such groups can also help to provide the informed and sustained support that complex missions require. They can help foster international support for the relevant peacekeeping operation and ensure synergy between wider political processes and mission progress. They can facilitate and sustain the consent of the parties to the conflict, including in addressing the imposition of conditions and restrictions on UN peacekeepers. Informal coalitions can equally advocate for necessary budgetary, personnel and other resources. Lastly, they can help marshal a swift and cohesive response to mission crises and contingencies.

Clearly, informal coalitions place demands on the attention and resources of members of the Security Council and all engaged stakeholders. Nevertheless, they are critical to building a purposeful partnership and a clear political strategy behind a peacekeeping mission. The Secretariat can assist, but cannot replace, the leadership of the Security Council in generating and maintaining such support.



DPKO and DFS suggest that members of the Security Council consider:

- **Establishing, with interested Member States, informal mission-specific coalitions of engaged stakeholders to assist the Secretary-General in securing and sustaining the necessary political and operational support.**



PLANNING AND MANAGING MISSIONS

The UN Secretariat implements the resolutions of the Security Council. It provides the Security Council with impartial expert assessments, proposes options or recommendations on the situation, and estimates the resource implications for current or potential missions. The Council must consult meaningfully with troop and police contributing countries in the planning and conduct of individual peacekeeping operations. DPKO and DFS engage with the entire membership, particularly the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, on peacekeeping policy issues and lessons learned, as well as with the Organization's budgetary bodies on financial planning and administrative management of missions. If the Secretariat is to retain the confidence of Member States in all these functions, it must continuously strive for effective planning and management.

The progress made in strengthening and systematically applying an integrated mission planning approach is an important step forward for the United Nations. But there is still some way to go. Headquarters and field planning capacities must be improved and planning roles and responsibilities clarified. Field planning capacity, in particular, has been identified as a priority for system-wide integration efforts. All peacekeeping stakeholders should have a thorough understanding of UN integrated planning and its interaction with mandate design processes as well as relations between headquarters and the field. This could be facilitated through joint scenario-based training for Permanent Missions, Secretariat and field staff.

Translating mission objectives into tasks

Once the Security Council has authorized a mission, it is the role of the Secretariat to translate these objectives into prioritized, operational mission tasks. This is best achieved in consultation with those who contribute the resources necessary to carry out these tasks. Although the Secretariat is in regular dialogue with troop and police contributing countries and organizes many briefings on specific operations, the quality of consultation, and its alignment to mission planning and mandate renewal, can be enhanced. In its Resolution 1327 of 13 November 2000 and Resolution 1353 of 13 June 2001, the Security Council set out a range of concrete measures to enhance dialogue, including steps to be taken by the Secretariat.



To develop more meaningful consultation, DPKO and DFS will more systematically fulfill the requests of the Security Council in SCR 1327 and SCR 1353 to:

- **Strengthen consultations with the Security Council and troop- and police-contributing countries on proposed tasks affecting their personnel before planning documents are issued; and**
- **Include information on consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries in regular reports of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on individual operations.**



Authority, command and control

The effective planning and conduct of operations rests on clear and robust command and control arrangements within UN Headquarters, between headquarters and the field, within the mission, and between the mission and the rest of the UN system on the ground. The confidence of the Security Council and contributing countries in these command and control arrangements is equally critical.

The civilian leadership of UN peacekeeping at headquarters and in most field missions reflects UN peacekeeping's fundamental political nature and profile. All components deployed to a UN peacekeeping mission come under the authority of the head of the mission who reports to and receives direction from the Secretary-General through the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations. The Secretariat has set in motion initiatives to better prepare senior mission leaders, and to empower them to serve on behalf of the entire UN system. The authority of the head of mission must be reinforced by a capable senior management team and support staff. Clarity of roles, responsibilities and mutual accountability are essential so as to instill greater understanding and confidence in the role of senior mission leadership.



To strengthen clarity and accountability in the command and control chain, DPKO and DFS will:

- **Develop more robust accountability frameworks between headquarters and senior mission leaders.**

Where troop or police contributing countries are expected to deploy significant force levels to operate in volatile or high-risk situations and to be ready to perform to the full extent of their capabilities, they need confidence in the command and control of the mission. And they have a legitimate interest in plans and directives that affect their personnel. Meaningful dialogue between the Secretariat and contributing countries and, as noted above, systematic and timely consultation before planning documents are issued or reviewed, is critical.

Where conditions on the ground demand a rapid response, or the deployment of significant new capabilities, a greater level of engagement and information-sharing between the Secretariat and contributing countries is essential. In exceptional circumstances, this could lead to requests for the provision of temporary surge support to headquarters or field planning structures under UN command and control. Intensified consultation with Member States must be balanced against the need to protect the impartiality of Secretariat planning and to preserve unified command and control. It is critical that the peacekeeping partnership find equitable ways to address the interest of contributing countries to interact with mission planning and strengthen their confidence in command and control, while maintaining the impartiality on which the legitimacy of UN peacekeeping depends.



To strengthen contributors' confidence in mission planning and command and control DPKO and DFS will:

- **Engage with members of the Security Council and contributing countries on strengthening mechanisms for consultation and interaction on mission planning processes within the framework of UN command and control.**

Communicating locally and internationally

Modern UN peacekeepers must be effective communicators, both locally and globally. Missions communicate to the host authorities and population as much through public information strategies as through their actions. Every component of a mission impacts the perceptions and often the lives of individuals. Effective communication of the mission's role and functions to local actors is essential. In the past, the effectiveness of UN peacekeeping has been hampered by ineffective communication, often exacerbated by a limited understanding of local culture, the diversity of views in the population, and divisions along ethnic, gender and other lines. As a result, missions at times fail to manage expectations, to adapt to real and perceived needs on the ground, and to sustain local support. Communication must begin before a mission arrives and continue throughout its lifetime.

The United Nations must also communicate peacekeeping messages globally to build international public support. Too often, the service and sacrifice of UN peacekeepers go unmentioned, and good news stories are few. All peacekeeping partners have a role to play in explaining the work of UN peacekeepers, countering misperceptions and building support for UN peacekeeping. The Secretariat needs to be able to support Member States in communicating to domestic audiences the value of UN peacekeeping. DPKO and DFS will aim to develop public information activities to ensure the development and dissemination of information on peacekeeping operations to key audiences in the field, in contributing countries, and with other key stakeholders.

Reviewing and reporting on progress

Regular monitoring is one of the most important ways that Member States can support peacekeepers in the field. It enables the Security Council and other stakeholders to maintain consensus on the objectives of a mission as it evolves and a shared assessment of the priorities to achieve those objectives. The Security Council now regularly requests targets – or benchmarks – to monitor progress toward transition.

Benchmarks should guide a mission throughout its lifetime and help it to identify and adapt to changing conditions on the ground. To fulfill this function, however, benchmarks must be well-defined and understood. Missions should distinguish the core benchmarks for which peacekeepers are responsible from broader targets which reflect wider progress in peace consolidation and rely on the performance of others. They should distinguish between short, medium and long-term targets. Relevant and realistic benchmarks must be established by the mission in consultation with national and other partners. To be effective, priorities and targets must be reviewed and adapted as the situation



evolves. To improve frameworks for monitoring mandate implementation, DPKO and DFS will develop benchmarks, once a mission is deployed and operational, for the Security Council's endorsement and subsequent assessment of progress.

The Secretariat can further assist Member States in monitoring mission progress by providing timely and quality information and reports. Likewise, the Secretariat can benefit from the country-specific knowledge and information that Member States and regional partners are often better equipped to provide. The Secretariat and missions currently devote significant resources to preparing and delivering reports and briefings. Not all of these may be useful and some could be discontinued, improved or replaced.



To improve reporting and information exchange, DPKO and DFS will:

- **Review current reporting practices and engage the Security Council and troop- and police-contributing countries in a dialogue on priority information requirements and options for enhanced mutual information-sharing.**
- **Produce, by December 2009, a proposal for updated and streamlined reporting procedures to be implemented within existing resources.**

A NEW PARTNERSHIP AGENDA

Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping

SECTION III

PARTNERSHIP IN ACTION: Delivery in the field



PARTNERSHIP IN ACTION: Delivery in the field

A renewed peacekeeping partnership must translate into action that delivers practical results on the ground through faster deployment of the right capabilities at the right time, greater readiness to implement critical mandated tasks, greater clarity on mandated tasks, and the ability to respond swiftly in times of crisis. This section examines ways of improving delivery of these core peacekeeping functions in the field.

FASTER DEPLOYMENT

The ability to rapidly deploy an initial presence and to begin operations is critical to the early establishment of security. The Brahimi report posited a 90-day time frame for deployment of a large, multidimensional operation. Yet the scale and complexity of missions, particularly those deployed to remote and dangerous environments, has made this target difficult to achieve.

Ultimately, rapid deployment is a function of political will. When Member States commit capacity such as strategic airlift and their own enablers to deploy and sustain personnel or to assist other countries in doing so, and when host authorities are willing to allow UN peacekeepers access, deployment can be fast. DPKO and DFS must do their part to improve rapid deployment through establishing a mission headquarters that can facilitate incoming uniformed and civilian components. Past experiences with rapidly deployable headquarters elements, such as the Standing Police Capacity, serve as good models on which to base this approach. A critical first step is the early preparation of an integrated deployment plan that sets the targets and timelines for an agreed initial operating capacity (IOC) of a mission headquarters. To this end, DPKO and DFS will finalize mission-start up guidance that clarifies roles and tasks for field managers in opening missions and the early sequencing of activities. Early thinking is underway within DFS on new approaches to enhance the rapid establishment of critical mission headquarters infrastructure and support contracts, including through a concentrated modular approach to basic mission start-up packages and earlier activation of essential contracts for start-up.

The rapid establishment of mission headquarters must be accompanied by a prioritized approach to mandate implementation in the first year. An early robust presence is critical for the credibility of a new peacekeeping mission. Initial deployment efforts should focus, therefore, on means to stabilize the conflict and on creating the basic political and security conditions for peace consolidation. The deployment of subsequent mission elements would be driven by mission planners – military, police and civilian – in consultation with UN headquarters and in dialogue with local and international partners.



A sequenced mission roll-out would enable mission leaders, planners and support systems to respond faster to immediate priorities and to establish a more accurate picture of the resources required to implement the mandate. These steps can help facilitate more accurate longer-term budget projections of mandate implementation costs and reduce the occurrence of unspent balances during mission start-up. Sequenced roll-out must not, however, lead to partial implementation of mandates. It will only work if there is a clear indication from the Security Council and budgetary committees that resources for the second phase of deployment will be made available. This, in turn, requires that the Secretariat demonstrate that it can plan and budget responsibly. Sequenced roll-out must be accompanied, from the outset, by longer-term planning and, as operations evolve, by flexibility in assessing and adapting the balance of capabilities within and across military, police and civilian components of the mission.

CLARIFYING AND DELIVERING ON CRITICAL ROLES

United Nations peacekeeping has proven its adaptability, and a basic delivery capacity for many peacekeeping tasks is in place. Member State investments have led to progressively stronger UN policies, standards and practice as well as support systems that missions can draw upon in DDR, elections, mediation support, human rights, SSR, courts and prison management. A shared understanding of common mandated tasks, the resources they require, and the challenges encountered in implementing them could further strengthen delivery.



DPKO and DFS encourage the members of the Security Council, potentially through the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping, and the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to:

- **Review with the Secretariat recurrent mandate tasks to enhance clarity and understanding of their objectives, operational implications, and persistent challenges in their fulfillment.**

Three cross-cutting tasks present particular challenges: protection of civilians, robust operations and peacebuilding tasks. In each case, there is little clarity or consensus on what peacekeepers can reasonably be expected to perform. The UN peacekeeping partnership must articulate what it can and cannot do in these three areas and equip itself to contribute effectively to a broader effort. This can only happen through an active partnership in policy and practice with contributing countries, UN and other international actors.

Protection of civilians

Since 1999, the Security Council has tasked UN peacekeepers, as a priority, with supporting national authorities to fulfill their responsibilities in protecting civilians. The Brahimi report underscored the mandate and moral imperative not to stand by when civilians are attacked. Peacekeepers have demonstrated time and again their commitment to protecting civilians. Often their presence alone is an effective deterrent against violence.



The presence of a peacekeeping mission generates high expectations among host populations and international opinion to protect individuals and communities in conflict. Yet, the ability of small numbers of under-equipped peacekeepers to protect civilian populations, often numbering several millions over vast distances, is finite. UN missions are regularly assigned a broad range of tasks that go well beyond providing physical security, including support for the voluntary return of refugees and displaced persons, and protection of civilians from sexual violence. These tasks require the engagement of all parts of the mission, whether military, police or civilian. The mismatch between expectations and capacity to provide comprehensive protection creates a significant credibility challenge for UN peacekeeping.

In some missions, progress is being made in addressing the gap between expectation and capacity. Drawing on case-specific experiences, missions are developing practical guidance and testing techniques for responding to the civilian protection challenge. Mobile operating bases, integrated protection teams, and enhanced integrated planning processes are some of the good practices that are emerging and must be collected for future reference. Yet individual initiatives are not sufficient. This is one reason why UN missions and the Secretariat are moving toward a more comprehensive definition that goes beyond mere physical protection.

For police, rule of law, human rights and humanitarian actors in missions, the protection of civilians is a familiar concept and each of these groups brings important contributions to mandate implementation. More effective policing and law enforcement techniques are essential in grappling with civilian protection tasks. National militaries, however, do not traditionally maintain proactive civilian protection doctrines, operating concepts or tactics beyond the requirements of international humanitarian law. As such, the United Nations may need to take a lead, in consultation with troop contributors so as to develop practical guidance on options and factors for planners and commanders to consider in implementing this mandate task. A mission's political, rule of law and security sector components also have important roles to play in assisting host authorities in building national capacity to protect civilians and in promoting early national responsibility for protecting the population. Integrating different perspectives and mission tools in the development and implementation of coherent protection strategies is as critical as it is challenging.

The Security Council, the Secretariat and troop and police contributors must work towards a shared understanding and consensus on what can and should be done to protect civilians. The UN Secretariat must clarify its concepts, improve guidance to planners on protection priorities, and develop guidance and training to be made available to military, police and civilian personnel. Assessment capacities must systematically collect and analyze threats to the civilian population. Mission leaders need to draw together political, military, police and civilian assets in integrated protection strategies or integrated teams to support implementation. To help improve knowledge on the subject, an independent study has been commissioned to begin the process of drawing practical lessons from UN peacekeeping missions implementing civilian protection mandates.



To better implement protection of civilians mandates, DPKO and DFS propose to use the findings of the independent study and an exchange of lessons learned with contributing countries to:

- **Develop a clear and comprehensive concept and appropriate guidance.**
- **Identify the required capacities, equipment and training.**

A robust approach to peacekeeping

The concept of ‘robustness’ in UN peacekeeping is a political and operational strategy to signal the intention of a UN mission to implement its mandate and to deter threats to an existing peace process in the face of resistance from spoilers. The concept is rooted in the guiding principles that are the foundations of UN peacekeeping: non-use of force except in self-defence and defence of the mandate, consent of the main parties and impartiality in implementation. Although it was introduced in the Brahimi report, questions remain as to what robust UN peacekeeping means in practice.

A robust approach is guided by the mission objectives established by the Security Council and should be driven by a clear political strategy. It requires confident and credible military and police postures. At the tactical level, a robust approach means that contingents may be required to use force in defence of the mandate. Such operations would always be limited in time and space. Competent leadership at political and contingent levels is essential in implementing this complex political-military concept. A robust approach carries significant implications for the wider mission, its partners and the local population. It therefore requires the support of host authorities and effective communication and coordination with other partners.

Robust peacekeeping has significant operational and support implications and requires agreed minimum standards among contributing countries. It demands a high degree of mobility of military and police personnel and the willingness and capacity to operate at a high tempo for sustained periods, night and day. The approach requires effective mission command and control structures and units that can work together in larger formations. This demands regular joint training and exercises in the field. Robust peacekeeping requires enhanced situational awareness and risk analysis to better anticipate and prepare for potential challenges. Scenario-based planning and reliable contingency arrangements are important for responding to threats to mission personnel and local populations. Robust peacekeeping calls for the introduction of modern technology, responsive logistics support and delegated authority to take difficult decisions in the field.

Ultimately, a successful robust approach depends on the commitment of the Security Council and the willingness of troop and police contributors to implement it. Lack of shared understanding among Member States on the scope and function of robust peacekeeping has prevented a full examination of its operational implications for missions, other partners and local populations. This has serious repercussions for those missions confronting volatile conflict situations without the political consensus and practical support necessary to deliver on mandated tasks.



DPKO and DFS intend to further define the parameters of a robust peacekeeping approach for discussion with contributing countries. DPKO and DFS will review and strengthen mechanisms for more inclusive planning for robust concepts of operations and begin to address capacity and capability gaps. This process must include a dialogue with Member States to ensure that troop and police contributors deploying to missions with robust concepts of operation are consulted and understand and accept assigned tasks and rules of engagement, and that they deploy assets with a minimum of caveats.



On the robust approach to peacekeeping, DPKO and DFS will:

- **Produce a draft strategic guidance note for discussion with Member States before the end of 2009.**
- **Develop guidance for mission planners for situations where a robust peacekeeping approach may be required.**
- **Define, with Member States, the logistical, training and equipment requirements for robust operations.**
- **Explore with Member States options to manage and minimize caveats.**

Peacebuilding tasks

UN peacekeepers play a critical role in building peace after conflict, in establishing the conditions for recovery and development activities, and in carrying out some of the tasks essential to stabilization and early consolidation of peace. The recent Secretary-General's report on peacebuilding (A/63/881–S/2009/304) identified recurrent immediate priorities, some of which UN peacekeeping operations are mandated to support. In complex missions, UN senior leaders are responsible for shaping a common vision and the integrated delivery of the peacebuilding activities of all parts of the UN family. And on occasion, UN peacekeeping missions are tasked to coordinate overall international efforts.

The diversity of peacebuilding needs and the gaps in international and national capacity to meet them pose real challenges for the successful exit of complex peacekeeping missions. Peacekeepers are often the largest and most visible international presence on the ground and face unrealistic expectations as to what they can reasonably achieve. At times, peacekeepers try to fill gaps in the provision of international support in areas where they have little capacity or resources and, in so doing, risk being stretched or ineffectual. Peacekeepers cannot anticipate all the tasks critical to a country's transition, and approaches will differ in each situation. In integrated missions, leaders should have the capacity to assess progress, draw on specialized expertise to identify critical gaps, and to work with a range of partners to meet peacebuilding needs.



IMMEDIATE PEACEBUILDING PRIORITIES*

- Support to **basic safety and security**, including mine action, protection, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR), strengthening the rule of law and initiation of security sector reform (SSR);
- Support to **political processes**, including electoral processes, promoting inclusive dialogue and reconciliation, and developing conflict-management capacity at national and sub-national levels;
- Support to the **provision of basic services**, such as water and sanitation, health and primary education, and support to the safe and sustainable return and reintegration of IDPs and refugees;
- Support to **restoring core government functions** particularly basic public administration and public finance, at national and sub-national levels;
- Support to **economic revitalization**, including employment generation and livelihoods (in agriculture and public works) particularly for youth and demobilized former combatants, as well as rehabilitation of basic infrastructure.

* From the Report of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (A/63/881–S/2009/304)

Among the core capacities and comparative advantage that UN peacekeeping can bring to a collective peacebuilding efforts are support to national political processes and the provision of basic safety and security. Within the former, complex missions provide good offices and promote dialogue and reconciliation. In many situations, they are mandated to support the re-establishment of frameworks for governance and strengthening national institutions. Support for the provision of basic safety and security, through the activities of military peacekeepers, police as well as mine action, DDR, judicial and corrections reform, is critical to effective stabilization and consolidation of the peace.

Ultimately, the successful departure of peacekeepers and continued peacebuilding depend on how quickly and effectively national capacities for the provision of security can be put in place. Support to early SSR is therefore one of the most critical tasks of UN peacekeeping to assist national actors to define and put in place functioning and legitimate frameworks for security and safety as early as possible. In core capacity areas, peacekeepers must be able to plan, lead and deliver a prioritized and sequenced set of activities. DPKO is already working to identify essential early tasks as the first step to a coherent post-conflict stabilization strategy.

In other peacebuilding areas, such as the provision of basic services, peacekeepers may be called on to support others as part of an integrated effort. UN peacekeeping is not well equipped to tackle the social and economic dimensions of peacebuilding and relies on others to provide sustainable development and capacity-building support. But successful transition depends on the ability of these partners to engage as early as possible. Support to basic infrastructure, remuneration for national armed forces and police, and investment in emergency employment initiatives are particularly critical for early peacebuilding. Member States must invest in the capacity of UN and other partners to perform in these areas and continue to make progress in establishing predictable divisions of labour between UN peacekeeping missions, UN development partners, the international financial institutions and bilateral donors.



To contribute to a broader peacebuilding effort, DPKO and DFS will:

- **Develop a coherent strategy for sequencing, resourcing and implementing mandated early safety and security stabilization tasks.**
- **Request missions, as relevant, to include information on progress in peacebuilding in their regular assessments on mandated tasks, as well as on related actions of UN agencies, funds and programmes and other partners, and to collectively draw attention to critical gaps.**

PLANNING FOR CONTINGENCIES AND MANAGING CRISES

The peacekeeping partnership is put to the test most in crises. A critical priority for missions is to prepare in advance for such eventualities. Timely, accurate and detailed analysis of the situation on the ground can provide early warning of an emerging threat. Early warning is also critical to enhancing the safety and security of United Nations personnel and to improving the Organization's ability to predict a crisis. The introduction of security risk assessments and more integrated analysis capacities at headquarters and in the field are significant steps in enabling the Secretariat to provide the Security Council and contributing countries with the information and assessment they require in order to respond to crises. Member States can play an important role in strengthening the Secretariat's capacity to prepare for contingencies by sharing appropriate and relevant information and analysis. And the Secretariat must also continue to improve its capacity to collect, gather and distribute information in a responsible way.

Planning for contingencies also includes advance preparation of possible responses to a crisis. The systematic inclusion of operational and in-mission reserve forces in planning for all missions, and the identification of strategic reserve requirements for complex missions operating in volatile environments, is essential. In the field, missions must systematically develop and review scenario plans.

Even the best plans are ineffectual in the absence of a credible response. When a political crisis erupts or serious violence breaks out, UN peacekeeping must be able to react rapidly and effectively. The Security Council, regional partners and Member States must engage actively at international levels, as well as on the ground, to prevent the collapse of a fragile peace process or attacks on the mission and its personnel. It is critical that headquarters and the mission leadership forge a unified political approach, with the support of all partners, to address the crisis. While multiple initiatives are essential, they must be mutually reinforcing.

The security of the mission and its personnel requires a credible operational response in the face of threats. The requirement for a rapidly deployable capacity to reinforce missions in crises is more pressing today than ever. The Brahimi report recommendation for standby brigades and a strong planning and analysis capacity were not supported by Member States. In 2005, Member States formally acknowledged the need for an enhanced rapidly deployable



capacity. To date, however, Secretariat proposals for options to provide strategic reserves, developed in consultation with Member States, remain gridlocked on grounds of cost as well as the political and planning challenges that pre-commitment of national or regional capacities present. Without a reliable mechanism for responding to crises, the authority and credibility of the peacekeeping partnership are vulnerable to challenges from spoilers on the ground. DPKO and DFS will re-explore the willingness of Member States to provide rapidly deployable capacities for new missions and for reinforcing existing missions in crisis.



To strengthen contingency planning and preparedness, DPKO and DFS will:

- **Pursue options, in consultation with Member States, to enhance information-gathering, analysis and security-risk assessment capacity, including drawing on information provided by contributing countries.**
- **When planning new missions and reviewing mission plans, provide to the Security Council an assessment, together with estimated costs and options, for reserve capacity requirements.**

A NEW PARTNERSHIP AGENDA

Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping

SECTION IV

PARTNERSHIP FOR THE FUTURE: Building capacity



PARTNERSHIP FOR THE FUTURE: Building capacity

Meeting the challenges of the future demands that the peacekeeping partnership explore new ways to identify, raise, train, equip, support and sustain the civilian, police and military capabilities that modern peacekeeping requires. Each partner has a role to play: the Secretariat, in defining mission requirements and training standards and supporting the field; and Member States, in contributing capable and equipped personnel, financing peacekeeping and providing capacity-building support. This section examines ways of projecting and meeting future personnel, capability and support requirements.

DEFINING FUTURE NEEDS

Projecting supply and demand

Unclear future demands and uncertain resource supply create significant challenges in planning for current and future UN peacekeeping requirements. Demand continues to grow in the face of critical shortfalls. Certain capabilities – such as helicopters and military enablers – are in short supply globally, while others – such as formed police units, police and certain civilian specialists – simply do not exist in the requisite numbers or areas of specialization. The Secretariat is improving its strategic planning to identify immediate and medium-term capability requirements. It must collaborate with and rely on Member States and partners to ensure that its analyses reflect existing supply and identify new supply sources.



CRITICAL SHORTAGES IN 2009

- **MOBILITY** – strategic airlift, utility and tactical helicopters, infantry with high mobility vehicles
- **ENABLERS** – engineers, logistics and transportation units
- **INFORMATION-GATHERING** – observation/surveillance, including high resolution; night operations capability; data management and analysis
- **FORMED POLICE UNITS** – specialized in public order management, including crowd control
- **SPECIALIZED POLICE** – including trainers, organizational reform experts and investigators,
- **CIVILIAN SPECIALISTS** – including in security sector reform, judicial and prisons management
- **STRATEGIC PLANNERS** – military, police and civilian
- **FEMALE MILITARY, POLICE AND SENIOR CIVILIAN PERSONNEL**
- **FRANCOPHONE STAFF OFFICERS AND POLICE** – for four French language missions


In the short term, the demands of today's missions give some insight on future UN peacekeeping requirements and certain trends have emerged. Modern UN peacekeeping operations are increasingly dynamic. They are expected to perform multiple, interdependent and, sometimes, new tasks in harsh and remote operating environments that



require good mobility, strong supply chains, durable equipment and greater self-sustainability. Fast-evolving national transitions demand flexible, highly skilled civilian staff to support political processes and deliver technical advice across a range of peacebuilding activities. More complex and dangerous operations require strengthened communications and greater interoperability between units. In urban areas, specialized police personnel capacities are needed to confront community violence, organized crime or public disorder. Critical, yet rare, skill sets are required to rebuild police forces and judicial systems, support prisons, restore basic border management capacities and assist a state to exercise its authority. Missions need to communicate effectively to host populations to explain their mandates and activities, and to manage expectations of what the mission can and cannot deliver.

Any discussion about capabilities cannot be divorced from current financial realities. While UN peacekeeping remains a comparatively inexpensive provider of security in post-conflict transitions, future UN requirements for peacekeeping operations will confront the challenge of sustaining the required level of financial support to deliver mandates. The current UN peacekeeping budget is a function of both the number and size of missions and their remote locations. The four largest and most difficult deployments in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sudan and Chad account for 63 percent of the budget. These deployments demonstrate that the numbers of personnel – military, police and civilian – as well as aviation and infrastructure costs are the most significant drivers of cost in large and remote locations.


COMPARATIVE COSTS OF UN PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS*



Financial constraints have important implications for mission planning and deployment. The tighter financial environment may demand difficult decisions concerning the number and types of missions to be deployed and the capabilities each require. Mission planners must ensure that the size and configuration of missions is appropriate to the mandate and the situation on the ground. Issues such as size, visibility and impact on the host country must be considered. Moving from a troop-intensive to a more agile mission structure and approach will depend on the feasibility of sourcing the very enabling capabilities that are currently difficult to obtain. Rebalancing numbers of personnel with more mobile capacities or technological solutions may change cost structures; it will not necessarily lower them.



DRIVERS OF COST FOR FIELD OPERATIONS*



* Figures based on approved 1 July 2008 – 30 June 2009 resources for peacekeeping operations. Does not include support to African Union Mission in Somalia.

A CAPABILITY-DRIVEN APPROACH

To meet future demands UN peacekeeping must adopt a more comprehensive approach to generating resources and creating incentives to deliver results in the field. A capability-driven approach moves away from a 'number-intensive' strategy to one that focuses on the skills, capacity and willingness of personnel, as well as materiel, to deliver required results. It demands clear operational tasks and standards for UN personnel that are linked to appropriate guidance and training, and to the equipment required to perform those tasks. It involves incentives that reward performance of mission tasks. A capability-driven approach requires that the peacekeeping partnership strengthen and better align the support systems that generate, support and reimburse those capabilities, and provide adequate welfare, safety and security for personnel. It calls for headquarters and mission leaders that can direct these capabilities and that can sustain the professionalism, morale and good conduct of a mission. Although this transformation will take time, it could serve to greatly strengthen UN peacekeeping in the future.



Defining operational standards

A first step in building the capabilities for the future is to set out clearer operational standards for critical mandate tasks. This is the basis for identifying required personnel and materiel. More clearly defined core operational standards would assist the design of effective basic training and support pre-deployment preparations, including mission-specific training and pre-deployment inspections. Operational standards would aid new contributors in developing national capacities to serve in UN peacekeeping missions.



POLICE STANDARDS DEVELOPMENT: A PRACTICAL PARTNERSHIP

An example of practical, collaborative work between personnel contributors and the Secretariat is already underway to define core tasks and operational requirements for formed police units, and to build future capability around these. The assessments, guidance and standards being developed will serve as the basis for the sustained strengthening of formed police units through better aligned training and equipment, and clearer support requirements for this emerging and increasingly important capability. This approach could be expanded to other policing areas from training a host State police service to conducting specialized investigations.

UN operational standards must be based on real scenarios and tasks undertaken by UN missions today and must reflect a realistic appreciation of the constraints faced in missions. They must be developed with the contributors that are implementing or have implemented those tasks in modern UN operations. In some specialized areas, such as DDR or mine action, UN system standards and guidance are well advanced and work is underway to source sufficient expertise to deliver these standards. In areas such as elections and human rights, technical standards and experts are often sourced from other UN partners. New and complex tasks, such as border control, judicial and security sector reform require clarity on core functions. Such work can only be carried out through a sustained partnership between contributing countries, UN and specialized partners, and the Secretariat.



To develop clear operational standards for uniformed contingents, DPKO and DFS propose to:

- **Engage Member States in a programme to design and establish standards for performing essential mission tasks, drawing on the operational requirements of missions today.**



Attracting and retaining the right personnel

Clearer operational standards will support efforts to mobilize and manage civilian, military and police personnel for key roles in missions and at headquarters. Missions today require diverse and mobile personnel with a broad range of skills and an ability to work in a multinational organization that integrates civilian, military and police cultures.

Working alongside their uniformed colleagues, a professionalized, well-managed and mobile civilian staff is vital to rapid mission start-up, efficient mandate delivery and ensuring continuity in operations. Building on the reform measures approved by the General Assembly in its Resolution 63/250 of 2008, DFS is taking steps to develop its 'talent management' framework to improve the way in which it forecasts civilian staffing requirements, reaches out to attract the best and the brightest workforce, manages the performance and development of staff already on board, and mobilizes key leaders and support staff in response to new or expanded mission mandates. Their full impact will be monitored and adjustments or further reforms proposed to the General Assembly, as requested. Complementing this, the UN system continues to examine options for mobilizing specialized professionals from within the system and beyond.

High turnover rates have been endemic in peacekeeping and recruitment, rotation and retention of uniformed and civilian personnel remain a constant challenge. Conditions of service that help retain civilian staff and longer deployment cycles for their uniformed colleagues are critical to creating a more stable human resource base in missions. The extension of rotation cycles would also address the administrative burden and financial and operational costs of short - sometimes only six-month - personnel deployments.



To improve personnel stability in missions, DPKO and DFS urge Member States to:

- **Extend, where feasible, the rotation cycle of their uniformed personnel.**

Training and equipping

Incoming personnel need training before they deploy to build the knowledge and skills to perform in the mission. Despite steady improvements in training for leadership roles and generic training modules, under-prepared personnel still deploy to the field. The impact of under-preparation is particularly acute in challenging and remote environments where units may be required to begin operations immediately upon arrival and where capacity for in-mission skill enhancement or equipment training is limited.

Work is underway with Member States to further strengthen UN peacekeeping's training strategy. The peacekeeping partnership has the resources necessary to build an effective global training network. It can draw upon experienced personnel from major contributing countries, bilateral and multilateral programme resources and networks of regional peacekeeping training centres.



Effective arrangements for equipping and sustaining UN peacekeepers are also critical for building future capacity. New peacekeeping tasks demand new equipment, from night vision and modern communication equipment, to naval vessels. The UN also needs access to new technologies for better situational awareness in the field. A more environmentally responsible approach requires new thinking and capabilities. In certain critical sectors, such as aviation, the UN relies on aging equipment fleets that may prove increasingly difficult and costly to maintain.

Meeting these equipment requirements requires that contributing countries have the resources and the incentive to provide them. Existing self-sustainment and contingent-owned equipment standards are onerous for some new contributors. Some contributors are unable to rapidly assemble the equipment for modern operations, or to cover initial investment in equipment. Others have been unable to sustain the required levels of capability in the field, particularly in difficult environments. Still others argue that reimbursement rates do not reflect today's demands and do not sufficiently recognize the cost to contributors of deploying higher quality equipment or high-end expertise. As such they create further disincentives for the provision of already scarce resources.



PARTNERS IN PEACEKEEPING

In 2003 the Partners in Peacekeeping initiative between DPKO and troop contributors provided a high level (including general officers from capitals) discussion conducted in mission areas and in New York to discuss equipment and sustainment issues in UN peacekeeping. It enabled a shared strategic-level examination of equipment and logistics issues and a much-needed frank discussion of challenges and important innovations. Although widely welcomed, the initiative was overtaken by the growth in operations from 2003 onwards and is yet to be resumed.

The next review of contingent-owned equipment, self-sustainment and reimbursement arrangements is scheduled for 2011. The coming year offers an opportunity for a senior-level strategic dialogue to better define the required equipment and self-sustainment standards for modern UN peacekeeping. This dialogue could examine the appropriate balance of UN-owned equipment versus contingent-owned equipment. In a period of sustained resource strain and with expanded need for modern capabilities, these questions are central to the peacekeeping partnership.



To help provide high-level policy direction for the Contingent-owned Equipment Working Group, DPKO and DFS suggest that:

- **Member States resume a senior-level dialogue with the Secretariat on the equipment and self-sustainment requirements for UN peacekeeping.**



Sustaining morale and good conduct

The success or failure of a mission rests on the performance and good conduct of its personnel. The United Nations pledges a duty of care to its military, police and civilian personnel, who deploy in some of the most harsh and insecure conditions. In turn, these personnel pledge a duty of service, through the dedicated performance of their duties and dignified and ethical professional and personal conduct. Failure of either side to keep its pledge harms not only the United Nations and those who serve under its flag, but, more important, it harms those we are meant to serve. The judicious and rapid handling of misconduct is a shared responsibility of the Secretariat and Member States, to which DPKO and DFS remain fully committed.

Over the past several years, the Secretariat has taken a number of steps to meet its responsibility to support the good morale, safety, conduct and well-being of its personnel in the field. Mindful that, since 1948, more than 2,500 peacekeepers have perished in UN field missions, measures to safeguard UN personnel remain a high priority. Improvements to security risk assessment and mitigation are continually pursued. Recognizing that 80 percent of fatalities since 2000 are the result of accident and illness, the Secretariat must ensure it has the policies and systems in place to promote the safety and welfare of personnel. The Secretariat must also count on Member States to deploy personnel that meet UN health, driving and other minimum standards designed to safeguard well-being and performance in the field.

EXPANDING THE PEACEKEEPING PARTNERSHIP

Growing the contributor base

A globally representative mix of contributors is a critically important strength of UN peacekeeping. Broad-based, global participation underpins legitimacy and strong partnership, offering both greater depth and flexibility to deploy the right combination of actors and capabilities in a particular situation. Greater participation enables more collective burden-sharing and helps build a shared understanding of the challenges to be met.

To optimize this global capacity, the Secretariat should be capable of undertaking forward-looking analyses of the willingness and readiness of countries to contribute. However, existing force generation capacity is fully absorbed in meeting current demands. Unlike many other UN agencies or departments, UN peacekeeping has no regional representation outside mission areas. Its capacity to build deeper contacts and longer-term relationships with current or potential contributing countries is sorely limited. In the absence of regionally-deployed personnel, DPKO, DFS and Member States may consider short-term deployments of personnel to work with contributors or regional organizations on specific projects to support capacity-development for service with UN missions.



Building future capacity

Bilateral, regional and multilateral programmes to help build peacekeeping capacity have grown significantly in recent years. UN peacekeeping aims to match these programmes to its operational needs and training to build the capacity of aspiring UN contributors. DPKO and DFS will strengthen dialogue with donors on bilateral support packages for new contingents so as to ensure that adequate training and ongoing support and maintenance is provided with donated equipment, and that such equipment can be maintained and supported by the UN.

Donor countries have emphasized the need for better information-sharing and coordination in the provision of capacity-building support. Measures to help match demand and supply would be an important step forward in building a global peacekeeping framework. The UN can provide clearer operational requirements and projections of short, medium and long-term demand and gaps in UN peacekeeping. DPKO and DFS will engage constructively with capacity-building support mechanisms and ensure that they are closely linked to ongoing support to African Union peacekeeping capacity development.

Interoperability and pooling resources

A forward-looking capacity development strategy must link the resources of the United Nations with those of other partners in the field. Within the UN system, integrated missions serve as the framework to maximize collective impact and minimize obstacles to working together. UN peacekeeping missions also regularly operate alongside or in sequence with regional organizations. The political and operational features of each situation will continue to demand case-specific and creative partnerships with international, regional and bilateral actors and will drive diverse operational responses in the field. Recent examples include the UN working with the African Union (AU) in Darfur, alongside the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in Kosovo and Afghanistan, as well as succeeding a European Union (EU) military operation in Chad and handing over policing operations to the EU in Kosovo.

Balancing flexibility and efficiency is a challenge for peacekeeping partnerships. Flexible, case-by-case partnerships involve transaction costs which must be measured against the political and operational gains that such partnerships bring. In a tight fiscal environment, efforts to limit transaction costs and redundancy of capacity must be intensified. Options must be pursued to improve resource-sharing and reimbursements, enhance information-sharing and the pooling of such scarce resources as strategic lift and specialist civilian and police expertise. All of these issues are particularly critical for the UN-AU partnership. They will be further examined in the forthcoming report of the Secretary-General regarding practical measures to provide effective support for the AU when it undertakes peacekeeping operations authorized by the United Nations.



To strengthen operational partnerships, DPKO and DFS propose to:

- **Intensify dialogue with relevant regional organizations to put in place framework arrangements for reimbursement and logistics support, as well as to examine the feasibility of pooling strategic capabilities.**



A HYPER-OPERATIONAL ACTIVITY: SUPPORT FACTS & FIGURES

UN aircraft in peacekeeping missions: 270
UN vehicles in peacekeeping missions: 17,350
Cost of daily fuel consumption: \$1.75 million
Daily water provision: 11 million litres
Daily power generated: 300 million watts
Number of peacekeeping procurement transactions in 2008: 17,387
Value of peacekeeping procurement transactions in 2008: \$1.43 billion

A NEW FIELD SUPPORT STRATEGY

The scope and magnitude of UN field operations today is straining a Secretariat infrastructure that was not designed for current levels of activity. Innovation and flexibility in administration and mission support are essential for delivering on the expectations of the Security Council, Member States and the host government and populations.

Secretariat rules, procedures, delegations of authority and systems are starting to adapt to be more responsive to field requirements but much more needs to be done to meet the complex demands of fast-paced and dispersed field operations. A delicate balance must be struck. The need to empower decision-making closer to the point of delivery must be twinned with clear standards and reliable accountability mechanisms. The Secretariat, in consultation with Member States, must find ways of building greater operational administrative flexibility while increasing the confidence of Member States and oversight bodies in the Secretariat's responsible stewardship of resources. Compliance with rules and procedures needs to be assessed alongside performance of mandated tasks. Achieving the mandate approved by the Security Council must be the first priority for a peacekeeping mission. Today's higher risk environments require an improved paradigm for operational risk management.

Consultation already underway with Member States on a new Field Support Strategy will continue into early 2010, as detailed business cases and return on investment analyses are developed. The Field Support Strategy explores opportunities for UN peacekeeping to realize economies of scale and to improve the performance of the UN support machinery. It proposes, for example, the development of regional service centres to consolidate administrative and support functions so as to help eliminate redundancy of services within each mission and reduce mission size and footprint. Regional services centres could also help to mitigate security and other challenges confronted by missions.

United Nations budgeting and financial oversight mechanisms currently compress their review of vast peacekeeping budgets into unrealistically tight timeframes. New operations submit multiple budgets in the start-up period, further overloading the machinery. The Field Support Strategy seeks a dialogue with Member States on improving existing financial arrangements to allow greater operational flexibility and to better support rapid deployment. The Strategy



recognizes that these improvements can only happen alongside qualitative improvements in transparency and an accountability framework that strengthens Member State confidence in peacekeeping resource management. The DFS Field Support Strategy mid-point non-paper will be distributed in the coming weeks.



Through its Field Support Strategy, DPKO and DFS will:

- **Continue to consult with Member States to identify innovations in service delivery and options that will enhance the overall effectiveness of field support, including: options to better support field operations globally, regionally and in-mission; and improved financial arrangements to allow operational flexibility and rapid deployment.**

A NEW PARTNERSHIP AGENDA

Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping

CONCLUSION

Way forward:

The new horizon for UN peacekeeping



Way forward: The new horizon for UN peacekeeping

United Nations peacekeeping needs a new horizon – a set of shared and achievable goals for the global peacekeeping partnership. The urgent business of today should not crowd out the importance of preparing for tomorrow. 2010 will mark the tenth anniversary of the Brahimi report and the end of the *Peace Operations 2010* reform process. The next twelve months offer Member States, the Secretariat, UN field missions and partners the opportunity to collectively reflect on past reforms and to consider future demands. It is a chance to revitalize the peacekeeping partnership for the future.

This process has already begun. A number of Member State initiatives are underway to examine current and future challenges, as well as opportunities, for United Nations peacekeeping. In response to requests from the Security Council and the General Assembly, the Secretariat has issued complementary reports on different peace and security instruments of the United Nations. This non-paper follows a research paper *Building on Brahimi: A Coalition for Peacekeeping in an Era of Strategic Uncertainty**, commissioned from New York University's Center on International Cooperation.

After a decade of increasing operational intensity, we know more about the realities of effective peacekeeping than ever before. The Secretariat alone cannot structure missions without intensive cooperation with Member States, and Member States draw upon the experience of the UN in strengthening their national capacities. Military peacekeeping rarely succeeds without a civilian component – but finding sufficient and highly qualified civilian staff is often as hard, or harder, than finding troops. UN peacekeeping can provide a unique framework for political reconciliation in a country emerging from war – but it is no substitute for genuine political engagement.

We also know that there is no monopoly of wisdom on peacekeeping. The experiences and perspectives of the Security Council, Member States and the Secretariat must all be taken into account, in a spirit of mutual respect. With this non-paper, DPKO and DFS seek to begin a comprehensive dialogue with Member States ahead of the next General Assembly session. Many of the issues identified require the leadership of Member States and sustained engagement by all partners will be essential. We need to define our agenda and a strategy to implement it over time in the face of political, operational and economic pressures. Without a committed partnership to build peacekeeping for the future, we will gradually lose momentum.

And, finally, we know that if we fail to continuously attend to peacekeeping, international peace and security will suffer. Where peace operations fail, thousands may die and hundreds of thousands may be displaced, inter-state tensions may increase and conflicts may reignite. But where peacekeeping succeeds, we can create the conditions for lasting stability and strengthen the foundations of our shared security.

*<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/newhorizon.shtml>

A NEW PARTNERSHIP AGENDA

Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping

ANNEX I

Summary of main recommendations



Summary of main recommendations

PARTNERSHIP IN PURPOSE

1. When the Security Council is considering the deployment of a new mission in complex situations, DPKO and DFS will:
 - **Present to the Security Council proposals on the full range of supporting actions that Member States and regional partners might provide to expedite mission deployment, including political measures as well as strategic lift, logistics and other operational support.**

2. Where UN peacekeeping follows an existing operation carried out by a partner, DPKO and DFS propose that members of the Security Council:
 - **Mandate a UN peacekeeping mission at least six months in advance of the envisaged transfer of authority to enable coordinated planning and start-up.**
 - **Authorize, where conditions on the ground permit, the deployment of advance planning capacities so as to facilitate the deployment of the future mission.**

3. DPKO and DFS suggest that members of the Security Council consider:
 - **Crafting mission mandates to reflect clearly achievable objectives and to specify those activities for which the mission is responsible.**

4. To strengthen Member State confidence in assessments and early planning for complex missions, DPKO and DFS propose to:
 - **Consult systematically with Member States in advance of a technical assessment mission on its objectives and broad parameters and debrief Member States on its main findings.**

5. DPKO and DFS suggest that members of the Security Council consider ways they can help ensure that new missions receive the capabilities they require to carry out the will of the Council, including:
 - **Adopting, when possible, a phased approach to the establishment of future UN peacekeeping missions to enable consultation, through existing forums or troop and police pledging events, with potential contributing countries and key partners prior to mandate authorization on (i) mission objectives and (ii) available resources.**



-
6. DPKO and DFS suggest that members of the Security Council consider:
 - **Establishing, with interested Member States, informal mission-specific coalitions of engaged stakeholders to assist the Secretary-General in securing and sustaining the necessary political and operational support.**

 7. To develop more meaningful consultation, DPKO and DFS will more systematically fulfill the requests of the Security Council in SCR 1327 and SCR 1353 to:
 - **Strengthen consultations with the Security Council and troop- and police-contributing countries on proposed tasks affecting their personnel, before planning documents are issued; and**
 - **Include information on consultations with troop- and police-contributing countries in regular reports of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on individual operations.**

 8. To strengthen clarity and accountability in the command and control chain, DPKO and DFS will:
 - **Develop more robust accountability frameworks between headquarters and senior mission leaders.**

 9. To strengthen contributors' confidence in mission planning and command and control DPKO and DFS will:
 - **Engage with members of the Security Council and contributing countries on strengthening mechanisms for consultation and interaction on mission planning processes within the framework of UN command and control.**

 10. To improve reporting and information exchange, DPKO and DFS will:
 - **Review current reporting practices and engage the Security Council and troop- and police-contributing countries in a dialogue on priority information requirements and options for enhanced mutual information-sharing.**
 - **Produce, by December 2009, a proposal for updated and streamlined reporting procedures to be implemented within existing resources.**



PARTNERSHIP IN ACTION

11. DPKO and DFS encourage the members of the Security Council, potentially through the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping, and the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to:

- **Review with the Secretariat recurrent mandate tasks to enhance clarity and understanding of their objectives, operational implications, and persistent challenges in their fulfillment.**

12. To better implement protection of civilians mandates, DPKO and DFS propose to use the findings of the independent study and an exchange of lessons learned with contributing countries to:

- **Develop a clear and comprehensive concept and appropriate guidance.**
- **Identify the required capacities, equipment and training.**

13. On the robust approach to peacekeeping, DPKO and DFS will:

- **Produce a draft strategic guidance note for discussion with Member States before the end of 2009.**
- **Develop guidance for mission planners for situations where a robust peacekeeping approach may be required.**
- **Define, with Member States, the logistical, training and equipment requirements for robust operations.**
- **Explore with Member States options to manage and minimize caveats.**

14. To contribute to a broader peacebuilding effort, DPKO and DFS will:

- **Develop a coherent strategy for sequencing, resourcing and implementing mandated early safety and security stabilization tasks.**
- **Request missions, as relevant, to include information on progress in peacebuilding in their regular assessments on mandated tasks, as well as on related actions of UN agencies, funds and programmes and other partners, and to collectively draw attention to critical gaps.**

15. To strengthen contingency planning and preparedness, DPKO and DFS will:

- **Pursue options, in consultation with Member States, to enhance information-gathering, analysis and security-risk assessment capacity, including drawing on information provided by contributing countries.**
- **When planning new missions and reviewing mission plans, provide to the Security Council an assessment, together with estimated costs and options, for reserve capacity requirements.**



PARTNERSHIP FOR THE FUTURE

16. To develop clear operational standards for uniformed contingents, DPKO and DFS propose to:
 - **Engage Member States in a programme to design and establish standards for performing essential mission tasks, drawing on the operational requirements of missions today.**

17. To improve personnel stability in missions, DPKO and DFS urge Member States to:
 - **Extend, where feasible, the rotation cycle of their uniformed personnel.**

18. To help provide high-level policy direction for the Contingent-owned Equipment Working Group, DPKO and DFS suggest that:
 - **Member States resume a senior-level dialogue with the Secretariat on the equipment and self-sustainment requirements for UN peacekeeping.**

19. To strengthen operational partnerships, DPKO and DFS propose to:
 - **Intensify dialogue with relevant regional organizations to put in place framework arrangements for reimbursement and logistics support, as well as to examine the feasibility of pooling strategic capabilities.**

20. Through its Field Support Strategy, DPKO and DFS will:
 - **Continue to consult with Member States to identify innovations in service delivery and options that will enhance the overall effectiveness of field support, including: options to better support field operations globally, regionally and in-mission; and improved financial arrangements to allow operational flexibility and rapid deployment.**

A NEW PARTNERSHIP AGENDA

Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping

ANNEX II

List of current UN peacekeeping missions



LIST OF CURRENT UN PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS

The United Nations has fifteen current peacekeeping missions:

United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) (*Middle East*)

Established May 1948

United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP)

Established January 1949

United Nations Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP)

Established March 1964

United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) (*Golan*)

Established June 1974

United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL)

Established March 1978

United Nations Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO)

Established April 1991

United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)

Established June 1999

United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC)

Established November 1999

United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL)

Established September 2003

United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire (ONUCI)

Established April 2004

United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH)

Established June 2004



United Nations Mission in the Sudan (UNMIS)

Established March 2005

United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT)

Established August 2006

African Union/United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID)

Established July 2007

United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (MINURCAT)

Established September 2007, and significantly modified and expanded in January 2009

One mission has recently closed and is currently under liquidation:

United Nations Observer Mission in Georgia (UNOMIG)

Established in August 1993. The mandate expired on 15 June 2009 and the mission is presently being liquidated.

The Department of Peacekeeping Operations also administers two special political missions:

United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA)

Established March 2002

United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi (BINUB)

Established October 2006