



INTERNATIONAL FORUM FOR THE
CHALLENGES OF PEACE OPERATIONS

Leading United Nations Peace Operations: Priorities And Ways



Challenges
Annual Forum
Report **2017**

CHALLENGES FORUM

PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

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

Armenia: National Defence University, Ministry of Defence

Australia: Australian Civil-Military Centre

Canada: Global Affairs Canada

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

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

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

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

India: United Service Institution of India

Indonesia: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Japan: Ministry of Foreign Affairs

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

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

Norway: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

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

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

South Africa: Institute for Security Studies

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

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

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

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

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

World Federation of United Nations Associations

International Secretariat: Folke Bernadotte Academy



Leading United Nations Peace Operations: Priorities And Ways

Challenges Annual Forum Report 2017



Copyright © 2017 International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations

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

ISBN: 978-91-87927-13-3

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

Suggested citation: Challenges Forum, Leading United Nations Peace Operations: Priorities And Ways, Challenges Annual Forum Report 2017 (Stockholm, 2017)

Author: Lisa Sharland, Challenges Forum Secretariat and Senior Analyst, Australian Strategic Policy Institute; Björn Holmberg, Director, Challenges Forum Secretariat; and Ben Rhee, Strategic Advisor, Challenges Forum Secretariat.

Contents

Preface	v
Executive summary	x
Recommendations	7
1. Introduction: Setting the Framework	10
2. Considerations For Senior Mission Leadership: What Has Changed And Evolved?	15
3. Identifying and Examining Emerging Issues for Senior Mission Leadership	26
4. Conclusion: Next Steps	47
Appendix 1. Programme	49

Preface

When looking back on 2017, much can be said of the mixed score card for multilateral peace operations.

On the plus side there was new momentum provided in part by the newly-elected UN Secretary-General, Mr. Antonio Guterres. The Secretary-General had promised in his 2016 campaign to focus his efforts on peace operations, peacebuilding and conflict prevention. In his first year on taking the office, Mr. Guterres began many of the structural peace and security reforms that will no doubt have a large (and hopefully positive) impact on the many complex deployments currently led by the UN.

This focus and mobilisation of the peacekeeping community on peace operations was - and remains - essential. At least two UN-led peace operations (Liberia and Sierra Leone) wound down in 2017, heralded as indicators of success in fulfilling their respective UN missions to restore peace and security and allow a political process to evolve. Elsewhere peace operations were a long way from achieving this mission and instead contributed to much of the frustration over lack of progress in peace operations.

In several peace operations in particular, the UN declared there was simply 'no peace to keep'. In 2017 these missions continued to reap a high toll: on the lack of political horizons to solve the conflicts, on the safety and security of the civilian populations they have been mandated to protect, including the safety of the personnel sent to keep and build peace. Developments in several peace operations in 2017 demonstrated a clear and urgent need for the international community to improve the capability, response and security of peace operations for civilian populations and peacekeepers themselves who tragically lost 61 UN personnel during the course of the year.

Alongside the numerous strategic and operational issues that are affecting peace operations are the political circumstances that dictate to a large extent the development of peace operations. In 2017, the instability in this political dimension became more evident than has been the case in many years. Indeed, for the past 21 years Challenges Forum partners have worked to examine and develop new thinking on the planning, conduct and evaluation of multilateral peace operations in an international system dominated to a large extent by one global superpower. But that appears to no longer be the case, and new and non-traditional actors are filing in to take on a variety of

roles in peace operations relevant to the Challenges Forum's work.

In the brave new multi-polar world, a host of new actors and leaders in multilateral peace operations will both challenge agreed norms on how peace operations are conducted but will look to 'significant platforms' such as Challenges Forum to channel dialogue and thinking on bringing to bear the fresh perspectives, creative thinking and renewed energy to improve multilateral peace operations.

For the Challenges Forum, 2017 has indeed opened new opportunities (and new challenges) in support of its primary purpose - to improve multilateral peace operations. While states and regional organisations continued their work to (re-)define their role in collective peace and security operations, the Challenges Forum network looked at how to support this with its wealth of diverse experience and expertise.

For example, at a workshop hosted by the United States Army War College in Carlisle and co-organised by the Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI) and the Geneva Centre for Security Policy-Center for Creative Leadership (GCSP-CCL), partners identified the vital role that leadership and strategic planning can play to improving security and safety of peace operations. Throughout 2017 a series of Challenges Forum publications on leadership of multilateral peace operations in complex conflict environments identified and developed understandings on how to improve peace operations through supporting development of leaders.

This work culminated with a decision to begin updating Challenges Forum's Senior Mission Leadership guidance for peace operations ('Considerations Study'). The decision was made during the 2017 Challenges Annual Forum, which Turkish partners Center for Strategic Research (SAM) at Turkish Ministry for Foreign Affairs hosted in Istanbul, along with other many other important issues that are reflected here in the Annual Report. In particular, UN Assistant Secretary-General for Strategic Planning, Mr. Fabrizio Hochschild, along with other senior UN leaders provided partners with the broader political-strategic picture connected in 2017 for the future of peace operations.

Looking inward at the Challenges Forum organisation itself, 2017 resulted in new challenges and opportunities. The challenge is of course that the Secretariat of the Challenges Forum has changed hands, and will have to work hard to maintain and build on the outstanding 21 years of leadership from Ms. Annika Hilding-Norberg, the founder of the Challenges Forum. The fact that key UN leaders on peace operations have maintained open

doors for the Challenges Forum, are willing to support requests made to its personnel, and can call the network a 'significant platform' for developments in peace operations is largely due to the inspirational work of Ms. Hilding-Norberg and past secretariat staff. I take this opportunity to recognise this and celebrate it.

I would also like to thank Ms. Isabella Björklund and Patricia Enhörning for their contribution to the Secretariat's work in 2017. In particular, I would like to acknowledge their efforts in partnership with our friends and colleagues at Turkey's SAM to ensure that my first experience of a Challenges Annual Forum meeting was a successful one.

Though the challenge of a brand new Secretariat is significant, there is also opportunity in this hand-over for Challenges Forum. It began in 2017 with myself taking on the role as Director of the International Secretariat, but the Secretariat was soon joined by a brand new team of three more professionals (Ms. Johanna Wiklund, Outreach Coordinator; Dr. Andreas Andersson, Specialist on Peace Operations; and Mr. Ben Rhee, Strategic Adviser).

In 2017, the Secretariat's goal was to continue the extraordinary work executed by the former Secretariat by renewing close dialogue with Challenges Forum partners. This dialogue was and continues to be to ensure the network remains relevant to partners, and can positively influence developments on improving peace operations. For example, the decision at the 2017 Challenges Annual Forum to proceed with creating the first Partner Organisation Advisory Committee (POAC) will cement partner organisations' role in establishing the long-term and strategic direction for Challenges Forum in the future (currently filled on a volunteer basis for a rotating, two-year period by the following Challenges Forum partners: Australian Civil-Military Centre (ACMC); Institute for Strategic Studies (ISS), South Africa; PKSOI, USA; and United Service Institute (USI), India).

Thanks to the encouragement and personal engagement of the Challenges Forum Patron, former Under Secretary-General for DPKO Mr. Jean-Marie Guehenno, we also have a strong champion for Challenges Forum and a trusted voice on providing advice on taking advantage of the network's opportunities to improve peace operations.

Throughout 2017, Maj. Gen (Rtd.) Robert Gordon was a strong support to the network and new Challenges Forum International Secretariat, and continued his role in advising Challenges Forum projects, in particular the Co-Chairs of the Considerations Study update.

Ms. Lisa Sharland from the Australia Strategic Policy Institute (ASPI) has also been a great support for the network, and has largely been responsible for this excellent report on the 2017 Challenges Annual Forum.

Finally, I would like to thank the hosts of the Secretariat, Folke Bernadotte Academy, for all the support and assistance provided to the Challenges Forum International Secretariat throughout 2017, in cooperation with the Swedish Armed Forces, the National Police Authority and the National Criminal and Probation Service. Though the Secretariat works on behalf of all partners to facilitate and coordinate Challenges Forum's program, the support provided by our hosts at the FBA in particular, as well as our Swedish partners, ensures that we can deliver results that benefit the entire network.

2017 resulted in many new opportunities for Challenges Forum, to take advantage of the expertise in its network and continue to contribute to efforts made on strengthening peace operations. But the challenges were evident, too, and what this will mean for peace operations in the future is hard to predict. Challenges Forum's efforts in 2017 ensured some small gains were made in the right direction to making peace operations better. The Secretariat of the Challenges Forum looks forward to continuing to build on that with our partners in 2018.

Dr. Björn Holmberg

Director

International Secretariat of the Challenges Forum

Executive summary

The Challenges Annual Forum 2017 was hosted 8 to 10 October in Istanbul by the Center for Strategic Research of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Turkey (SAM). More than 70 participants from 21 countries, the United Nations, academia and think-tanks took part in the dialogue over two days. The theme for the annual forum was *Leading United Nations Peace Operations: Priorities and Ways*. Drawing on a series of background papers, presentations and working group discussions, the Forum served as a first step to revise and update the *Considerations for Mission Leadership in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations* (Considerations Study). It also contributed to broader discussions in support of the Challenges Forum work strand on leadership to support stronger and more effective leadership of UN peace operations.

Peace operations have evolved significantly since the drafting of the first Considerations Study in 2010, with UN peace operations continuing to evolve and adapt to respond to new and emerging realities on the ground. Since the annual forum was held in October 2017, the UN Secretary-General has subsequently announced his ‘Action for Peacekeeping’ initiative, which sets out a series of priority action areas to address many of the pressing challenges that UN peacekeeping operations continue to face. The revision of the Considerations Study therefore provides a timely opportunity to seize on these reforms and ensure it remains a contemporary guide in addressing many of the challenges that senior mission leaders continue to face in contemporary UN peace operations.

This report captures the diverse experiences of a range of individuals serving in peace operations and engaged in the reform of peace operations as part of the Challenges Partnership, and offers a series of recommendations to inform the forthcoming review of the Considerations Study, as well as more general recommendations as they relate to senior mission leadership in UN peace operations emerging from the Annual Forum. The recommendations offered below are grouped according to key topics discussed throughout the two-day annual forum.

Recommendations

Issue	No	Recommendations for Mission Leaders
Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA)	1	Considerations Study needs to be reviewed significantly to better reflect the role and importance of mission leaders in preventing and addressing sexual exploitation and abuse
	2	Establish mechanisms for transparent reporting and engagement with civil society on issues around sexual exploitation and abuse
	3	Consider the participation of women in the peace operation as another tool that may support efforts to prevent and reduce sexual exploitation and abuse
	4	Take a victim-centred approach to sexual exploitation and abuse, which supports the activities of the Secretary-General's Victims' Rights Advocate (through a possible representative in mission)
	5	Identify and share examples of good behaviour and role models within the mission
Protection of Civilians (POC)	6	Establish effective conflict analysis within the mission drawing on intelligence reporting
	7	Support mechanisms within the mission that enable information to be shared across components on a timely and responsive basis.
	8	Ensure that aspects of the POC accountability framework are integrated into the Considerations Study as they relate to leadership
Political processes	9	Mission leaders need to consider their roles in engaging other leaders and regional organisations when it comes to political engagement and political solutions
	10	Considerations Study needs to address some of the issues that needed to be considered at different stages of the mission cycle. A start-up mission differs from a long-standing mission, or from one in the process of downsizing.
	11	Undertake thorough stake-holder analyses and identify the actors at regional, national and local levels that are supportive of the mission's mandate, as well as those that appear to have reservations.
Civil society	12	Revised the definition of civil society in the Considerations Study and update accordingly

	13	Develop a concrete methodology for how to identify civil society representatives and potential partners in a balanced manner, tailored for the country specific context
	14	Consider how to engage with the corporate and donor sector to identify issues of mutual interest and avoid poor coordination
	15	Effectively utilise the civil affairs component (where available) to strengthen engagement with civil society, or a focal point within the mission if there is no civil affairs officer or unit
Rule of law and human rights	16	Ensure the Human Rights Due Diligence Policy is being applied when cooperating with national, parallel and regional forces.
Policing	17	Undertake a review of the Considerations Study to include developments since the development of the Strategic Guidance Framework on Policing
Terrorism and extremism	18	Create new output on the issue of addressing terrorism and violent extremism in the chapter 'Creating a Secure and Stable Environment'
	19	Ensure the new UN intelligence policy is understood and implemented effectively in the mission, in order to assess and address potential threats to the mission, personnel and civilians
	20	Mission leaders should familiarise themselves with UN tools on counter-terrorism and preventing violent extremism in order to assess the types of support that can be provided to the host government in terms of conflict prevention initiatives and capacity-building
	21	Consider the potential role, opportunities for cooperation and comparative strengths of other mechanisms including regional forces, parallel forces, sanctions and arms embargoes when addressing terrorism
Transnational organised criminal activity	22	Consider role and opportunities for cooperation with other Security Council mechanisms (e.g. sanctions) and regional organisations that may assist in addressing the threat of transnational organised crime
	23	Review considerations study to ensure comprehensive coverage of transnational organised criminal activity and approaches
Emerging technology	24	Identify how to incorporate new and emerging communication platforms internally within mission and with external actors
	25	Establish effective mechanisms to analyse and assess information for use by the missions, drawing on the new intelligence policy

	26	Identify opportunities to cooperate with emerging technology companies in mission areas (if appropriate to the mission context)
Scenario-based training	27	Ensure scenario-based training modules include comprehensive treatment of issues related to UNSCR 1325 and 2250, as well as sexual exploitation and abuse
	28	Consider the role incentives for senior staff to participate in each exercise and possibly applying sanctions to those who refuse to undergo such training
	29	Include some mid-level and junior staff in scenario-based training exercises, particularly if they are supporting the mission leadership team.
	30	Run scenario-based exercises in headquarters to ensure staff are aware of some of the leadership challenges in the field
Humanitarian Assistance	31	Include more comprehensive treatment of mission transition strategies and what this means for leadership in Considerations Study
Sustaining Peace	32	Outline all the 'harms' whether intentional or unintentional that occur when undertaking peacekeeping operations, including environmental and economic impacts resulting from operations
	33	Consider how theories of change may explain how other actors will be engaged in peacekeeping activities, and their relevance to sustaining peace.
	34	Consider the challenges of transitioning from a UN peacekeeping mission from the mission outset, with guidance on how to build strong institutions beyond mission mandates
	35	Ensure there are strategies to engage and support youth participation through implementation of UNSCR 2250, engage and support women's participation through implementation of UNSCR 1325 and its subsequent resolutions, and integrate a gender perspective throughout the life-cycle and different tasks of the mission.

1. Introduction: Setting the Framework

The Challenges Annual Forum 2017 was hosted 8 to 10 October in Istanbul by the Center for Strategic Research of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Turkey (SAM). More than 70 participants from 21 countries, the United Nations, academia and think-tanks took part in the dialogue over two days. The theme for the annual forum was *Leading United Nations Peace Operations: Priorities and Ways*. Drawing on a series of background papers, presentations and working group discussions, the Forum served as a first step to revise and update the *Considerations for Mission Leadership in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations* (Considerations Study). It also contributed to broader discussions in support of the Challenges Forum work stand on leadership to support stronger and more effective leadership of UN peace operations.

The Consideration Study was developed by the Challenges Forum and its partners, in close cooperation with the UN Secretariat, to provide a hands-on tool for mission leaders of UN peace operations. The Considerations Study has been widely used by a range of international organisations and Member States. This has included use in training courses run by Member State peace operations training institutes, as well as senior mission leadership courses by the UN and regional organisations. The study has also been made available in each of the six official languages of the UN, extending its reach and applicability to a range of stakeholders.

When the Considerations Study was published in 2010, Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Patron of the International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations and Former Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations in the United Nations identified several key issues upfront that the study needed to consider:

What are the preconditions for success? What are the responsibilities and coordination requirements? What resources are needed and available? What are the challenges and risks? Which objectives should the mission pursue? Which outputs will support those objectives? Which activities will deliver the

selected outputs? Which resources are required to undertake those activities? What risks and challenges are involved and what should the short-, medium- and long-term benchmarks be? In essence, what needs to be prioritized and how can the mission leadership team best sequence its efforts?

Today, those questions and many others continue to challenge mission leaders in peace operations. In the time since the Considerations Study was first published, the environments and security contexts into which UN peace operations are being deployed has continued to rapidly evolve. This has included the deployment of the Force Intervention Brigade (FIB) in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) in response to the attack of the M23 in Goma in 2012, a significant reconfiguration of the peacekeeping mission in South Sudan in December 2013 in response to the outbreak of civil war, and the deployment and re-hatting of African Union missions in the Central African Republic (CAR) and Mali in 2013 and 2014 respectively in order to protect the civilian population and facilitate peace processes.

In each of these cases, UN peacekeeping has had to evolve and adapt in an effort to respond to the realities on the ground where it is deployed, presenting unique challenges and difficult decisions in each context for mission leaders. In some cases this has meant engaging with political authorities in contexts where host state consent is contentious and the government's armed forces are active in the conflict (e.g. South Sudan), identifying means to protect the civilian population despite ongoing sectarian violence (e.g. CAR), or implementing a mission mandate in an asymmetric threat environment alongside a parallel counter-terrorism mission, where peacekeepers are coming under regular and direct attack (e.g. Mali). As one of the speakers noted, these developments have created 'doctrinal uncertainty' within missions and pushed the boundaries on the outer limits of peacekeeping.

These developments in the field were among some of the reasons that the former UN Secretary-General commissioned a High-level Independent Study on Peace Operations (HIPPO) in 2014.¹ The HIPPO Report provided a series of extensive recommendations to peacekeeping stakeholders. It recommended four essential shifts that needed to occur to strengthen UN peace operations, namely promoting the primacy of politics, delivering on a 'full spectrum' of peace operations, supporting a more inclusive peace

¹ United Nations, *Report of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations on uniting our strengths for peace: politics, partnership and people*, UN Doc A/70/95-S/2015/446, 17 June 2015 (hereafter 'HIPPO Report').

and security partnership, and ensuring field-focused and people-centred operations. Some of the reforms emerging from the HIPPO report have been taken forward, along with the findings of the Peacebuilding Architecture Review and the Global Study on Women, Peace and Security. However, many of the challenges identified in these reports continue to exist and require the ongoing commitment and support of various peacekeeping stakeholders to address them.

At the same time as those high-level reviews, several crises and failings have emerged in currently deployed missions. The mishandling of widespread cases of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) have resulted in further concerted reform efforts to address the issue by the Security Council, the Secretary General and Member States. Similarly, significant failures by peacekeeping missions in South Sudan and the Central African Republic to fulfil their mandate to protect civilians resulted in several independent investigations to assess the failures that had taken place during 2016 and 2017. In all these instances, the investigations and reports on the events that had taken place noted the importance of leadership in order to hold staff accountable and ensure missions were able to deliver on their mandates.

Upon coming into office in January 2017, the new UN Secretary-General, Antonio Guterres, started to outline his reform agenda to tackle a number of different challenges facing the UN. In the context of peace operations, this has included initiatives to address management reform, support gender parity and re-structure the peace and security architecture that supports peace operations. If leaders are to succeed in their roles, then they need to be prepared to take forward and implement key aspects of the peace operations reform agenda, in addition to their mandated tasks. The Forum was therefore timely within the larger context of the evolving reform agenda, with developments at headquarters and in the field in recent years triggering the need to review the Considerations Study.

The Forum set out to address three specific objectives within this context. First, to critically review the Considerations Study related to several key emerging issues on the senior mission leadership of peace operations (that is, the what and why). Second, to identify any additional key emerging issues during the Forum. And third, to present suggestions for how the various emerging issues could be integrated in future leadership guidance, including the revised Considerations Study version 2.0. The Forum built on the

findings from a preliminary workshop which had been held in Carlisle in the United States from 28 February to 1 March 2017 on *Taking Leadership to the Next Level: UN Peace Operations 2020* and which focused on the why, what and how of leading UN peace operations.²

This report examines the discussions and key recommendations emerging from the Forum in two parts. It should be noted that while this report includes no separate sections on women, peace and security, or youth, peace and security, the issues were raised and addressed throughout the forum discussions and are subsequently integrated into analysis provided throughout this report. The first part (Chapter 2) explores the issues that were identified in the review the Considerations Study chapter by chapter, in order to identify sections that need to be reviewed and updated to take into account challenges that have emerged as part of the reform agenda or as a consequence of developments in the field in peace operations.

The second part (Chapter 3) thematically analyses emerging issues for senior mission leadership as discussed in the different working groups throughout the forum. These include issues such as sexual exploitation and abuse, protection of civilians, peace operations and civil society, political process, terrorist and extremist environments, transnational organised criminal activity, the Strategic Guidance Framework on Policing, the use of emerging technology for decision-making, scenario-based learning for senior leadership teams in UN field missions, bridging peace operations with humanitarian assistance and long-term development, and addressing the root causes of conflict and sustaining peace. Analysis of these challenges focuses both on the challenges of implementing particular mandated tasks, as well as the tools available to prepare and train mission leaders, including technology, communications platforms and scenario-based and crisis training.

This report captures the diverse experiences of a range of individuals serving in peace operations and engaged in the reform of peace operations as part of the Challenges Partnership, and offers a series of recommendations to inform the forthcoming review of the Considerations Study, as well as more general recommendations as they relate to senior mission leadership in UN peace operations emerging from the Annual Forum.

² See Robert Gordon, 'Leading United Nations Peace Operations', Policy Brief 2017:1 (Challenges Forum 2017).

Box 1: Turkey's contribution to UN peacekeeping and peace-building

Turkey has a long tradition of contribution to UN peacekeeping missions. As of February 2018, Turkey had 141 military and police personnel deployed across UN missions in Haiti, Mali, Darfur, Lebanon, Kosovo, South Sudan and Somalia.

In 2006, Turkey's deployment of personnel to UN peacekeeping increased significantly with its commitment to an expanded UNIFIL.³ That included the contribution of a warship to the Maritime Task Force, which was commanded by a Turkish admiral for six months. That commitment continues today, with one vessel committed to the Maritime Task Force. Turkey's military is also involved in other multilateral peace operations, including those led by NATO and the EU.

In addition to peacekeeping, Turkey continues to remain engaged in a range of UN bodies supporting international efforts to maintain peace and security, most recently serving on the UN Security Council in 2009-2010. Furthermore, Turkey has participated in the Peacebuilding Commission country-specific configurations for Guinea, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Burundi and Central African Republic.⁴

³ Nil S. Satana, 'Peacekeeping Contributor Profile: Turkey', Providing for Peacekeeping, available here <http://www.providingforpeacekeeping.org/2014/04/03/contributor-profile-turkey/>.

⁴ Republic of Turkey, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 'Turkey's Approach and Contributions to the United Nations Peacekeeping Operations', available here http://www.mfa.gov.tr/turkey_s-approach-and-contributions-to-the-united-nations-peacekeeping-operations.en.mfa.

2. Considerations For Senior Mission Leadership: What Has Changed And Evolved?

UN leaders are made, they are not born.⁵ They need knowledge and they need guidance on what is expected of them. For mission leaders, part of the challenge may be working out exactly what they don't know, so that they can address these gaps in their knowledge. But at the same time, the UN senior appointments team also needs to have a thorough understanding of the different strengths of potential candidates for particular leadership roles when putting candidates forward for appointment.

Mission leaders need to be able to manage a diverse array of stakeholders and actors. This includes mission personnel within the military, police and civilian components, as well as engagement with the host authorities, regional actors, and the UN Security Council.

This chapter explores the key issues, challenges and recommendations that emerged from discussions about revising some aspects of the existing chapters in the Considerations Study.

2.1. Session 1: Cross-Cutting Issues, Mission Management and Political Processes

Chapter Two of the Considerations Study considers cross-cutting issues and mission management. It examines the implications of a range of mandated tasks and components within missions for leadership purposes with a focus on protection of civilians (POC), human rights, gender, mine action, security sector reform (SSR), and disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR). The chapter also examines different mission management considerations for a leader. Chapter Three of the Considerations Study focuses on the role of mission leaders in facilitating and support the political process. It examines how to ensure the peace process is supported, national reconciliation promoted, peaceful and credible elections held, that state authority and legitimate institutions are strengthened, and that civil

⁵ Diane Corner, 'Reflections on the Challenges Facing Leaders of UN Peace Operations', Policy Brief 2017:4 (Challenges Forum 2017).

society is revitalised and independent media support. For the purposes of the Challenges Forum, discussions in this session focused on issues that needed to be included in the revision of material on POC, SEA, political processes and efforts to engage and support civil society.

Sexual Exploitation and Abuse

Peacekeeping operations are undermined by exploitation and abuse (SEA) incidents. Several high-profile incidents through 2015 prompted significant action, prompting the Secretary-General to appoint a Special Coordinator on improving the UN's response to SEA in February 2016, which was followed in March 2016 with action by the Security Council to adopt resolution 2272. The incoming Secretary-General has continued to push for reforms, releasing his report on Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse: A New Approach for the consideration of the General Assembly in March 2017⁶ and appointing a Victims' Rights Advocate in August 2017.

Unfortunately instances of SEA have continued to emerge in UN peacekeeping missions, compounded recently by a series of incidents of improper behaviour and abuse that have come to light in the humanitarian and aid sectors. According to a workshop presenter, the number of reported allegations against peacekeepers has risen considerably since 2015. However, it remains unclear whether such increases are the result of more active and transparent measures by UN personnel to file and report claims from civilians or if it simply represents an increase of cases of abuse committed by peacekeepers against the host community. Participants acknowledged it was probably a combination of both.

With a renewed effort from the Secretary-General to end impunity and increase the overall transparency of mission activities, the Victims' Rights Advocate (Jane Connors) is attempting to establish multi stakeholder networks and channels for engagement with civil society while also encouraging senior leaders to share best practices that could be used for crafting out new preventive measures. The Secretary-General has tasked missions in Haiti, South Sudan, the DRC and CAR to provide regular reporting on this subject and to allocate trained staff to work on the behalf of the Victims' Rights Advocate during mission activities, ensuring missions are taking a victim-centred approach. Zero-tolerance and maximal accountability will be enforced on all levels and every element of training for UN staff will make clear to new personnel what is expected of them when they are deployed in a field environment when it comes to behaviour, leadership and accountability.

6 United Nations, *Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse: A New Approach*, UN Doc A/71/818, 28 February 2018.

Protection of Civilians

Since 2010 the UN Secretariat and Member States have invested considerable focus on developing a comprehensive set of guidance and training materials on POC for troop and police contributing countries, as well as peacekeeping missions. This had included the development of a Policy on Protection of Civilians, as well as specific guidance for military and police components. Yet the application and implementation of training for those deploying to peacekeeping missions has often been ad hoc and poorly managed, resulting in poor operationalisation of POC mandates in the field. As events in Malakal and Juba in South Sudan in 2016 demonstrated, there were still significant challenges with improving the ability of peacekeeping missions to implement their POC mandate. Following the violent events in Juba in July 2016, the Secretary-General fired the Force Commander of the mission. While this decision was viewed as particularly controversial, it reflected the increasing frustration within the UN system over a lack of leadership and accountability when it came to POC. The Department of Peacekeeping Operations is currently developing an accountability framework that will be included as part of its review of the Policy on POC in 2018.

The importance of conflict analysis, information sharing and intelligence were identified as a particular ongoing challenge when it came to POC. Having a lack of forward looking analysis often prevented staff from identifying potential indicators of mass atrocities that were being planned and carried out by either state or non-state actors. Recent cases of rapidly escalating violence in South Sudan served as concrete examples of such a lack of situational analysis. Intelligence gathering was therefore a prerequisite for atrocity prevention since identifying triggers for escalating violence, political turmoil and ethnic cleansing campaigns could result in better tailored POC measures. To understand this concept, peacekeepers within missions needed to work closely with local communities, collecting and systemizing data from a wide range of sources. This information and data then needed to be shared with mission leaders to ensure that it could be acted on appropriately through various lines of operation within the mission. Senior leaders needed to ensure they were requesting this type of information, encouraging staff to gain a deeper situational analysis and regularly integrate intelligence data into country reports.

Box 2: Protection of Civilians in South Sudan in 2016

– ‘Cammaert Report’

Protection of civilians remains at the core of the mandate for the UN Mission in South Sudan. Despite this, however, the mission has faced several significant crises where it has failed to protect the civilian population since its establishment in July 2011.

Two separate events in 2016 prompted the UN Secretary-General to commission independent investigations into UNMISS’ ability to implement its POC mandate. From 17-18 February 2016 there were clashes between civilians in the Malakal POC site which resulted in the deaths of approximately 30 civilians and 123 injured. There was a further crisis in July 2016, when violence erupted in the capital Juba from 8 to 11 July resulting in the deaths of many civilians, as well as two peacekeepers serving in UNMISS.

The ‘Executive Summary of the Independent Special Investigation into the violence which occurred in Juba in 2016 and UNMISS response’ was released in November 2016.⁷ Among the many findings of the ‘Cammaert report’ were that there was a ‘lack of preparedness, ineffective command and control and a risk-averse or “inward-looking” posture’ that resulted in a lack of trust among the local population and humanitarian agencies in the mission’s ability to protect civilians under threat. The report provided several recommendations to the UN Secretariat, UNMISS, Government of South Sudan, the UN Security Council and troop and police contributing countries. Several of the recommendations were directed at the role of mission leadership, particularly the Force Commander and Deputy Force Commander.

The Secretary-General reported back on progress to implement the recommendations emerging from the ‘Cammaert’ report in a letter addressed to the UN Security Council on 17 April 2017.⁸ That letter noted that the United Nations had undertaken a two-track approach to implementing the recommendations through (1) the establishment of a Headquarters task force focused on systemic and strategic issues, and (2) through UNMISS with the development of a mission-specific action plan. The letter also noted that the Secretariat would continue to provide updates through existing reporting mechanisms, as appropriate.

Engaging Civil Society

Another key challenge for mission management was how to properly

⁷ United Nations, ‘Executive Summary of the Independent Special Investigation into the violence which occurred in Juba in 2016 and UNMISS response’, 1 November 2016.

⁸ United Nations Security Council, *Letter dated 17 April 2017 from the Secretary-General addressed to the President of the Security Council*, UN Doc S/2017/328, 17 April 2017.

understand the different actors that can promote and strengthen peace. Community representatives often form a fundamental bridge between mission staff and civil society. It is therefore critical that mission management establishes ties to civil society actors within the host community. One suggestion identified by participants was to create a permanent civil society unit within each mission, especially during the post-conflict phase, although it was argued that such a function was likely already well served by the civil affairs component in the mission. Nonetheless, there was agreement that mission leaders needed to ensure that they were engaging with and listening to the local community as part their political leadership role within the mission. This might require further training for senior and middle management staff prior to deployment on the boundaries of their engagement with civil society to ensure staff are equipped and prepared. Some participants noted that greater engagement by the mission with civil society may also facilitate the ability of peace operations to support the broader implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including Sustainable Development Goal 16.

Supporting the Political Process

One of the key shifts identified in the HIPPO report was the primacy of politics. This is essential across all missions, but particularly important in the context of special political missions (SPMs) which often prioritise political engagement through the role of political missions, envoys or regional offices. There is a need for thinking to evolve on how to collect information and apply different operational tools in different mission specific contexts. This requires a holistic approach that encompasses the full spectrum of tools available as part of peace operations. Identifying approaches for political solutions need to be considered at the earliest stages of mission planning, before a mission deploys. Far too often, political considerations come in at a late stage of peace keeping, generating missed opportunities and short sighted “one size fits all” solutions.

Peace operations are increasingly deployed into environments where there is transnational crime, illicit trafficking, asymmetric threats and violent extremism. Addressing these threats requires flexible political solutions. It also requires an ability to engage broadly with an expanding number of actors and stakeholders that may be participating in conflicts, which may include engagement in regional solutions. This requires some revision to the Considerations Study with regard to different skills and training that senior leaders may need to operate in these complex political and security

environments.

2.2. Session 2: Creating a Secure Environment, Strengthening Rule of Law and Human Rights

Chapter Four of the Considerations Study focuses on how missions create a secure and stable environment. The existing chapter examines mechanisms for ensuring warring factions are separated, fighting has stopped and civilians are protected, that freedom of movement has been recovered and public order established, that disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration (DDR) programs have been implemented, the defence sector professionalised, and that territorial integrity has been recovered. Chapter Five of the Considerations Study focuses on how missions can strengthen the rule of law with respect for human rights. The existing chapter examines nature of strengthening the rule of law, through the legislative framework, judicial sector, police and other law enforcement sector and corrections system. For the purposes of the Challenges Forum, discussions in this session focused developments related to operating in an environment of terrorism and violence extremism, the rule of law and human rights.

Terrorism and Violent Extremism

The deployment of a UN peacekeeping mission into Mali in 2013 created a new set of challenges for mission leadership in the context of peace operations. While several special political missions—such as those deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan—had operated in environments with an active terrorist threat, the deployment of MINUSMA in 2013 marked a turning point with the deployment of a peacekeeping mission into an asymmetric threat environment.

Some participants suggested that lessons could be drawn from the experience of countries in conducting counter-insurgency (COIN) operations. While there were some lessons that could be drawn on from the experience of decades of counter-insurgency operations, participants agreed that peace operations still needed to retain their unique character and focus on efforts to support the political dialogue. Even more importantly for peacekeeping missions, there was a need to ensure that leaders could adapt the three peacekeeping principles (consent of the parties, impartiality, and non-use of force except in self-defence or defence of the mandate) flexibly to operate

in these challenging environments. Participants agreed that military efforts alone were not enough to fight off terrorist attacks and further stressed the need to have an understanding of context, as well as to set realistic goals.

In an environment of violent extremism and asymmetric attacks, streamlined information-gathering and intelligence were imperative in order to understand motives and strategies of groups that posed a threat to mission personnel and civilians. Several lessons could be drawn from the experience with the All Sources Information Fusion Unit that had initially been established in MINUSMA. The new UN Policy on Intelligence in Peacekeeping would also provide some importance guidance to mission leadership, particularly in high-threat environments.

Mission leaders also needed to have a thorough understanding of the mandates and functions of other regional and international mechanisms operating in these complex threat environments. In the context of Mali, for instance, this required coordination and communication with a range of parallel forces such as Operation Barkhane and the G5 Sahel Force. Furthermore, in some mission contexts, missions needed to coordinate their approach with the implementation of other Security Council tools under Chapter VII, such as arms embargoes and sanctions regimes, which could also assist a mission with the implementation of their mandate. Leaders needed to have a thorough understanding of the different mechanisms that were available to them and utilise them effectively, in order to ensure they were most effective in delivering on the mission mandate.

Safety and security of peacekeepers was an issue that required ongoing consideration by mission leaders, particularly when operating in high threat asymmetric threat environments. Special Representatives of the Secretary-General had a unique responsibility for the ensuring the security of their personnel, as they were often the designated security official within the mission area.

Box 3: Cruz Report on Improving Security of Peacekeepers

During 2017 UN peacekeeping suffered its highest number of peacekeeper fatalities in over two decades, with 56 peacekeepers killed. In November 2017, the UN Secretary-General appointed retired Lieutenant General Carlos Alberto dos Santos Cruz 'to carry out an in-depth review of peacekeeping fatalities and injuries due to hostile acts'. The independent report, also referred to as the 'Cruz Report' was released in early 2018 with

the UN developing an Action Plan to take forward the report's recommendations.⁹

The report identifies four broad areas for action for the United Nations and Member States in order to reduce fatalities in UN peacekeeping, namely changing mindsets, improving capacity, achieving a threat-sensitive mission footprint, and enhancing accountability. Among these four broad areas of action, the report recommends the need to review the peacekeeping principles, and for personnel to adopt a more proactive posture for self-defence and be prepared to operate in asymmetric threat environments.

In terms of mission leadership, the report acknowledges that leadership in New York, Mission Headquarters and in distant field locations 'need to take urgent action to reduce fatalities'. The report subsequently notes that simplistic interpretation of mandates, disagreements over who should lead operations, and a failure to take preventative measures to prevent attacks have all contributed to the level of fatalities in missions. It recommends 'leadership at all levels must be held accountable for failing to adopt to high-risk operational environments'.

The latest reiteration of the Action Plan was released on 9 April 2018.¹⁰ It sets out actions that have been undertaken in the four broad areas for action at the field and headquarters level. It also outline a series of actions in progress at the field and headquarter levels to be achieved by the end of May 2018, as well as June 2018 and beyond. The five highest-risk missions (MINUSCA, MINUSMA, MONUSCO, UNAMID and UNMISS) have appointed implementation teams in the field. It is anticipated that the Action Plan will continue to be updated going forward.

The report has been met with mixed reviews by practitioners and academics, with some claiming it is overly militaristic in approach, whereas others have argued it follows on with more direct recommendations that were not included in the HIPPO report.¹¹ Nonetheless, the UN Secretariat has acknowledged the importance of the report in sparking debate on the viability of peacekeeping missions in contexts such as Mali, South Sudan or the Democratic Republic of the Congo, where the UN is operating at the outer limits of peacekeeping.¹²

Rule of Law and Human Rights

Police components in peacekeeping missions are involved in a range of tasks ranging from POC through to training and capacity-building of the local

⁹ United Nations, *Improving Security of United Nations Peacekeepers: We need to change the way we are doing business*, 19 December 2017.

¹⁰ United Nations, 'Improving Security of United Nations Peacekeepers – Action Plan for Implementation of Fatalities Report', 9 April 2018, available here https://peacekeeping.un.org/sites/default/files/180406_action_plan_revised.pdf

¹¹ See series on the Cruz report by the International Peace Institute, published here: <https://theglobalobservatory.org/tag/cruz-report/>

¹² David Haeri, 'Strengthening UN Peacekeeping: Placing the Santos Cruz Report in Context', International Peace Institute Global Observatory, 28 February 2018, available here <https://theglobalobservatory.org/2018/02/strengthening-peacekeeping-cruz-report-context/>

police forces. Unfortunately, many police officers were still deployed only for short time frames which were not suitable for institution-building.

One of the challenges for mission leadership related to the capacity building. The police's ability to detain people would, for example be seriously hampered if there were no adequate prison facilities, which would also limit the ability of the host authorities to detain and prosecute offenders. It was however important to safeguard the credibility and integrity of the police force and keep a strict separation between the judicial chain and the political sphere.

Violent extremism had made it necessary for peacekeeping missions to rethink how they work with human rights components. One consequence was that human rights monitoring has shifted from having focused on one or two parties, to involve a complex mixture of several key parties. Since peacekeeping missions are often supposed to support national and regional forces in their work, there was a risk that the UN was seen as aligned with international counter-terrorist forces. If these forces were accused of disproportional use of violence or politically motivated attacks, this could affect the credibility of the peacekeeping mission. It was therefore important to ensure the Human Rights Due Diligence Policy was being applied when cooperating with national, parallel and regional forces. The peacekeeping missions should only give support to forces that operated in accordance with these standards. Mission leaders needed to consider what circumstances would necessitate the withdrawal of mission support or cooperation with other entities.

2.3 Session 3: Promoting Social and Economic Recovery

Chapter Six of the Considerations Study focuses on how missions promote social and economic recovery. The existing chapter examines support to secure effective humanitarian relief, the establishment of basic services, return and reintegration of refugees and internally displaced persons, and enabling the overall transition from recovery to development. For the purposes of the Challenges Forum, discussions in this session focused on key developments surrounding sustaining peace and how these relate to efforts to promote social and economic recovery within a mission context.

In 2016 the Security Council and the General Assembly voted in parallel

on the sustaining peace resolution.¹³ This followed many of the significant reviews that had taken place in 2015, including the review of the UN's peacebuilding architecture. Despite this consensus, sustaining peace has fallen into a process of trying to demystify its meaning with many often delinking peacebuilding from sustaining peace while others see it as an addition to conflict prevention. Sustaining peace is a broader concept that captures conflict prevention, peace-making, peacebuilding and post-conflict reconstruction. Sustaining peace is not just about strengthening political institutions but strengthening community resilience. Moreover, it is about learning from what has contributed to peace not only in countries emerging from armed conflict but more so from countries that are not as vulnerable, and have the capacities and structures for peace. All departments and entities within the UN system must support the process if sustaining peace is to move forward.

In order to more effectively ensure peace operations implemented the concept of sustaining peace, peace operations would need to rethink how they undertook and developed specific measures to strengthen capacities within a host country and support efforts within local communities to build resilience. There was consensus that 'something' must be put in place to sustain peace as peacekeeping missions' mandates eventually come to an end. This required more thorough consideration of the transition and exit strategies required by a mission. Mission leaders had particular responsibilities in considering the future direction of missions, including their eventual drawdown. The HIPPO report proposed the concept of a compact that would hold host governments to account. Such compacts could provide a vehicle for senior leaders to engage with host governments and the Security Council to identify and prioritise needs and outline mission objectives.

In terms of the Considerations Study, several participants noted the need that the chapter on social and economic recovery needed review. This is because there has been limited involvement of local partners with the focus solely being on carrying out the mission mandate. Factors such as lack of capacity of local organisations to absorb funds, donor competition, corruption, and gender disparities were also identified as factors that impede efforts for sustaining peace. Rather, it was argued that a new chapter should be included in the Considerations Study on sustaining peace, drawing on some of the

¹³ UN General Assembly resolution 70/262 and Security Council resolution 2282 (2016).

recommendations from the resolutions and review of the peacebuilding architecture.

The adoption of Security Council resolution 2250 on youth, peace and security provided a key opportunity for peace operations to support sustaining peace. For example, in Liberia, youth had been working closely with police to mitigate any electoral related violence. Mission leaders needed to ensure they were effectively engaging with youth as part of their mission mandate, as they were key to sustaining peace, particularly after a mission had departed the country.

Mission leaders needed to keep in mind that it was important that host countries identified their own priorities when it comes to socio-economic recovery and sustaining peace, as this was critical to ensuring national ownership and long-term support to take forward initiatives that may be initiated by the peace operation. This also required a more concerted effort to address the root causes of conflicts as part of the intervention, in order to strengthen the drivers of peace (such as traditional community governance practices) and weaken conflict drivers (such as non-accountable security sectors). Without undertaking an analysis of these drivers, then the success of a peace operation is likely to be limited.

3. Identifying and Examining Emerging Issues for Senior Mission Leadership

This chapter examines the discussions regarding new and emerging issues that were discussed in the working groups during the forum, with a focus on concrete recommendations for how they might be updated and integrated into the Considerations study.

3.1 Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA)

The primary focus of discussions during this working group were on the importance of direct engagement and transparency by mission leadership when it came to preventing and addressing incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA). It was acknowledged that the current version of the Considerations Study did not provide enough guidance on the issue. While the existing version identifies the gravity of SEA as an issue that requires attention, it provides little information on how senior mission leaders should approach the issue or manage it within a mission context, therefore there needed to be a much more thorough and holistic examination of the topic in the revised 2.0 edition. This was essential given the impact that SEA has on the civilian population, as well as the overall legitimacy and accountability of a mission and its ability to implement its mandate.

The importance of victim-centred approaches was mentioned by several participations. It was an issue that had been highlighted on several occasions by the new Secretary-General, with priority attached through the appointment of a Victims' Rights Advocate. It was essential that victims' perspectives were considered when designing and implementing approaches to address SEA. The revision of the Considerations Study needed to place more emphasis on the responsibility of leaders to ensure they identified potential mechanisms and approaches within missions that would enable victims' to come forward and be supported. Mission personnel were often in positions of significant power when it comes to the local community, therefore effective communication and consultation mechanisms needed to be in place to address this power imbalance.

Increased participation of female peacekeepers was identified as a factor that could contribute to efforts to reduce overall incidents of SEA. Some participants suggested that the presence of more female personnel was likely to influence the behaviour of men in the field. In cases where there were incidents of SEA, the presence of women in the field could also facilitate better levels of reporting, responses and support for victims if managed effectively. For instance, some victims may find it easier to approach women to express their concerns, improving reporting on incidents. Similarly, some participants suggested that an increased female presence could reduce the overall stigma surrounding the issue, increasing awareness and transparency of abusive and unacceptable behaviour.

Several challenges continued to impede the ability of missions to prevent and address SEA. In the case of allegations against civilians, some participants suggested there was an unclear 'chain of command', with inadequate legal and administrative responses. In many cases, it was unclear how cases were resolved and whether perpetrators had been held to account. This was true not only in cases of allegations against civilians, but also military and police personnel, where responsibility for prosecution rested with their own national governments. This lack of transparency contributed to an overall culture of impunity on the issue and needed to be improved.

Transparency was mentioned by most participants in the working group as essential when dealing with SEA. Mission leaders had an important role in monitoring developments across the mission. Carrying out unannounced visits in different parts of the field could provide mission leaders with a clearer picture of some of the problem areas in different parts of the mission. Mission leaders also needed to clearly communicate what will follow an allegation of SEA in terms of legal consequences and other measures. Some participants suggested that there needed to be much greater clarity over the definition of the term 'zero tolerance' and what it implies for the mission. Providing training at different stages of deployment could strengthen the message. For example, training during deployment was argued to work especially well considering every mission's specific context, with different tool-boxes depending on the situation. Pre-deployment training was viewed as essential, particularly for contingents, in order to create a shared view on the severity of SEA., there was agreement that more training was essential to address the issue.

Mission leaders needed to ensure they were not afraid of talking openly about SEA in order to increase transparency and reduce stigmatization. Leaders at all levels of the mission were role models in terms of raising awareness and effectively reporting and managing incidents. One contribution to the discussion was the idea of praising good examples and responses in order to set a positive standard for the mission, rather than simply focusing on 'naming and shaming'. This would provide peacekeepers with a model of behaviour that they should be following as good practice, in an effort to improve the overall response to addressing and preventing SEA.

Box 4: Preventing and Responding to Sexual Exploitation and Abuse

There have been several significant and high-profile initiatives to address sexual exploitation and abuse in UN peace operations in recent years. In June 2015 the UN Secretary-General established a Panel to undertake an independent external review of the response by the UN to a series of allegations of SEA in MINUSCA. Those events also prompted the Secretary-General to request the resignation of his Special Representative in the CAR in August 2015, sending a signal on the importance of mission leadership on the issue.

There were further important developments throughout 2016 as the Secretary-General appointed a Special Coordinator on improving the UN's response to SEA in February 2016, which was followed in March 2016 with action by the Security Council to adopt resolution 2272. That resolution notably requested the Secretary-General to replace military or police units that failed to hold perpetrators of sexual exploitation and abuse to account. The Secretary-General also established a 'Trust Fund in Support of Victims of Sexual Exploitation and Abuse' in that same month to provide greater support to victims and addressing gaps in assistance, support for complainants and children born as a consequence of sexual exploitation and abuse.

The current Secretary-General, Antonio Guterres, has continued to push for reforms, releasing his report on Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse: A New Approach for the consideration of the General Assembly in March 2017¹⁴ and appointing a Victims' Rights Advocate in August 2017. During 2017 Secretary-General Guterres also established a 'Voluntary Compact on Preventing and Addressing Sexual Exploitation and Abuse' with 72 Member States signing the compact as of 29 September 2017. The Secretary-General also established a 'Circle of Leadership' on the issue, which required a commitment from the Head of State or Government of countries

¹⁴ United Nations, *Special Measures for Protection from Sexual Exploitation and Abuse: A New Approach*, UN Doc A/71/818, 28 February 2017.

(in their personal capacity) to support victims and 'implement steps to end impunity and hold perpetrators to account'.

3.2 Protection of Civilians (POC)

Senior mission leaders continue to grapple with how to better undertake POC. Several challenges faced by mission leaders derive from their roles and responsibilities, availability of information, and the relationship with host governments. Participants were in agreement that if certain factors can be improved for example, early warning and early response, delineation of roles and responsibilities, and knowledge of operating contexts, then this would contribute to better mission management and promote a secure environment for the protection of civilians.

Mission leaders may have to engage with a host government that is considered a perpetrator in the conflict. This can't be avoided, as a mission is reliant on the ongoing consent of the host government for their presence within a country. Similarly, mission mandates often require an ongoing level of dialogue to support the political process. As events in South Sudan and other mission contexts have demonstrated, leaders need to be able to effectively engage with political counterparts to deliver difficult messages, while ensuring the mission is able to deliver on its POC mandate in potentially hostile environments.

Another political challenge for mission leaders may involve managing relationships with TCCs and PCCs. In some cases, they may not respond as expected because national caveats do not permit them to respond when needed to protect civilians. Mission leaders need to ensure they have clear lines of communication with TCCs/PCCs, they need to clearly articulate what is expected of them, and when this fails, that they clearly communicate these events to headquarters, so appropriate decisions can be made about the future engagement of particular TCC/PCCs.

Accountability was identified as a critical issue that required further attention in the context of POC, with the need to more clearly define roles and responsibilities. Participants recommended that the 2016 Independent Special Investigation Report into Violence in South Sudan provides valuable insights regarding how senior mission leaders can undertake the protection of

civilians better.¹⁵ The report examines the response of UNMISS to violence in Juba in July 2016, providing several recommendations specifically to the mission, but also across UN peacekeeping to address deficits within mission leadership when it comes to POC. The development of an accountability framework on POC would also serve as a positive step forward that in this regard. It was expected that the accountability framework will provide further direction for senior mission leadership regarding what is expected of them and their staff when it comes to implementing POC mandates.

Discussions in this working group also focused on the importance of training on POC. In the context of particular missions, leaders and staff require a better awareness of the language, culture and traditions of the population in the areas where they are deploying. Similarly, mission leaders need to be prepared and able to respond appropriately in crisis situations. Training should take into consideration the pressures that mission leaders and their teams are likely to face when out on mission, as crises can often affect the ability of leaders and mission staff to make decisions on the ground. It is, for example, not unusual for someone who has witnessed their colleagues being killed to change how they respond or fail respond to a crisis. Adequate time should be taken to invest in scenario-based crisis exercises, particularly in-mission with the leadership team, in order to ensure they can respond appropriately when civilians are under threat. Some participants also suggested the use of an 'outsider' or 'red team' to provide an independent perspective on the responses of the mission leadership team in scenario-based exercises.

While most of the discussion focused on responding to potential failures within the mission, participants stressed the importance of leaders ensuring they shared successes that were taking place within missions. Such lessons could be helpful to guide senior mission leadership in good practices when confronted with future challenging situations.

3.3 Peace Operations and Civil Society

There had been several trends that had emerged within civil society organizations in recent years. For example, many non-governmental organisations (NGOs) were now taking the initiative to enhance external

¹⁵ United Nations, 'Executive Summary of the Independent Special Investigation into the violence which occurred in Juba in 2016 and UNMISS response', 1 November 2016.

accountability and transparency, and social media had spurred new outreach methods for stakeholders. However, in tandem with these development, many countries have also witnessed a growth in attempts by government to control civil society groups, which were often competing for resources and legitimacy. It also meant that the lines could often be blurred in terms of which civil society organisations were genuine and those that were fake. One participant pointed out that such measures had been particularly damaging in proxy war environments such as Syria or eastern Ukraine. One of the key challenges for engaging with civil society is first to define it. It was noted that the definition of civil society used for the Considerations Study perhaps should be updated, encompassing a new set of actors such as political parties or scholars within the academia. However, there was no consensus in the group on this point nor on the extent that a broader definition would actually be fruitful in addressing this problem.

Civil society is not a monolithic unit. The fabric of civil society organisations in Kosovo differ significantly from those in Kandahar. Leaders must therefore be aware of the nature of civil society organisations within their specific mission context in order to successfully coordinate outreach activities with the right representatives of the communities. Leaders also require an understanding of how those organisations may be in a position to contribute to building peace. It was also critical that mission leaders considered the role of different women's civil society organisations within the community, to ensure they were being engaged effectively in community discussions. Participants suggested that senior leaders should produce a concrete methodology for how to identify civil society representatives and potential partners in a balanced and non-biased manner, making sure that such an approach is tailored for the country specific context before implementing it.

In addition to civil society organisations, mission leaders also needed to consider how they might engage with the corporate and donor sector, including setting up consultative forums with major organisations in the mission's area of operations, identify issues of mutual interest and avoiding negative outcomes resulting from poor coordination. This was key in municipalities or communities where funding from private donors or foundations may outnumber the funding allocated by UN member states. One participant shared an example from the Central African Republic where a consultative dialogue between mission staff and a local telecom

operator had resulted in a joint project supporting the development of telecommunications infrastructure.

Unfortunately some mission leaders may commence their roles in missions with a lack of personal experience engaging with civil society. This can be compounded at times by a lack of references in Security Council mandate to the importance of engaging with civil society. Since those resolutions articulate the mandate from which the mission can operate, the lack of explicit mentioning of civil society provides few incentives for leaders to push for further engagement. Educating mission leadership on the importance of civil society as part of overall missions objectives needs to be supported with Member State advocacy on the issue, which may include specific phrases highlighting mission engagement with civil society when formulating the mandate for peace operations. Some participants also suggested that mission leaders should consider mechanisms to improve engagement with civil society by ensuring there is effective support for the civil affairs unit within the mission, or through the identification or appointment of a focal point within the mission if there is no civil affairs officer or unit.

3.4 Political Process

The aim of the discussion was to address how leadership interacts with and supports political processes as part of the implementation of mission mandates for peace operations. Participants agreed that everything in a peace operation was political, whether it was decisions about technical issues and capacity building of civilian staff right through to decisions about the actors you choose to engage with and efforts to implement security sector reform (SSR). Leaders needed to consider the political implications of the decisions that they make and manage them effectively.

As a starting point, mission leaders needed to study their mandate carefully and consider the implications of the mandate within the mission's life-cycle. There is a huge difference between missions that operate in a frozen conflict to those that are deployed in an extremist environment. A start-up mission further differs from a long-standing mission, or from one in the process of downsizing. Participants agreed that it was important that the Considerations Study addressed some of the issues that needed to be considered at different stages of the mission cycle.

Knowledge of context was also key and should be an essential part of incoming leaders' preparation and training. Often the list of people that an incoming leader was required to meet with was very long, while at the same time a "meet-and-greet" was rarely enough to develop an effective working relationship or determine whether there was broad support for the mission. Some participations suggested that the mission should undertake thorough stake-holder analyses and identify the actors at regional, national and local levels that were supportive of the mission's mandate, as well as those that appeared to have reservations. There was however some concern regarding whether this was politically feasible. Many missions also operated in rapidly changing contexts where written analyses could quickly become outdated, or worse, may be made public and shared with local stakeholders causing embarrassment and further political challenges.

Mission leaders also needed to be able to draw on the lessons of those that have gone before them. This required current leaders to ensure that their approaches to different challenges and crises were being effectively recorded for other personnel to draw on as part of wider lessons learned. Examples were given of how missions had initiated projects and activities, only to later find out that similar efforts had been undertaken before. Some participants suggested the idea of a "playbook" where different scenarios that leaders might encounter are described with a list of potential responses and approaches.

In the context of the political process, elections were no longer considered to be a purely technical exercise, or even a reliable bench-mark. Participants agreed that the Considerations Study should be updated accordingly. Mission leaders needed to consider a wide range of different scenarios and potential outcomes if their mandate requires them to support the conduct of elections. This might include reflecting on the consequences of facilitating a possibly flawed electoral process, which could affect the mission's future credibility, or managing a scenario where the one of the parties who contributed to the outbreak of conflict is then elected to form government. In these instances, senior mission leaders have a responsibility to consider what these developments might mean for the overall political process within the country and ensure that is communicated effectively to various stakeholders.

3.5 Terrorist and Extremist Environments

Peacekeeping operations are increasingly taking place in contexts where terrorism and extremist threats exist posing an even greater challenge to mission leaders and their teams. More discussion and consideration was needed regarding the consequences for peace operations when it came to operating in these high threat environments.

The lack of clear agreement over definitions of terrorist and violent extremism presented challenges from the outset in discussions over the issue. Two divergent views emerged. On the one hand, some participants felt that peacekeepers were not well equipped to deal with issues of counter-terrorism and violent extremism and should therefore not be involved (consistent with findings in the HIPPO report). Such interventions entail the use of force, and peacekeeping troops could be seen as going to war with terrorists affecting their position as impartial actors. Alternatively, some participants drew on their understanding of the United Nations Global Counter Terrorism Strategy and the United Nations Plan of Action for Preventing Violent Extremism to suggest that senior mission leadership could act and manage operations in such complex environments. The UN's Global Counter Terrorism Strategy which member states approved and have continuously reaffirmed their support of calls on member states to address conditions that are conducive to the spread of terrorism as well as on building the capacity of member states to prevent and combat terrorism.

Participants proposed the inclusion of a new operational output and a sub-chapter under the chapter on 'Creating a Secure and Stable Environment' in the Considerations Study. This sub-chapter should aim at: raising awareness of mission leadership on emerging security challenges and preparing mission leaders to address emerging security threats. The sub-chapter should also include an analysis of different types of operations that have been set up to deal with terrorism in order to identify lessons learned and potential avenues of cooperation in environments where missions may be deployed alongside one another (for example, as was the case in Afghanistan with UNAMA, and Mali with MINUSMA).

Mission leaders should carefully analyse the UN Global Counter Terrorism Strategy and the Plan of Action to understand the implications of the two documents on their work. While peace operations are not equipped to conduct counter-terrorism operations, there are important conflict prevention components in these strategies that should be considered by mission leaders.

While not directly engaged in combatting extremist groups, missions may have an important role in strengthening the capacity of the host authorities to prevent and manage the conditions which could be conducive for violent extremism. Missions have to take into consideration the socio-economic as well religious factors that have an influence on their activities on the ground. Initiatives that support the development of livelihood activities, and facilitate community engagement particularly with women and youth, can be important factors in terms of preventative approach (according to the SG's Action Plan). Strengthening judicial processes and legal processes will also form an important part of these longer-term efforts. Mission leaders may have to revise how they sequence and prioritise their interventions particularly in terrorist and extremist environments.

In contexts where missions are operating in an environment where there is an active terrorist or extremist threat, then missions need to consider how they might support the host authorities in mitigating this threat. For example, under the SG's Plan of Action to Prevent Violent Extremism, countries have been directed to develop National Action Plans. Missions may be able to support host authorities in these initiatives, as a vehicle to support conflict prevention efforts and build sustainable peace.

3.6 Transnational Organised Criminal Activity

This session addressed the effects of transnational organized criminal activities on peace operations and senior leadership. Discussions focused on two themes: the importance of knowledge, education and expertise regarding criminal activities in the context of the operation, and cooperation and collaboration with different stakeholders at the national, regional and global efforts to address transnational crime. Participants suggested that the Considerations Study should be reviewed to ensure that transnational organised crime was addressed as a cross-cutting issue.

Transnational organized criminal activities are not a new dynamic in peace operations. However, the complexity and the impact of these types of criminal activities on the ability of missions to implement their mandates has created new challenges that mission leaders need to plan for and address. It was unclear during the discussions which UN entity may have responsibility for tackling some of the cross-border challenges within missions. For example, the UN Office of Drugs and Crimes (UNODC) may be engaged

in regional strategies to address cross-border criminal activity, yet they may have no mandate to cooperate with a mission. Furthermore, peace operations may be limited in their ability to address some of these challenges, as their mandates often only extend to the borders of the country they are deployed in, yet these types of activities cross borders. Criminals are therefore often able to exploit these gaps where missions are deployed.

Regardless of how a mission mandate is formulated, it was critical that mission leaders gave consideration to the impact transnational criminal activities on the ability of the mission to implement its mandate. Such criminal activities may be a significant spoiler in the mission's area of operations, requiring strategies for different components of the mission to engage at various levels. Furthermore, criminal activities can often have a direct connection to governance and the corruption of political leaders and officials within the host government. Therefore understanding the nature of transnational criminal activities is not only essential to address potential threats to mission personnel, but also to ensure mission leaders have a much more thorough understanding of the impact they may have on political dialogue and governance within the country. Ideally these assessments should be carried out during the mission planning process as well as throughout the mission cycle.

In order to understand and address transnational criminal activities, senior leaders need resources, knowledge and education. They require an understanding of the role of other UN agencies and entities such as UNODC, the Department of Political Affairs and the role of UN sanctions in their area of operations. In some instances, they may need to develop cooperation with INTERPOL, regional organisations, UN regional officers and other member states to gain a clearer picture of the regional dynamics and potential threats to the ability of implementing the mission mandate.

In terms of the Considerations Study, the working group agreed that the issue warranted further consideration as a crosscutting issue, since it includes elements that relate to the political environment, protection of civilians, rule of law, security sector reform and overall capacity building of the host state institutions and population.

3.7 Strategic Guidance Framework for International Police

Peacekeeping

Discussions in this working group focused on the Strategic Guidance Framework for International Police Peacekeeping (SGF) and its implications for senior mission leadership. The discussion during the session mainly revolved around national ownership and policing, limits and opportunities in the implementation of the SGF, and the different roles and mandates of police components in peacekeeping. Participants agreed that there needed to be more emphasis given to the role of police in peacekeeping missions, and that it was crucial that the leaders understood the different roles and comparative advantages that police can bring to peacekeeping.

Leadership has a responsibility to ensure that the SGF is passed down to all levels of policing in the mission. Nevertheless, the SGF cannot be used as a guidance tool its own. It needed supplementation with efforts invested in soft-skill development. Despite its concrete value as a doctrinal document, it does thus not offer sufficient preparation for the level of complexity a senior mission leader faces when leading a mission.

Mission leaders, particularly those in the policing component, need to be cognisant of the importance of national ownership to the tasks they are undertaking. In some cases, it may be beneficial to draw on the skills of those serving in the mission that share a common language with the local population. For example, one participant noted a context where some deployed police shared the same language with the host country during a mission and how this had been key in facilitating communication between the mission and local community. Similarly, mission leaders need to ensure they are drawing on the skill sets of different officers serving in the mission. In some instances, engaging female police officers in capacities to work with their national counterparts may be beneficial and support efforts to implement resolution 1325. National ownership could also be facilitated by establishing mechanisms for effective communication with leaders in the community and the local population. For example, in one context, a mission reached out to local mayors to understand their needs and work with them. These initiatives were often essential to build the relationships and identify the work needed to enable the mission to support capacity-building and ultimately transition.

When implementing a policing mandate, mission leaders need to ensure a thorough analysis is undertaken of the existing police, prisons and

justice mechanisms within a country, in order to assess competencies and potential areas of cooperation. It is critical that these tasks are undertaken in cooperation with the host authorities, as a means to support national ownership as well. This also requires cultural awareness, to understand some of the institutional dynamics that may be unique to the local context that police are operating within. The national police force performs an essential part in the building a country's judiciary system and in the strengthening of rule of law, so it is critical that UNPOL and the national police work effectively together when possible. Mission leaders have an important role here in facilitating this cooperation and overall direction within the mission.

It is also important the mission leaders understand some of the key distinctions between military functions and police functions within the mission. This is particularly important for those mission leaders that may be new to operating in a mission environment. Building a relationship between the military and police components is key to the overall effectiveness of a mission.

In terms of reviewing the Considerations Study many participants stressed that the role of police peacekeepers needed more thorough treatment and that it must be recognised as a key function of peacekeeping missions. Police peacekeepers have a critical role in not only supporting the short-term goals of the mission when it comes to public order (for example, Formed Police Units) and mentoring, but also in support longer-term initiatives to invest in capacity-building. There needed to be a clearer articulation of those different types of functions and responsibilities in the Considerations Study.

3.8 The Use of Emerging Technology for Decision-Making

Technology can act as a critical enabler in peace operations. Unfortunately, senior mission leaders sometimes tend to be slow or outright sceptical in understanding the value of applying and utilising new technology. This is often exacerbated by the hierarchical structures within missions. Leaders need to ensure they are open to the possibilities that technology can deliver in peace operations while also having an understanding of some of the particular risks and consequences.

Communication technologies can increase the nature and volume of information that may be available to a mission. Yet if this is not utilised

effectively, it can become challenging to separate information of substance and consequence from irrelevant information, which may have a detrimental impact on the ability of the mission to quickly verify facts on the ground. This may be compounded by a lack of qualified staff to assess and analyse information within the mission. Nonetheless, if information was analysed and filtered appropriately, communication platforms could enable rapid communication and information sharing among mission personnel. This could support important mechanisms such as early warning which may support the implementation of POC mandates.

Similarly, communication technologies provided a vital platform for missions to communicate with a range of external actors, including armed groups and the local community. A proactive approach to social media, radio usage or other connective technology that is broadly used within the host country is key to gaining trust and dissuading potential rumours that could otherwise reduce the effectiveness of mission activities. For example in Mali, senior staff in the mission created direct links via WhatsApp with local militia factions in order to outline potential conditions for a local cease fire. Using these new platforms enabled the mission to establish a direct and secure line of communication between the parties involved. Communication technologies can be a vital tool for identifying and reaching out to targeted stakeholders. Missions should consider best practices from other contexts where the missions successfully established a constructive dialogue with communities and actors through the use of platforms such as Twitter, Facebook and WhatsApp, for example.

At the same time, it is important to remember that the same advantages that come with new and innovative technologies can also be used utilised against the mission and its staff, since it is also available to armed groups, terrorist organisations or transnational organized crime structures. Mission leaders must grasp the rapid flow of information and the importance of engaging in discussions regarding mission activities that takes place on social media platforms in order to clarify intent and counter damaging rumours.

Tracking the political discourse via social media and establishing cost efficient technological surveillance such as unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's) can assist a mission in establishing holistic situational awareness. UAV's had proven to be particularly useful for the MINUSCO mission in terms of gaining intelligence from remote and often inaccessible regions in real

time, informing decisions by mission leaders. New surveillance technologies should be considered as part of a range of tools and capabilities available to peacekeeping missions. Senior staff should be trained and educated on how to use such technology to optimize mission performance.

Increased cooperation and dialogue between leading technology companies and senior leaders also have the potential to identify new opportunities to integrate emerging technologies into peace operations. For example, this might include identifying access to encryption technologies to ensure secure communication within missions or incorporating new software into the management of databases and information platforms. One participant noted that the UN system is steeped in long and rigorous procurement systems, sometimes resulting in obstructive processes that fail to adapt to the fast-paced environment of new technology. More direct engagement and understanding by mission leaders about emerging technologies may enable more rapid adoption to technology platforms.

Box 5: Integrating Women, Peace and Security as part of leadership

Peace operations are required to implement the UN Security Council's resolutions on women, peace and security (WPS). Similarly, nearly all UN peacekeeping missions are mandated to support the protection of women, their participation in political processes and the integration of gender perspectives into their work. In order to meet these obligations, gender advisers are now routinely deployed as part of peace operations. There are also ongoing efforts from headquarters and the field to ensure that women are deployed into senior leadership roles, and that the numbers of female personnel deployed to peace operations (particularly military and police) are increased.

Several high-level studies have recognised the need to strengthen the implementation of WPS within peace operations. In 2015, the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations noted that there was an 'inconsistent application' of WPS in mandate formulation and renewals, which was compounded by a lack of analysis of those issues in reports and briefings to the Council, including briefings by senior mission leaders. It recommended that gender be integrated into all mission components, with the Senior Gender Advisor to be located in the Office of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, directly reporting to the Special Representative and providing advice to the senior mission leadership team on integrating a gender perspective into the activities of the mission. Many of the same recommendations were echoed in the Global Study on the Implementation of United Nations Security Council resolution 1325. Yet many challenges remain, with decisions on the ground in missions and regarding

mission budgets often having an impact on the access of gender advisers to senior leadership within missions.¹⁶

The 2017 Secretary-General's annual report on women, peace and security noted that a 'gender in peacekeeping' dashboard had been established to support senior leadership to monitor progress, and that there was targeted senior leadership training on WPS commitments. Yet it acknowledged that efforts to increase the levels of female military and police officers in UN peacekeeping missions continued to remain well below the targets that have been set. Most recently, in announcing his 'Action for Peacekeeping' agenda, Secretary-General Antonio Guterres noted that '[T]he presence of women in our operations contributes directly to increase mission effectiveness and credibility, yet we have to repeatedly asked for more female military officers, soldiers and police personnel. The UN faces similar challenges in ensuring that women are appointed to senior leadership positions within missions.

3.9 Scenario-Based Learning for Senior Leadership Teams in UN Field Missions

Scenario-based and crisis response training had been identified as an important tool for training senior leaders in several recent reviews.¹⁷ Efforts were underway within some think tanks and training organisations to produce scenario-based training exercises where future senior leadership teams could practice strategic thinking, effective decision-making and crisis management. The aim was to create eight different modules, containing scenarios that would take approximately three hours to complete. The fictional scenarios would represent a mix of crisis management issues, ranging from incidents that could be handled at mission level (such as attacks towards the mission or a POC crisis) to strategic issues that required more cooperation with headquarters (budget cuts or hostile host nations). These exercises should be designed to reflect a complex and blurred reality, where participants would not deal with traditional "right or wrong" answers but instead focus on identifying plausible steps forward in addressing and containing the crisis. The course instructors would include at least one former SRSB or Force Commander, who ideally would also assume the role of a future mentor for the leadership team.

¹⁶ See, for example, Sarah Taylor, 'UN Peacekeeping: Where is the Gender Expertise?', International Peace Institute Global Observatory, 27 October 2017, available here <https://theglobalobservatory.org/2017/10/un-peacekeeping-where-is-the-gender-expertise/>.

¹⁷ United Nations, 'Executive Summary of the Independent Special Investigation into the violence which occurred in Juba in 2016 and UNMISS response', 1 November 2016.

The aim of the working group discussions in this context was to brainstorm some of the challenges when it came to developing the methodology and content of the scenario-based training. Some participants raised concerns that these scenarios might be too narrowly focused on reactive aspects of leadership. Subsequently, there was a risk that proactive measures such as capacity-building, strengthening of institutions or establishing long term POC mechanisms would be overlooked when designing each exercise. Some other challenges that were identified related to how best to integrate the role of the local population into the scenarios, as well as the use of communication tools such as social media. These were all relevant considerations that needed to be factored in by mission leaders.

Several participants noted the importance of ensuring the scenarios captured responsibilities as they related to Security Council Resolution 1325 (women, peace and security) and 2250 (youth, peace and security). Similarly, scenarios needed to include developments that would test the ability of senior leaders to adequately address cases of sexual exploitation and abuse.

Many participants expressed enthusiasm regarding the possibility of wide spread usage of these modules. Some participants noted that the scenario-based exercises could also be of benefit not only to incoming senior leaders, but also staff engaged in middle management of adviser roles as that often form an important part of the mission management team. Similarly, the exercises would also be of benefit to staff at UN headquarters, ensuring that are aware of the multifaceted challenges that leadership teams face during deployments.

It was possible there may be some resistance among senior staff to participate in the scenario-based exercises. Some senior leaders involved in past exercises had been reluctant to take advice from former Force Commander trainers and mentors. This demonstrated that there was an important need to ensure that scenario-based training was a compulsory requirement for incoming senior mission leaders, rather than an optional activity.

3.10 Bridging Peace Operations with Humanitarian Assistance and Long-Term Development

The aim of the working group was to discuss challenges for senior leadership regarding social and economic recovery, bridging peace operations with

humanitarian assistance and long-term development, and creating a continuum between peace operations and sustained peace. One of the key challenges for mission leaders related to communication and coordination, where appropriate, between different humanitarian actors and UN agencies on the ground. Changing this silo mentality was often difficult due to concerns about the interference of mission leadership therefore further consideration was needed of mechanisms for leaders to overcome some of this resistance and opposition in the field. This was particularly important given the increasingly important role of communication between missions and different non-governmental actors on the ground. Each of the different actors needed to have an understanding of the different strengths and comparative advantages that they could contribute in efforts to facilitate longer-term development.

The discussion came back several times to the importance of viewing the mission within the context of larger reform agendas. Most of these reforms had taken place following the development of the first Considerations Study, therefore needed more comprehensive consideration to integrate key findings into version 2.0. For example, there was a need for mission leaders to understand the implications of Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development in terms of their mission responsibilities. The Sustainable Development Goals were an essential part of the peace process.

With regards to the Considerations Study, it was agreed that Chapter 6 was the most outdated and required comprehensive revision. More knowledge needed to be integrated regarding the concept of sustaining peace, including what this meant for mission leaders in terms of working with other actors such as UN agencies, humanitarian organisations and non-governmental organisations. Furthermore, there needed to be more exhaustive treatment of issues such as the time-frames and prioritisation processes of different mandated tasks within mission, as well as approaches to support the different roles and tasking provided to the police component in missions, given their critical role in supporting the development of sustainable institutions. Finally, some participants suggested that the examination of mission transitions in the Considerations Study lacked significant depth and needed more comprehensive treatment in the next version. Many of these concepts could be examined as approaches in support of ‘sustaining peace’.

Mission leaders also needed to consider the mechanisms and processes to

support national and local ownership. The requirements can differ greatly between missions in terms of culture as well as expectations. There can also be difference in attitude from the local community in rural and urban areas within one mission. Leaders must have an understanding of when they have authority to coordinate different actors and when they do not have this author. Giving the local community ownership must be prioritized above all, as there can be no sustained peace in a community that is resisting the mission. Inviting different groups and actors to consult with leadership at an early stage in a mission could support the creation of greater community ownership.

3.11 Root Causes of Conflict and Sustaining Peace

The sustaining peace framework is ‘a change of mindset’. The concept of ‘sustaining peace’ was a new one that had emerged within the UN context in recent years, although it was grounded in concepts related to conflict prevention, mediation, peacebuilding and development. The term had gained new momentum within the context of peace operations due to the findings of the HIPPO, Review of the UN Peacebuilding Architecture and the adoption of simultaneous resolutions in the General Assembly and Security Council in 2016.¹⁸ This session sought to create an understanding of the meaning of sustaining peace while also linking it to the 2030 Sustainable Development Agenda, specifically Goal 16 on peace and security. The session also outlined various suggestions including the development of theories of change for peacekeeping operations, as well as analysis of initiatives that have contributed to sustainable peace in some countries.

Sustaining peace had mostly been associated with the notion of preventing conflict rather than that of building peace. Several participants noted the viewing prevention through a conflict lens was problematic because it becomes a tool for mitigation (which is short-term) rather than peacebuilding (which is long-term). While there was appreciation of the importance of understanding root causes of conflict, it was suggested that more attention was required in analysing and understanding the drivers of peace. When the sustaining peace resolution was being conceptualised for example, Senegal was analysed to find out how it has remained peaceful for so many years despite being surrounded by countries that have experienced violent conflict.

¹⁸ UN General Assembly resolution 70/262 and Security Council resolution 2282 (2016).

It was suggested that peace and conflict mapping would shift the thinking of states of sustaining peace as an agenda only for conflict and post-conflict countries to one that includes all countries.

In the context of peace operations, this meant mission leaders needed to give greater consideration to the notion of building peace and preparing the host authorities for the departure of the peace operation from day one. In other words, ongoing consideration needed to be given to transition and exit strategies, in order to move from peacekeeping to non-peacekeeping contexts. This would differ in each mission context requiring mission leaders to consider how best to support capacity-building initiatives that would be sustainable and support the departure of a mission.

In linking peacekeeping operations to sustaining peace, mission leaders also needed to view their activities as projects with clearly defined theories of change that explain how other actors will be engaged in peacekeeping activities, and the relevance of their engagement in sustaining peace. By providing a theory of change, the leadership is also able explain who will be accountable for what aspects of the operations.

Participants suggested that a framing chapter on sustaining peace be included in the Considerations Study. This was referred to as the “chapeau” chapter as it would integrate all aspects of peacekeeping operations including the technical and resource considerations. Furthermore, participants also suggested that the Considerations Study should identify all the ‘harms’ or adverse impacts that may be caused by the deployment of a peace operation (whether intentional or unintentional). This may include the environmental and economic impacts of operations, including recruiting local mission staff on other sectors in the host country or the impact on unemployment when a mission mandate comes to an end. By facilitating greater awareness of these potential negative impacts, mission leaders should be better placed to consider how to address them in mission contexts, contributing to more sustainable approaches and long-term peace.

In summary, participants underlined that the sustaining peace framework could help to approach issues in peace operations more holistically and more dynamically. Local and national actors had a critical role in building sustainable peace and addressing root causes of conflict. Mission leaders had an important role in establishing platforms that facilitate dialogue and peacebuilding. Similarly, mission leaders needed to ensure that the host

authorities and local communities understood that missions were temporary. Ultimately, it was the responsibility of the host authorities to sustain peace. Peace operations can assist in addressing the root causes of conflicts, but not solve them.

Box 6: Sustaining Peace

In April 2016, the Security Council and General Assembly adopted identical resolutions on sustaining peace.¹⁹ The formulation of the resolutions followed the three major reviews that had been undertaken throughout 2015 examining peace operations, women, peace and security and the peacebuilding architecture, as well as the new Agenda 2030 for Sustainable Development.

In January 2018, the Secretary-General released his first report on peacebuilding and sustaining peace pursuant to requests in the resolutions adopted nearly two years earlier.²⁰ The report provides an update on progress to implement those resolution as well as specific recommendations. Leadership is highlighted as an area of focus in the report. In particular, it notes that there is a 'need for collaborate leadership' particularly when a peace operations is being drawn down. In this regard, the report recommends that there is a mapping of capacity of the UN country team with the identified peacebuilding priorities, and that this be discussed with Member States through the Peacebuilding Commission (with Liberia identified as a good example). In particular, the report notes the importance of comprehensive gender analysis as part of that efforts to ensure that gains on gender equality are not eroded when the mission departs.

In a demonstration of wide-spread support for the concept, the General Assembly and Security Council subsequently adopted identical follow-up resolutions on peacebuilding and sustaining peace in April 2018.²¹ The adoption of the resolution in the General Assembly followed a High-Level Meeting in the General Assembly on the topic, and requests the Secretary-General to reports on his recommendations and options to advance the agenda going forward.

¹⁹ UN General Assembly resolution 70/262 and Security Council resolution 2282 (2016).

²⁰ United Nations General Assembly and Security Council, *Peacebuilding and sustaining peace – Report of the Secretary-General*, UN Doc A/72/707-S/2018/42, 18 January 2018.

²¹ UN General Assembly resolution 72/276 and Security Council resolution 2413 (2018).

4. Conclusion: Next Steps

The Challenges Forum 2017 provided a valuable platform for discussion of a range of issues currently facing mission leaders in peace operations. There are several areas that will require work in this forthcoming version of the Considerations Study.

First, initiatives to address developments in existing chapters will need to take in significant developments related to the adoption of Security Council and General Assembly resolutions, as well new and revised guidance and doctrine on a range of cross-cutting issues. This includes on topics such as protection of civilians; intelligence; policing; women, peace and security, and youth peace and security. It will also be critical that chapters and work strands examine tools available to mission leaders, such as emerging technologies in communications and situational awareness, as well as scenario based training.

Second, Challenges Partners will need to give in-depth and comprehensive consideration in relation to developments such as terrorism and extremism, and sustaining peace. While the HIPPO Report articulated that peace operations are not the right tool to deal with terrorism and that peace operations should not be conducting counter-terrorism operations, they are nonetheless deployed in those environments, whether they be political missions, or peacekeeping operations. Mission leaders need to be prepared to operate in these environments. Similarly, with the evolution in discussions within the UN system about ‘sustaining peace’, leaders need to be giving thought as to how this concept impacts on their approach to mission planning and operations, right from day one.

Third, discussions during the Challenges Forum made it clear that the Considerations Study needs to ensure there is even more emphasis on the importance of accountability in leadership, particularly as it related to approaches to deal with sexual exploitation and abuse, as well as mandated tasks such as protection of civilians.

Building on this work, this summary of discussions is intended to provide a framework to allow the Challenges Partners to take forward work to revise the Considerations Study, so that it may serve as a useful guidance

tool for those tasked with leading future peace operations. Many of the recommendations that emerged during the two-day forum echo the challenges being considered as part of the Secretary-General's Action for Peacekeeping initiative and may serve as a useful guide to inform discussions and debates about those reforms throughout 2018 and beyond.

Appendix 1. Programme

Sunday, October 8

19:00-20:30 Welcoming Reception at Hotel

Monday, October 9

08:00-08:45 Registration

08:45-10:00 Welcome and Opening

Speakers Assoc. Prof. Mesut Özcan, Chairman, Center for Strategic Research (SAM), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey

Keynotes Gen. Hulusi Akar, Chief of Turkish General Staff, Turkey

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

Dr Björn Holmberg, Director, International Secretariat of the Challenges Forum, hosted by the Folke Bernadotte Academy

Keynotes Ms Ameerah Haq, Former Under-Secretary-General, Department of Field Support, United Nations / Former Special Representative of the Secretary-General, UNMIT, Former Member of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, Bangladesh

10:00-10:15 Break

10:15-11:30 Considerations for Mission Leadership in United Nations Peacekeeping Operations – Setting the Framework
Introduction to the Considerations Study and tentative key emerging issues to address. Reflections of acting and former Senior Mission Leaders - political, police, military - on leadership challenges and opportunities in UN Peace Operations. Also on strengthening the leadership life cycle, and the challenge of reaching gender parity.

Chair	Maj. Gen. Robert Gordon, Senior Adviser, Challenges Forum / Former Force Commander, UNMEE, United Kingdom
Speakers	<p>Ms Diane Corner, Former Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General, MINUSCA, United Kingdom</p> <p>Ms Elisabeth Spehar, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, UNFICYP, United Nations</p> <p>Brig. Gen. Riana Paneras, Senior Researcher, Institute for Security Studies / Former Police Commissioner, UNAMID, South Africa</p> <p>Lt. Gen. (Retd.) Chander Prakash Wadhwa, Former Force Commander MONUSCO, India</p> <p>Ms Gabriella Seymour, Chief, Senior Leadership Appointment Section, Office of the Under-Secretary-General, Department of Field Support</p>
11:30-11:45	Group Photo
11:45-13:00	Lunch
Keynote	Prof. Abdulkadir Varoglu, Deputy President, Baskent University, Turkey
13:00-14:15	<p>Session 1 on Senior Leadership: Cross-Cutting Issues and Mission Management (Chapter 2 of Study) / Facilitating and Supporting the Political Process (Chapter 3 of Study)</p> <p>This session focus on addressing key emerging issues such as Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA), Protection of Civilians (POC), Gender, and, Peace Operations and Civil Society. Furthermore, the Forum participants are encouraged to identify other key emerging issues relevant to this session in the working groups.</p>
Chair	Mr Amr Aljowaily, Deputy Assistant Foreign Minister for United Nations Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Egypt
Speakers	SEA: Ms Jane Connors, Assistant Secretary-General, Victims' Rights Advocate, United Nations

- POC: Ms Savita Pawnday, Deputy Executive Director, Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, India
- Political Process: Ms Eiko Ikegaya, Team Leader, Policy Planning Unit, Policy and Mediation Division, Department of Political Affairs, United Nations
- Civil society: Mr Bonian Golmohammadi, Secretary-General, World Federation of United Nations Associations (WFUNA), United Nations
- 14:15-15:30 Parallel Working Groups: Senior Leadership and Emerging Issues (Chapter 2 / Chapter 3)
- Working Gr 1: Senior leadership and Sexual Exploitation and Abuse (SEA); Chair, Maj. Gen. Kristin Lund, Senior Adviser, NODEFIC, Norway
- Working Gr 2: Senior leadership and Protection of Civilians (POC); Chair, Dr. Alan Ryan, Executive Director, Australian Civil-Military Centre, Australia
- Working Gr 3: Senior leadership and Peace Operations and Civil Society; Chair Dr. Almut Wieland-Karim, Executive Director, ZIF, Germany
- Working Gr 4: Senior leadership and the Political Process; Chair, Mr Laurence Wilkes, Deputy-Head of UN Peacekeeping, Foreign and Commonwealth Office, United Kingdom
- 15:30-15:50 Break
- 15:50-17:15 Report Back in Plenary
- Chair Mr Amr Aljowaily, Deputy Assistant Foreign Minister for United Nations Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Egypt
- SpeakersChairs of the working groups
- 17:15-17:30 Wrap up Day
- Mr Jonas Alberoth, Deputy Secretary-General, Folk Bernadotte Academy, Sweden

18:30-21:00 Bosphorus sightseeing boat tour & dinner

Tuesday, October 10

08:30-09:30 Session 2 on Senior Leadership: Creating a Secure and Stable Environment (Chapter 4 of Study) / Strengthening Rule of Law with Respect for Human Rights (Chapter 5 of Study)

This session focus on addressing the key emerging issues related to the challenges in UN peace operations staff sharing space of with counter terrorism – if and how to deal with extremism, transnational organised criminal activity and its effect on security, and, the Strategic Guidance Framework for International Police Peacekeeping (SGF). Furthermore, the Forum participants are encouraged to identify other key emerging issues relevant to this session in the working groups.

Chair Col. Brian R. Foster, Peace Operations Division Chief, Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI), US Army War College, United States

Speakers Mr Mahamat Saleh Annadif, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, MINUSMA, United Nations
Superintendent Luis Carrilho, Former Police Commissioner, MINUSCA, MINUSTAH, and UNMIT, Portugal tbc
Brigadier General, Ali Ucarı, Turkish Armed Forces, Turkey
Consul General Ms Jennifer L. Davis, Former Senior Adviser to United States Foreign Policy Administration; United States
Ms Georgette Gagnon, Director, Field Operations and Technical Cooperation Division, Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, United Nations
Dr. Mark Downes, Assistant Director, Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, Switzerland

09:30-10:50 Parallel Working Groups: Senior Leadership and Emerging Issues (Chapter 4 / Chapter 5)

Working Group 1: Senior leadership and how to manage

peace operations in a terrorist and extremist environment; Chair, Mr Shujah Ahmed, Director, International Studies, Institute for Strategic Studies Research and Analysis, National Defense University, Pakistan

Working Group 2: Senior leadership and transnational organized criminal activity, and its effect on security; Chair, Brig. Gen. Riana Paneras, Senior Researcher, Institute for Security Studies / Former Police Commissioner, UNAMID, South Africa

Working Group 3: Senior leadership and the Strategic Guidance Framework for International Police Peacekeeping (SGF); Co-Chairs, Police Commissioner Ufuk Ayhan, Deputy Director of Police Academy, Turkey and Police Commissioner Anne-Marie Orlor, former UN Police Adviser, Swedish Police

Working Group 4: Senior leadership and the use of emerging technology for decision making; Chair, Lt. Gen. (Retd.) Chander Prakash Wadhwa, United Service Institute, India

Working Group 5: Scenario-Based Learning for Senior Leadership Teams in UN Field Missions; Chair, Mr Arthur Boutellis, Brian Urquhart Center for Peace Operations, International Peace Institute, United States

10:50-11:45

Report Back in Plenary

Chair

Col. Brian R. Foster, Peace Operations Division Chief, Peacekeeping and Stability Operations Institute (PKSOI), US Army War College, United States

Speakers

Chairs of the working groups

11:45-12:15

Reflections on the ongoing UN Reforms, Peace Operations, and Leadership

Chair

Dr Björn Holmberg, Director, International Secretariat of the Challenges Forum, hosted by the Folke Bernadotte Academy

Speaker

Mr Fabrizio Hochschild, Assistant Secretary-General for Strategic Coordination, Executive Office of the Secretary

General, United Nations

12:15-13:15	Lunch - Roof Panorama Hall- The Marmara Hotel
Keynote	Mr Mustafa Sani Şener, CEO, TAV Airports
13:15-14:15	<p>Session 3 on Senior Leadership: Promoting Social and Economic Recovery (Chapter 6 of Study)</p> <p>This session focus on addressing the key emerging issues related to and challenges of social and economic recovery in the light of the HIPPO report and its recommendation of bringing conflict prevention and mediation to the fore. How do we create a continuum between peace operations and long term development addressing root causes of conflict having in mind the UN Secretary-General considerations on sustained peace? Furthermore, the Forum participants are encouraged to identify other key emerging issues relevant to this session in the working groups.</p>
Chair	Ambassador Lina Arafat, Director, Jordan Institute of Diplomacy, Jordan
Speakers	<p>Mr Alexander Ilitchev, Former member of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations, Russian Federation</p> <p>Ms Gwendolyn Myers, Founder and Executive Director, Messengers of Peace, and Global Shaper, World Economic Forum, Liberia</p> <p>Dr Youssef Mahmoud, Senior Adviser, International Peace Institute, Former Member of the High-level Independent Panel on Peace Operations</p>
14:15-14:45	Break
14:45-16:00	Parallel Working Groups: Senior Leadership and Emerging Issues (Chapter 6)

Chair	<p>Working Group 1: Senior leadership challenges regarding social and economic recovery - bridging peace operations with humanitarian assistance and long-term development; Ms Johanna Gårdmark, Director, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden</p> <p>Working Group 2: Senior leadership challenges on how do we address root causes of conflict having in mind the UN Secretary-General considerations on sustained peace, Mr Jonas Albero, Deputy Director-General, Folke Bernadotte Academy, Sweden</p> <p>Working Group 3: Senior leadership challenges on how do we address root causes of conflict having in mind the UN Secretary-General considerations on sustained peace, Ms Diane Corner, Former Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General, MINUSCA, United Kingdom</p> <p>Working Group 4: Senior leadership challenges on how do we address root causes of conflict having in mind the UN Secretary-General considerations on sustained peace, Mr Bonian Golmohammadi, Secretary-General, World Federation of United Nations Associations</p> <p>Working Group 5: TENTATIVE Scenario-Based Learning for Senior Leadership Teams in UN Field Missions, Chair, Mr Arthur Boutellis, Brian Urquhart Center for Peace Operations, International Peace Institute, United States</p>
16:00-16:45	Report Back in Plenary
Chair	Ambassador Lina Arafat, Director, Jordan Institute of Diplomacy, Jordan
Speakers	Chairs of the working groups
16:45-17:30	Concluding Session – Concluding Remarks
Chair	Assoc. Prof. Mesut Özcan, Acting Chairman, Center for Strategic Research (SAM), Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Turkey
Speakers	<p>Mr Jean-Marie Guéhenno, Patron, Challenges Forum / President, International Crisis Group, France</p> <p>Assoc. Prof. Talha Köse, Ibn Haldun University (Istanbul),</p>

Turkey

Dr Björn Holmberg, Director, International Secretariat of
the Challenges Forum, hosted by the Folke Bernadotte
Academy

18:45-21:30 Reception hosted by the Consulate General of Sweden in
Istanbul

