

Building Partnerships for Capacity-Building of Peacekeepers¹

BACKGROUND PAPER

ANNUAL FORUM 2014: Building Capacity for Peace Operations in Response to Diversified Threats: What Lies Ahead?

Challenges Forum, 14–16 October 2014, Beijing, China.

Aim and Scope

This paper examines the types of capacity-building partnerships that are required, given the changing nature of peace operations and the increased complexity of modern missions and environments. It looks at the possibilities for cooperation within the wider international community for ensuring that peacekeepers in the future will be identified, prepared and equipped to meet the challenges of modern peace operations. It identifies the areas where the activities and efforts of capacity-building need to focus, suggests the types of partnerships that are necessary, and proposes ways and methodologies of designing such partnerships and the additional tools that such partnerships might employ. It further proposes how the current international system might adapt its approaches to capacity-building in order to enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of preparing for modern peace operations.

The paper takes into account a number of relevant considerations in the current UN project on Training Architecture². The paper also focuses on the most challenging aspect of capacity-building, namely that of preparing peacekeepers through education and training and equipping them with the requisite skills for today's complex and dangerous missions.

The Changing Nature of Peace Operations and Increased Complexity of Missions

The nature and complexity of modern peace operations continues to evolve. In a recent statement to the UN Security Council, the Secretary-General offered three principal observations: that 'UN peacekeeping operations are increasingly mandated to operate where there is no peace to keep'; 'some UN peacekeeping operations are being authorized in the absence of clearly identifiable parties to the conflict or a viable political process'; and, 'UN peacekeeping operations are increasingly operating in more complex environments that feature asymmetric and unconventional threats'³. He went on to note that he has mandated the Secretariat to

COL (Retd) DAVID LIGHTBURN is a specialist in multi-dimensional peace operations; crisis management (NATO & EU); civilian-military-police relations; peace operations education and training. His politico-military background includes a 30-year military and diplomatic service; extensive experience in, and with, international organisations, including 13 years as NATO International Staff (1987–2000)—principal member of NATO's Balkans Task Force and founder and Head of the Alliance's Peacekeeping Section; 2001–04 Director External Affairs Canada's Pearson Peacekeeping Center. He is currently a senior advisor to the Folke Bernadotte Academy Sweden (since 2004); permanent member of Executive Committee of the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centers (since 2005); co-Director Evaluation for Swedish Viking series of integrated exercises (since 2005); an international consultant for UN Training Architecture Project (2014); and, independent crisis management consultant.



中国国际战略学会



¹ This paper is a commissioned background paper for the International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations. The views expressed are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Challenges Forum Partnership or the Host.

² This paper's author is an International Consultant supporting the current UN project on a systematic review of the peacekeeping training architecture.

³ Excerpts from an 11 June 2014 Statement by the UN Secretary-General to the UN Security Council.

initiate a review of UN peacekeeping and this review is scheduled for completion by end April 2015.

In addition to the Secretary-General's review, and also relevant to capacity-building, the Security Council has asked the Secretary-General for 'an assessment report and recommendations on the progress of the partnerships between the UN and relevant regional organizations in peacekeeping operations'⁴. This report is due 'no later than 31 March 2015'.

This challenging peacekeeping environment was further elaborated by a senior UN official during the 20th annual conference of the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centers (IAPTC) in June 2014⁵. In addition to dangerous environments and lack of peace agreements, peacekeepers are challenged by new and expanded tasks as a result of more complex mandates and the implications of multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations. Moreover, such trends and the consequent need for more effective training come at a time of increasing resource constraints and expectations for greater efficiencies in training, including in the field of capacity-building.

To meet the new challenges, the police community, under the lead of the UN's Office of the Rule of Law and Security Institutions (OROLSI), is currently developing a detailed Strategic Guidance Framework (SGF). This project will continue until end 2015 but already the framework for police pre-deployment training (PDT), and its linkage to in-mission induction training, has been developed and tested, with a significant UN train the trainer element.

The Capacity-Building Training Requirement

The evolving dangerous, complex and expanding peacekeeping environment implies a need for enhanced capabilities and greater understanding of the operating environment.

The UN has conducted two Peacekeeping Training Needs Assessments (TNAs) since 2008⁶ ⁷. The first helped define peacekeeping training strategy, policies and standards that have been implemented since then. The second TNA in 2012 and 2013 built on the main findings of the 2008 report; emphasizing the link between mandate implementation and training needs. It determined the knowledge, skills and behaviors required for effective mandate implementation, identified performance and skill gaps, and also assessed current training activities and mechanisms. The conclusions of these reports, in particular the 2012 study, need to be a key factor in the development of peacekeeping training in UN member states, regional organizations and capacity-building countries and programs.

⁴ United Nations, Security Council, *Resolution 2167*, Resolution, UN S/RES/2167(2014), 28 July 2104

⁵ David Haeri, at IAPTC, 24 June 2014, Jakarta, Indonesia.

⁶ United Nations, Integrated Training Service, Policy, Evaluation and Training Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, *Report on the Strategic Peacekeeping Training Needs Assessment*, October 2008.

⁷ United Nations, Integrated Training Service, Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support, *Training: a Strategic Investment in UN Peacekeeping, Global Peacekeeping Training Needs Assessment*, Final Report 2012-2013, 2013.

A further principal factor affecting peacekeeping training is the formal acknowledgement recognition by the Security Council in 2013 of Multi-dimensional Peacekeeping⁸. There are two principal implications for training from the UN's concept of multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations: the first is that it is important that all contributors to a UN mission are aware of the other contributors and their basic strengths and capabilities; the second is that all need to be aware of the various dimensions of such operations and their own particular roles, as well as those of others. This means, for all uniformed personnel, greater understanding of the complexities of both security and rule of law operations, but also of their roles in security sector reform (SSR), disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of combatants (DDR) and humanitarian operations. Contemporary mandates for peacekeeping also emphasize the need for a broader understanding of each other's roles in areas such as protection of civilians, sexual and gender-based violence and child protection.

The principal elements requiring both PDT and in-mission training include military contingents, formed police units, individual military officers (staff officers, observers and liaison officers), individual police, and civilians (seconded and recruited).

Partnerships in Capacity-Building

Capacity-building in support of modern peace operations is a challenging task for the international community. The identification of modern peacekeepers is a national responsibility, in support of UN-mandated missions that are conducted by the UN itself, or by regional organizations, or in some cases by coalitions of the willing. In all cases some form of force generation process identifies countries willing to contribute uniformed contingents, as well as individual military and police personnel— the Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs) and the Police Contributing Countries (PCCs). Some member states also second civilians to both the UN and to their respective regional organization.

Partnership No. 1—the UN and Member States

Perhaps the most significant partnership in today's peace operations is that of the UN and its member states themselves. The relationship is clearly defined in the UN's Policy on Training for all United Nations Peacekeeping Personnel⁹. The responsibility for PDT is that of the member states. UN Integrated Training Service (ITS) specifies standards for such training, develops and distributes training material, and provides specific support for national PDT in the form of train-the trainers' courses, and the provision of mobile training support teams for new material/subjects. As mentioned above, the UN is currently examining ways of strengthening this relationship as a part of its project on strengthening the overall UN training architecture. The relationship with those member states who are not principal TCCs or PCCs, but willing to contribute to capacity-building, is equally important.

⁸ United Nations, Security Council, 6903rd meeting, SC/10888, 21 January 2013.

⁹ United Nations, Department of Peacekeeping Operations, Department of Field Support, *Training for all United Nations Peacekeeping Personnel*, Policy, 2010.20, 1 May 2010.

There are a number of challenges, but also promising areas for progress, in these important capacity-building partnerships. A first issue is the current proliferation of UN training material, combined with a generally 'non-user friendly' UN training website. Improving this situation can be accomplished through a revised and streamlined website, together with the effective communication of training material and other information—the formats (web, CD, memory stick, paper copy—all or some) and the means (through UN missions in New York, or through formal regional, or other less formal gatherings such as the IAPTC and its related regional associations¹⁰). New demands and material resulting from the implications of multi-dimensional peacekeeping and more comprehensive mandates can also be addressed through a renewed emphasis on UN teams of train-the-trainers (ToTs), especially for training new materials such as Child Protection and Protection of Civilians. These teams also become an area where new partnerships between the UN and volunteer member states can contribute. For countries new to peacekeeping, or for training organizations requiring advice and assistance in design and delivery of courses, the UN has developed Mobile Training Support Teams (MTSTs). This too is an area where other volunteer member states or training organizations may wish to partner with the UN and contribute. Another issue challenging the UN is the need to streamline its certification of training processes, to enable countries to build local capacity to UN standards and for donor countries to achieve a greater degree of 'legitimacy' through UN certification of specific courses.

A particular need in this UN-member state partnership is a data-base—a key tool for communicating the possible international and regional sources of training, its availability and its ease of use. Such a data-base needs to be a particularly focused and specially-structured effort, so that instead of 'laundry-lists' of training organizations and their courses, perhaps the data-base should be organized based on mission training needs, i.e. categories of training such as military contingents, Formed Police Units (FPUs), UN Military Observers (UNMOs), UN Logistics Officers (UNLOs), UN Special Operations (UNSOs), police mentors, police induction, senior leaders, etc. Under such headings available training by region could be identified with facts such as specific courses or training, initial contact information, dates, availability, responsibility for costs, and designed so that exhaustive net searches are not necessary. Critical to such an effort however is a management concept and responsibility, and an effective updating process.

One other area for capacity-building focus is that of the important need for effective senior leadership in missions. Both recent UN training needs assessments identified this as a critical factor for mission success. The UN has its own Senior Mission Leadership (SML) training—a course that takes place quite frequently in different parts of the world,

¹⁰ International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centers (IAPTC), and 4 regional affiliations. In Africa, the African Peace Support Trainers Association (APSTA); in the Americas, Latin American Association of Peacekeeping Training Centers (ALCOPAZ); in the Asia/Pacific region, the Association of Asia Pacific Peace Operations Training Centers (AAPTC); and in Europe it is the European Association of Peace Operations Training Centers (EAPTC).

and it offers some three days of induction training prior to deployment. Others including regional organizations like the African Union (AU) and European Union (EU) as well as individual countries have similar programs but these are generally not recognized by the UN system. This therefore is an area for potential harmonization of standards and curricula, the careful selection of national candidates (only the most likely qualified and deployable candidates), the maintenance of (national and/or centralized) standby lists of trained officials, and the need for more such training and more UN member state support (including its funding).

Partnership No. 2—the UN and Regional Organizations

As noted at the outset, the UN is currently reviewing progress in its partnerships with regional organizations, most notably the AU and the EU with whom the UN conducts hybrid and composite missions. The current UN training architecture project suggests that increasing involvement of some regional, and sub-regional, organizations in coordinating, guiding and otherwise supporting training within a region could strengthen capacity in countries in the region or sub-region. Aside from obvious economies and efficiencies, there is potential to achieve a greater degree of interoperability of militaries and police, in particular in Africa, and such regional/sub-regional cooperation would also leverage cultural ties and strengths.

The UN relationship with the EU is more focused on working to build capacity in other regions and sub-regions, especially in Africa and Asia. Current education and training efforts include harmonization of training standards, cooperation in methodologies for evaluation of training, seeking compatibility in training certification and mechanisms, and even ensuring a greater standardization of training terminology. These steps will not only increase the potential for enhanced interoperability in composite or hybrid missions, but also strengthen the potential for more standardized capacity-building.

The UN partnership with regions need not be limited to the obvious formal organizations; partnership could usefully extend to the aforementioned IAPTC and its four regional associations. The annual meetings of each of these ‘training-focused’ gatherings provide opportunities for the UN to communicate developments in training standards and policies, to distribute materials, to seek contributions to ToT teams and MTSTs, and to otherwise meet bilaterally and multilaterally with TCCs, PCCs, and capacity-building donors.

Partnership No. 3—Capacity-building Donor Countries and Recipients of Assistance

A number of UN member states are engaged in capacity-building, in particular European and North American countries, and Australia. The partnerships between countries receiving capacity-building assistance and those delivering such assistance offer the most potential for the international community for additional capacity, but at the same time they can be fraught with difficulties and consequences. The challenge is to harmonize this well-intentioned training to agreed standards, and thus

prepare effective and relatively interoperable peacekeepers to meet today's and tomorrow's challenges.

Some of the challenges in these partnerships include the establishing of conditions on the part of the donor—number of courses or exercises, aim of the training, the eligibility criteria for participants (local, regional, international?), costs, etc. A further concern is that some training does not necessarily meet the UN standards or cover key aspects of training for multi-dimensional peacekeeping. A third issue is the fact that not a lot of this training is coordinated between donors themselves. Also, there is the question of does the training match the priority training needs or is it just an available expertise from a donor?

Accordingly, since some capacity-building programs of some donor countries and organizations vary in both quality and relevance, the donor countries need to work more closely with the host recipient country, the region, other donors and the UN ITS to determine the range of training needs and priorities, and offer training to UN standards and with a minimum of conditions. This might be done initially by arranging one or more capacity-building donor's workshops, with a view to harmonizing training standards, training priorities and training delivery means and schedules for a host region and/or set of countries, or as appropriate even individual countries. This might be done under the auspices of a region, a training institution, a country or the UN.

One further possibility is the aforementioned need (in the discussion of UN-member state relations) to match capacity-building donors with those needing timely training, starting during the actual UN (or regional) force generation process.

Another potential for building certain capacities is through distance learning. In certain particularly specialized areas, including some relatively new topics, e-learning or blended learning (combining classroom, exercise and e-learning) can be useful in preparing individuals.

Partnership No. 4 —National Partnerships

One additional partnership where cooperation could significantly improve the effectiveness of uniformed personnel and strengthen national capacity is to begin such cooperation and understanding at home—partnerships between national military, police and, to the extent possible, deployable civilians. Integrated training of military, police and civilians has progressively improved over the past 10 years or so, in particular through national (and international) face-to-face courses designed to accommodate and facilitate multi-functional exchanges of views and experiences.

Progressively a number of former military training institutions have added police advisors/trainers to their staffs, and have actively reached out to representatives from local NGOs, UN agencies and government agencies to support what was previously only military training. National institutions such as in Germany have formed very close, formal, training relationships and exchanges. Courses have emerged that now train military, police and civilians side by side. Other courses have been

designed to have specialized (to function) parts and then culminating in an integrated exercise (Swedish Armed Forces International Centre (SWEDINT) for example). Similarly there are a number of integrated training exercises that adopt a comprehensive approach to design, conduct and evaluation in training military, police and civilians as a part of a training audience together. The most prominent and progressive of these is the Swedish led, United States supported, Viking series.

The challenge to countries therefore is to bring the training of their personnel (uniformed and other) together at some juncture. In most cases this undoubtedly means, as a first step, cooperation amongst government agencies themselves. On the pure technicalities of training, it has been observed in the UN Training Architecture project that a number of countries have extremely well developed and sophisticated military training facilities, due to the culture of training in the military. The use of such established facilities could also benefit police and civilians, but today, in some countries, remain military only. Some of the new training challenges resulting from multi-dimensional peacekeeping and from mandates that emphasize protection of civilians, child protection and sexual and other forms of gender based violence (SGBV) have much training in common for all. Certainly integrated rule of law, SSR and DDR operations, for example, require capacity-building at home rather than learning in the mission. Accordingly a major challenge to all countries is to develop, or as appropriate enhance, multi-functional (integrated) training. Those countries that offer capacity-building assistance need also to focus on this integrated training aspect in the design and delivery of capacity-building support.

Recommendations for further consideration

First, standards of training for peacekeepers vary, with the result that some peacekeepers are not adequately trained prior to deployment, impacting on not only interoperability but also mission effectiveness as a whole. In the interest of mission effectiveness UN minimum training standards should be used as a common basis for the preparation of peacekeeping contingents and individuals.

Second, while the training requirements of new missions are generally identified relatively early in the force generation process, the matching of the training needs of willing TCCs and PCCs with the capacity-building capabilities of other UN member states lags behind. It is proposed that the force generation process (in the UN and regions) include, from the outset, participation by countries willing to contribute to building capacity (as soon as mission needs and the training needs of specific TCCs and PCCs are being identified).

Third, information on the availability and sources of courses, exercises and other education and training for peacekeeping is difficult to find and retrieve. It is proposed that a new data-base be created and managed by the UN that is functional in nature, and where all of the training offered on the site meets UN standards.

Fourth, one of the critical implications of multi-dimensional peacekeeping is the need to work with, and thus understand, the capabilities and roles of other contributors to a mission. It is proposed that interaction and understanding between military, police and civilians begin at home and that national government departments of TCCs and PCCs work together to ensure multi-functional, integrated, education and training in order to strengthen the capacity of national contributions.

Fifth, the capacity-building programs of donor countries vary in both quality and relevance. It is proposed that such donor countries work with the host recipient country, the region, other donors and UN ITS to determine the range of training needs and priorities, and offer training to UN standards and with a minimum of conditions.

Sixth, regional engagement with capacity-building offers considerable potential for economies and efficiencies and greater operational interoperability, through the leveraging of cultural similarities and regional burden-sharing and/or cooperation in training development and delivery. It is proposed that the AU, Organization of American States (OAS) and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) work formally to encourage greater burden-sharing and cooperation within regions and sub-regions, and that the respective informal training associations (respectively the African Peace Support Trainer's Association (APSTA), the Latin American Association of Peacekeeping Operations Training Centers (ALCOPAZ) and the Association of Asia-Pacific Peace Operations Training Centers (AAPTC)) focus on enhanced capacity-building measures and harmonization in the near term.

Seventh, both North American and European countries, and Australia, provide capacity-building programs, but these are not well coordinated amongst the donors, or with regions, host countries and other stakeholders. It is proposed that one or more capacity-building donors' workshops be arranged, with a view to harmonizing training standards, training priorities and training delivery means and schedules for a host region and/or set of countries. This might be done under the auspices of a region or sub-region, an institution, a country or the UN.

Eighth, senior leadership has been identified as a critical factor for mission success. It is proposed that regions and countries with senior leadership training programs harmonize their standards and programs with the UN SML Course. In a related vein it is proposed that member states select candidates for such training carefully, choosing only the most qualified and likely deployable candidates.