

Peace Capacities Network Research Workshop Report 2014

Dr. Lotte Vermeij, Paul Troost and Wael Abdel Wahab



**PEACE
CAPACITIES**

NETWORK BRAZIL · CHINA · EGYPT · INDIA · INDONESIA
NORWAY · RUSSIA · SOUTH AFRICA · TURKEY

Publisher: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
Copyright © Norwegian Institute of International Affairs 2015
Any views expressed in this publication are those of the authors.
They should not be interpreted as reflecting the views of the
Norwegian Institute of International Affairs. The text may not be
printed in part or in full without the permission of the authors.

Visiting address: C.J. Hambros plass 2d
Address: P.O. Box 8159 Dep.
NO-0033 Oslo, Norway

Internet: www.nupi.no
E-mail: info@nupi.no
Tel: [+ 47] 22 99 40 00
Fax: [+ 47] 22 99 40 50

Peace Capacities Network

Research Workshop

Report 2014

Dr. Lotte Vermeij, Paul Troost, Wael Abdel Wahab

Published by Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

About the Peace Capacities Network

The Peace Capacities Network is a group of research institutes located in Brazil, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Norway, Russia, South Africa and Turkey that collectively analyze the growing influence of these countries in the fields of international peacekeeping and peacebuilding. The aim of the network is to enhance knowledge on peace operations, Security Sector Reform (SSR) and civilian capacities from the perspective of these increasingly influential actors in the context of a changing global order.

Peace Capacities Research Workshop

From 7-11 December 2014, the members of the PeaceCap network convened in Cairo for a Research Workshop, hosted by the Cairo Centre for Conflict Prevention and Peacekeeping in Africa (CCCPA). The aim of the workshop was to develop the PeaceCap Network's research agenda on peace operations, SSR, and civilian capacities, and to kick off the studies each of the PeaceCap partners will conduct on these topics during 2015. During the workshop, the PeaceCap partners discussed the specific questions that will inform the three baseline studies on the role of emerging actors in peace operations, security sector reform and civilian capacities.

It was agreed that during 2015, each of the partners would conduct research on the role and engagement of their respective countries with regards to: 1) peace operations, 2) SSR, and 3) civilian capacities. The research will result in three separate national baseline studies for each partner country. Once the national baseline studies are finalized these will be synthesized into three PeaceCap Network reports, providing an overview of the role of emerging actors within peace operations, SSR, and civilian capacities.

The first synthesis report will focus on the role and engagement of emerging actors in peace operations. This study will be coordinated by the PeaceCap partner in India: the United Services Institute of India (USI). The national baseline studies should be submitted to USI and NUPI by 31 July 2015. This will allow for the synthesis report to be published in October 2015 (see further timeline specifications in Peace Operations section below).

The second synthesis report will focus on the role and engagement of emerging actors in SSR. This study will be coordinated by the PeaceCap partner in Russia: the Center for World Politics and Public Diplomacy (CWPPD). The national baseline studies should be submitted to CWPPD and NUPI by 30 October 2015. This will allow for the synthesis report to be published in January 2016 (see further timeline specifications in SSR section below).

The third synthesis report will focus on the role and engagement of emerging actors with regards to civilian capacities in peace operations. This study will be coordinated by the PeaceCap partner in Egypt: the Cairo Centre for Conflict Prevention and Peacekeeping in Africa (CCCPA). The national baseline studies should be submitted to CCCPA and NUPI by 31 December 2015. This will allow for the synthesis report to be published in March 2016 (see further timeline specifications in Civilian Capacities section below).

During the Research Workshop in Cairo, Jasser Elshahed, the Director of the Crisis Response Department of the League of Arab States briefed the participants on the vision and work of his department, and his presentation was followed by a discussion that explored potential areas of collaboration. The final outcome of the Research Workshop was an agreed set of framing questions for each topic to inform the interviews that will be conducted by the researchers responsible for each of the national baseline studies. These will be elaborated upon below.

Research Theme I: Peace Operations

The first discussion was introduced by Senior Research Fellow from NUPI, Dr. Mateja Peter, who drafted a policy brief on the role of emerging powers in peace operations, many of which are represented in the network. According to Dr. Peter, over the last decade, attention for the influence of these powers has been rising in academic and policy circles, both in the Global North and South. The first issue pertains to who is referred to with the adjective 'emerging': the BRICS grouping has traditionally been the most recognizable, and strong economic growth is a strong factor underpinning the rise of new actors in the realm of geopolitics, with peace operations as one of its expressions. But the term can be applied beyond the BRICS bloc, with the less well-known MINT countries (Mexico, Indonesia, Nigeria, Turkey) as the second-tier equivalent to the BRICS. Ultimately, the unique trajectories and histories of their emergence processes means these actors defy wholesale generalization, but they do share a desire for more political influence tied to regional significance. While emerging power countries have historically been relevant before as troop contributing countries, they are now in a process of transition from accepting norms as defined by the Northern liberal peacekeeping agenda to exercising more influencing in setting the norms for the future of peace operations. Up to this point, there are strong indications that the emerging powers are taking different positions on many issues, informed by different historical and political perspectives.

These developments give rise to many questions, the core question being what motivates these countries to engage in peace operations. According to Dr. Peter, one of the conventional attitudes is that Troop Contributing Countries (TCCs) see peacekeeping as a way to externally fund their militaries, but in reality this assumption does not add up.

Other motivations are more persuasive, such as the opportunity to gain experience for armed forces, strengthen regional allegiances, socialize and motivate the troops, and in case of Brazil and India, be taken into consideration for a permanent seat on the Security Council.

But are there other commonalities that suggest a collective outlook on the state of peace operations at this point in time? Most of the emerging powers come from disenfranchised positions, as most have been colonized at one point in time, which to some extent shapes their international engagement. This particularly manifests itself in skepticism about intervention in external affairs, sovereignty, peace enforcement practices contrasted with traditional peacekeeping, issues dealing with the core principles of peacekeeping and the peacekeeping agenda, and domestic governing issues. Then there is a range of other issues that recent peace operations have been faced with, ranging from organized crime, increasingly robust mandates and the introduction of new technologies. All these themes fed into the discussion, and led to the following research questions that inspired the terms of reference:

Approach and Methodology of the Peace Operations baseline study:

- Common themes will be used in order to be able to compare the countries in the synthesis report, even if national Baseline studies will not have necessarily identical outlines
- Time frame of the study:
 - Brahimi report (2000) until 2015
- Looking back: Map the policies and contributions of the countries over the 2000-2015 period
- Present: what are the current policies and state of contributions?
- Looking forward (proactive):
 - What is the position of the countries with regards to future perspectives and contributions? How would they like peace operations to change in the future? Do they want to increase or change their contributions in the future?
 - Analysis and critical approach
- Scope:
 - Peace Operations, i.e. not just peacekeeping, but the whole spectrum of peace operations
 - All Peace Operations. Not only UN operations, but also regional.
- Methodology:
 - Analyze speeches, statements, reports, etc
 - Interviews with officials in the Government, experts, peacekeepers who returned etc

- Field visits where possible
- Length of the national reports: 20-30 pages
- Length of the synthesis report: 20-30 pages
- Timeline:
 - Dec 2014–July 2015: Network partners produce country-based reports
 - Aug–Sept 2015: Synthesize country reports
 - Oct 2015: Publish and disseminate reports
 - Nov 2015: Baseline launch, dissemination seminar, USI – India

Guiding Questions for the Peace Operations Baseline Study:

- Conceptual issues:
 - What terminology is used by the network countries?
 - How do they define or understand Peace Operations?
 - How do they view other concepts such as stabilization, peace support operations, peace enforcement, etc.?
- What are the motivations behind Peace operations participation? “National Interest” is defined in this respect in which manner?
- Which kind of operations does the country prefer to participate in? What kind of operations will the country not participate in? What are the parameters for participation/non participation? Examples are peacekeeping/peacebuilding/peace enforcement, UN vs non UN, coalition of the willing, hybrid operations with regional organizations, use of force, etc.
- What is the country’s position on the kind of operations the UN should and shouldn’t be doing?
- Challenges regarding peace operations faced by countries
- National policies (white papers, statements, official documents –if any)
- What positions do the countries take regarding peacekeeping in international foras (statements in Security Council, C-34, national reports to High Level panel- January 13th, 2015), and other peacekeeping/peacebuilding debates?
- Mapping of contributions to peace operations (UN, AU, NATO etc): TCC, PCC, civilians, funds etc.
- Focus on military, police and civilian expert contributions (include deployment numbers)- not only military

- Use the Terms of Reference of high level panel as a wish list of issues we would like more information on to be able to compare our countries. Examples are:
 - Mission support / Logistics
 - International humanitarian law: definition of combatant, whether this legal term applies or not to peacekeepers- especially in robust missions?
 - Drones – Intelligence gathering – Sovereignty
 - Combatant –aggressor versus party to the conflict
 - Mandates
 - Process and participation of TCC countries and regional/sub-regional organizations
 - Extensiveness and realistic mandates
 - Doctrine
 - Protection of Civilians
 - New technologies
 - Robustness
 - Use of force
 - Asymmetric threats
 - Mission security (include civilians)
 - Peacekeeping/Peacebuilding nexus
 - Funding: reimbursements and percentages that countries contribute financially
 - Gender mainstreaming in peace operations (including information on increasing female peacekeepers)
 - Training for military, police and civilians (Note: police should also be dealt with extensively in baseline study 2, and civilians in baseline study 3)
 - Challenges of harmonization of standards and integration in a single mission
 - Capabilities / capacity building of TCC
- What is the position of the country on SSR in peace operations? Should UN peace operations be doing SSR? Are there things that the UN should NOT be doing in SSR?
- How intrusive should peace operations be, i.e. to what extent should the UN and other forms of peace operations promote

specific approaches to democracy, justice, policing, civil-military relations, etc.?

- What national caveats have the countries employed in the past and are currently being employed?
- What is the position of the country with regards to use of force, i.e. to what extent are they willing to use force and to deploy in robust missions?
- Special political missions: how does the country engage with or contribute to SPMs?
- What is the contribution of Emerging Powers to peace operations, and how is it different?
- Is there something systematic in the views of Emerging Powers on mandates? Are there certain issues more or less acceptable? Do they have ideas with regards to how TCCs and PCCs can be more actively engaged in mandating processes?
- Further issues to be included are those mentioned in the Policy Brief by Dr. Mateja Peter.

Research Theme II: Security Sector Reform

Security Sector Reform is the second theme that will be researched by the Peace Capacities Network. Iis Gindarsah, research fellow at the Centre for Strategic and International Studies in Jakarta, presented a literature review on the development of SSR and the important ongoing discussions that shape the theory and practice of SSR to this day. One of the overall conclusions was that Security Sector Reform can refer to many different practices of different actors in many different environments. This means that SSR approaches and implementation vary greatly within the international community. This review highlights that SSR is a normative concept not only to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of security institutions, but also to improve the governance of the security sector in line with democratic norms and values. According to Gindarsah, SSR is a multi-purpose concept that is context-specific. Hence, the application of SSR agenda favors a comprehensive approach to include most aspects of governance. SSR implementation also has to be integrated in order to optimize the capacities of the sectors involved, while shaping the environment for sustainable success over the long term. The prospect of SSR lies in key tenets, such as legitimacy and national ownership. Commitment to SSR is long term and requires sustainable commitment and substantial resources from relevant stakeholders to achieve desired outcomes.

Dr. Cedric de Coning, Dr. Kari Osland and Paul Troost prepared a paper for the Research Workshop on the SSR concept. In the paper they question whether SSR is tied to Western, neo-liberal norms, or if the SSR concept also has utility for emerging powers. They discuss how the

current transition to a multipolar world order and the emergence of new actors in peace operations provides an opportunity to reflect on alternative interpretations of the SSR concept. They argue that while the concept was shaped by the international system, the influence of the countries from the North have resulted in their norms and values being reflected in how the concept was defined by international and regional organisations. However, the growing influence of the BRICS and other emerging powers are starting to have an impact on how SSR are viewed and practiced. The emerging powers have not adopted the donor-recipient development model associated with the Western development tradition. Instead, they seem to favour development partnerships that recognise mutual benefit based on equality, respect for sovereignty and self-determination. The paper considers several different terminologies to see if any of these provide a better fit with the development approach favoured by the emerging powers, but conclude that the UN SSR concept, as reflected during the Security Council debate on Resolution 2151 on SSR in April 2014, provides the most universally accepted conceptual basis for the PeaceCap Network's SSR research.

From the subsequent discussion amongst the members of the network, a number of common research themes emerged:

Approach and Methodology of the SSR baseline study:

- Time frame of the study:
 - Brahimi report (2000) until 2015
- Looking back: Map how the policies and SSR activities of the country have changed over this period
- Present: what is the national policy on SSR today, and what SSR activities are the countries currently engaged in?
- Looking forward:
 - What is the position of the country with regards to future perspectives and contributions to SSR? How should SSR be done differently in the future?
 - Analysis and critical approach. Reflecting domestic security sector dynamics. What are our countries doing? What do we want to achieve? Is it effective?
- Scope: broad variety of topics that are related to SSR from the military, police, intelligence and justice sectors
- Methodology:
 - Analyze speeches, statements, reports, UN guidelines etc. Filter out what has already been covered by basic literature.
 - Interviews with officials in the Government, experts, peacekeepers who returned etc
 - Field visits when possible

- Case studies to determine how the concept is being applied
- Not necessarily label it as SSR when doing interviews, but use the national approach/terminology?
- Length of the national reports: 20-30 pages
- Length of the synthesis report: 20-30 pages
- Timeline:
 - Jan–Oct 2015: Network partners produce country-based reports
 - Nov–Dec 2015: Synthesize country reports
 - Jan 2016: Publish and disseminate reports
 - Jan/Feb 2016: Baseline launch, dissemination seminar
ICIS – Russia

Guidelines for content of the SSR baseline study:

- SSR Concepts and Policies
 - Use UN definition of SSR as starting point
 - What terminology and interpretation do our countries use?
 - What is the security sector and how is it defined in the PeaceCap partner countries?
 - What is the definition and attitude towards SSR/what is the perspective of the nation state on SSR?
 - How does this definition relate to other concepts such as peace stabilization/ peace support operations, peace operations, etc.?
 - How do emerging powers understand and approach SSR in the security and justice sector?
 - How do the approaches of emerging powers differ from existing SSR initiatives by the UN?
 - Need to decide whether we will focus our research on the concept or activities? What activities do we focus on?
 - How are our countries engaged in SSR abroad?
 - DDR: how do we approach armed groups?
 - Access to justice as part of the Post-2015 agenda: What is network states' opinion on Goal 16- security/development nexus. Which aspect of Goal 16 (Governance, Rule of Law, Security, Violence, Justice and Peace) is most important for enabling development? What's the agency responsible for carrying out Goal 16? How is it going to be implemented?

- Training and equipment. Do we analyze what capabilities forces require? What do we offer? How do we target management/leadership and bureaucratic infrastructure at ministries? Acknowledge that training alone is not sufficient, we have to look at the larger system.
- What are the issues our countries focus on? What is the reasoning behind this and how are their strategies implemented?
- What are the limits of what can be referred to as SSR?

- SSR Activities
 - Who is doing SSR? Development agency/military to military/police to police/MFA/ triangular cooperation (North-South-South)/etc.
 - How is it done and what are the decisions being made?
 - What are the modalities we use? Multilateral, trilateral and bilateral relationships
 - Security assistance
 - Funding: how and who is funding it? For how long?
 - How is SSR implemented?
 - Relationships with the justice sectors
 - How is national ownership implemented in the countries? Are consultative bodies used? Use case studies to illustrate.
 - Payment, equipment, logistics, bureaucratic issues

- SSR Evaluation
 - Effectiveness: how are countries assisting?
 - Accountability: normative questions
 - National ownership and consent. Are we responsive to demands and requests by recipient countries?
 - Training: benchmarks. When do we consider it a success and what are the basis for deciding whether to continue funding or not?
 - What do our countries consider an effective security sector? What are the goals we help other countries to achieve? What is the end state we want to achieve?

- Should SSR be applied gradually and which issues should be given priority? For example start with effectiveness, and focus on accountability once the situation stabilizes.
- Add critical analysis element to study: critically analyze the position and activities of our own countries

Research Theme III: Civilian Capacities

The discussion of the third research theme was introduced by Wael Abd-el Wahab of the Cairo Centre for Conflict prevention and Peacekeeping in Africa, and Onur Sazak of the Istanbul Policy Center. As a continuation of the research performed by the Civilian Capacities Network, several developments have occurred since the publication of the national baseline report in 2013. As this report represented a comprehensive overview of national civilian capacities for post-conflict reconstruction, it offers the opportunity to revisit the developments in the civilian capacities field, and trace the progress made by national governments in developing their domestic civilian capacities for post-conflict reconstruction. One of the main enduring issues is the overlap of efforts by the international community, stemming from poor communication and coordination. Secondly, complementarity remains an issue for government provided personnel (GPP) who are disconnected from local stakeholders and one another. Similarly, coordination between civilian capacity providers and host governments is still insufficient in the cases studies, such as Afghanistan and Somalia. Meanwhile, the UN CIVCAP project showed that multilateral engagement of civilian capacity providers is still insufficient, and that most of the network countries prefer to operate through bilateral engagement in countries where they have national interests. The following research agenda emerged from the consequent discussion:

General Background Information:

- Partners already published national baseline studies during the CivCap project (2011-2013).
- Based on the national baseline studies, the CivCap synthesis report was published in 2012.
- The upcoming baseline studies should be in line with the previous ones, while incorporating new elements.

Approach and Methodology of the Civilian Capacities baseline study:

- Time frame of the study:
 - In-depth analysis from the 2012 CivCap baseline study onwards
- Looking back: map what our countries have done
- Present: what are our countries doing right now?
- Looking forward (proactive):
 - What is the position of our countries with regards to future perspectives and contributions?
 - Add the opinion of our institutions what should be done in the future
 - Analysis and critical approach
- Scope:
 - Civilian Capacities in Peace Operations
 - All Peace Operations, not only UN operations. Bilateral, regional, etc.
- Methodology:
 - Analyze speeches, statements, reports, etc
 - Interviews with officials in the Government, experts, peacekeepers who returned etc
 - Field visits when possible
- Length of the national reports: 20-30 pages
- Length of the synthesis report: 20-30 pages
- Timeline:
 - Jan–Dec 2015: Network partners produce country-based reports
 - Jan–Feb 2016: Synthesize country reports
 - March 2016: Publish and disseminate reports
 - March 2016: Baseline launch, dissemination seminar, New York

Guidelines for content of the Civilian Capacities baseline study:

- Termination of UN CIVCAP initiative:
 - Does this have an effect on multilateral engagements?
 - Reasons behind the suspension: Are there any lessons to be drawn?
 - Lessons learned from the CAPMATCH tool
- Regional organizations developing new (or building on existing) work regarding civilian capacities (AU, LAS, OSCE,EU)
- Bilateral contributions

- Which institutions are involved? MFA, MoD, development agencies
- Training and preparations
- Other issues to be considered:
 - Updates since the last civilian capacities baseline national studies. Track progress since CivCap baseline study 2012.
 - Examine reasons behind these updates/stalemate: What worked? What didn't work? Is there a possibility to measure an impact of previous reports?
 - What is the status of deployment and Government Provided Personnel (GPP). Use statistics until December 2015.
 - Funding
 - Gender
 - Civilian capacities from the perspective of host countries: have the engagements by our countries been effective?

Conclusion

The Research Workshop has helped to further refine the network's research agenda for 2015. The researchers that will undertake the respective national baseline studies now have a common understanding of the scope and approach that these studies will use. This will ensure that there are sufficient commonalities among the baseline studies to inform the kind of comparative analysis intended for the development of the synthesis reports on emerging powers and peace operations, Security Sector Reform and civilian capacities, that the Network will produce in 2015 and 2016.