Security Council

Letter dated 17 December 2010 from the Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations to the President of the Security Council

In my capacity as Chairman of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, I have the honour to submit the report of the Working Group (see annex).

It would be appreciated if the present letter and its annex could be circulated as a document of the Security Council.

(*Signed*) Tsuneo **Nishida**
Chairman of the Security Council Working Group
on Peacekeeping Operations

Annex

Report of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations

I. Introduction

1.   The establishment of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations was announced in the statement by the President of the Security Council of 31 January 2001 (S/PRST/2001/3) in the context of the Council's efforts to strengthen cooperation with troop-contributing countries. In a subsequent note by the President issued on 14 January 2002 (S/2002/56), the Council authorized the Working Group to convene joint meetings with troop-contributing countries as an additional mechanism for strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries on specific peacekeeping operations. The activities of the Working Group before the period 2009-2010 were reported to the President of the Security Council by the Chairman of the Working Group (see S/2001/546, S/2001/900, S/2001/1335, S/2004/1040 and S/2006/972).

2.   According to the presidential statement (S/PRST/2001/3), the Working Group should address both generic peacekeeping issues relevant to the responsibilities of the Council and technical aspects of individual peacekeeping operations, without prejudice to the competence of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations. The Working Group during the period 2005-2006 classified areas of its activities that derived from stipulated mandates into three aspects, namely, (a) creation of a new mission and modification of mission mandates; (b) operational issues related to specific missions; and (c) operational issues with implications for generic issues of peacekeeping operations (see S/2006/972). The Working Group during the period 2009-2010 conducted its discussions in accordance with this past practice.

3.   The activities during the period 2009-2010 were also carried out against the backdrop of the challenges of historically high levels of deployment and increasing complexity of mandates. This called for, inter alia, a renewed effort to minimize capability gaps that hinder mandate implementation, to manage resource constraints, administrative and support machinery, to expand the contributor base and to strengthen cooperation with other actors within and beyond the United Nations system.

4.   The Working Group in 2009-2010 made gains on several fronts towards strengthening coordination with a wider range of stakeholders for filling gaps.

5.   A total of 16 meetings were held from January 2009 to December 2010. Apart from the meetings intended for internal discussions on organizational work and report drafting, all the meetings were held with the participation of major troop- and police-contributing countries, and other stakeholders including regional organizations. A chronology of the meetings held during 2009-2010 is annexed to the present report (attachment I).

II. Summary of the discussions during 2009-2010

6.   Three interim reports were circulated on the activities from January 2009 to July 2010 that comprised a total of 13 meetings (S/2009/398, S/2009/659 and

S/2010/424). The detailed summary of discussions in the second half of 2010 is annexed to the present report (attachment II).

7. The overarching theme throughout activities was how to fill in the gaps that lie between mandates and actual implementation. With a view to producing practical proposals for improvement, the Working Group took up as many existing missions as possible for case studies.

8. In the first half of 2009, the Working Group worked with troop-contributing countries and other stakeholders to identify where the gaps exist from various perspectives. Issues discussed in this first series of meetings included (a) mandate formulation including protection of civilians; (b) prioritization and streamlining of mandates; (c) resources; and (d) mission planning and the consideration of the peacebuilding perspectives. On the basis of the views then expressed (see S/2009/398, appendix), the Working Group at subsequent meetings gave in-depth consideration to three major aspects, namely, (a) improvement of the cooperation mechanism with stakeholders beyond Security Council members; (b) actual capacity gaps on the ground in specific missions; and (c) "transitional strategies".

9. During the second half of 2009, under the theme of "improvement of the cooperation mechanism", a diagram (S/2009/659, attachment II) was produced on the basis of Security Council resolution 1353 (2001), which is annexed to the present report (attachment III). The diagram is meant to serve as an indicative guideline for scheduling a monthly programme of work, in particular for setting the dates of meetings with troop- and police-contributing countries and determining due dates for reports of the Secretary-General. The practice of holding meetings with troop-contributing countries before Security Council consultations started to take root, but not yet the practice of distributing a summary of the content of such meetings by the President of the Council. During the Council presidency in April 2010, the Chair of the Working Group anticipated this practice by delivering a verbal summary of the content of meetings with troop-contributing countries at the informal consultations held by the Council.

10. Throughout 2010, the Working Group looked at the issue of civilian and military capacity gaps on the basis of concrete case studies of current United Nations peacekeeping missions in order to enhance understanding of where the gaps existed. The Group also considered the issue of coordination and partnerships for filling those gaps and for capacity development. In doing so, the utility of the "gap lists" was discussed, which required further development of a mechanism that should link identified needs with available capacities. At the meeting held in October 2010, the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste, the next mission whose mandate was due to expire (February 2011), was taken up as a trial case, for which the Working Group examined the capacity gaps before the deliberations of the Security Council on the mandate. The Working Group is to reassess this practice at the beginning of 2011. Participants were briefed on the issue of the critical shortage of military utility and attack helicopters that was seriously affecting fulfilment of mandates in some missions.

11. The Working Group took up "transitional strategies" as its theme for the second half of 2010. Both the October and November meetings included members of the Secretariat who shared experiences from the field. The Group was also briefed on an analytical paper produced by the New York University Center on International Cooperation at the request of the Department of Peacekeeping

Operations of the Secretariat, which examined the evolution of and trends in peacebuilding components of multidimensional peacekeeping mandates over the past 20 years. The Group had an extensive dialogue on a number of key aspects of transitional strategies which should be developed further (see attachment II). Subsequently, the Security Council held an interactive informal consultation on peacekeeping operations focusing on the Security Council's role in mandating peacekeepers to support peacebuilding objectives, based on questions derived from the analysis discussed at the November meeting of the Working Group.

12.   Set out below are the activities during 2009-2010 thus far mentioned, reframed in accordance with the criteria set forth previously (see para. 2 above), showing the consistency of activities from the period 2005-2006:

    (a)   Creation of a new mission and modification of mission mandates:

       – Concrete proposal on the mechanism of cooperation with troop-contributing countries and other stakeholders (the second half of 2009)

       – Discussion on how to link existing capability gaps with necessary resources and how to reflect that in deliberations on mandates in the Council (2010, until October)

    (b)   Operational issues related to specific missions:

       – Case studies on the gaps in specific missions (throughout 2010), especially those in the transition phase (second half of 2010)

    (c)   Operational issues with implications for generic issues of peacekeeping operations:

       – Overall review of the gaps (first half of 2009)

       – The critical shortage of military helicopters (October 2010)

       – Overall review of peacebuilding mandates in the context of peacekeeping (November 2010)

III.   Suggestions for the way forward

13.   The most important contribution of the Working Group has been in bringing Council members together with major troop- and police-contributing countries and the Secretariat. The interactive dialogue among a wide range of stakeholders at Working Group meetings has served to enhance transparency and accountability in the work of the Council, as well as to create some common ground to advance various challenges. In order to build on the activities and achievements of the Working Group over the past two years, the following suggestions are made for the way forward that can be taken into consideration by the next Chair of the Working Group.

A.   Further encourage inclusive dialogue among relevant stakeholders, especially in the context of the establishment, renewal or modification of the mandate of a peacekeeping operation

14.   In the statement by the President of the Council of 5 August 2009 (S/PRST/2009/24), the Council stated its intention to increase its interaction with

the Secretariat in the early phase of mandate drafting and throughout mission deployment, and to make progress on earlier and more meaningful engagement with troop- and police-contributing countries. In this regard:

(a) The Council should continue with the good practice of systematic triangular consultations of the Council, troop and police contributors, and the Secretariat, including in the context of mandate deliberations and renewals;

(b) Measures set out in Council resolution 1353 (2001) should continue to be fully implemented, making good use of the diagram (attachment III) as a guideline for scheduling a monthly programme of work;

(c) Efforts should be made to ensure timely and appropriate communication of the concerns and views of troop- and police-contributing countries, as expressed at the consultation meetings, to the members of the Council so that those concerns and views can receive due consideration, by means of distributing the summary of the discussion at meetings with troop-contributing countries at informal consultations, as set out in Council resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, section B, paragraph 6, and in accordance with paragraph 33 of the annex to the note by the President of the Security Council of 26 July 2010 (S/2010/507);

(d) The Secretariat is encouraged to give timely inputs. Further interaction with relevant bodies such as the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Peacebuilding Commission could also be useful.

B. Facilitate regular reporting on critical gaps affecting mandate implementation and addressing them

15. The Working Group provided opportunities for information-sharing about critical gaps in both military and civilian capabilities. In the presidential statement (S/PRST/2009/24) the Council also recognized the need for ensuring that mandates for peacekeeping operations are clear, credible and achievable and matched by appropriate resources. The Working Group could further be utilized as a platform for discussing the specific capacity gaps and ways to secure necessary resources for specific peacekeeping missions, in time for mandate deliberations. The future Working Group could also serve as a means for making better use of the "gap list" which is now being assessed by the Secretariat, and finding other ways to meet the critical gaps.

C. Build common ground on early peacebuilding tasks in a peacekeeping context in order to prepare for transitions and exits

16. There remain more challenges, including the development of a strategy for critical early peacebuilding tasks undertaken by peacekeepers. As the United Nations system as a whole seeks effective mechanisms to cope with the immediate aftermath of conflict, the Working Group can be a facilitating vehicle to generate practical solutions with a view to better preparing peacekeeping missions from the outset, to build the foundation for transition and handover to other peacebuilding actors for longer-term peace consolidation and development.

Attachment I

Chronological tabulation of the meetings of the Working Group held in 2009 and 2010

Date	Participants	Briefer	Subject matter
25 February 2009	Members of Working Group only	Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations	Organization of work and other procedural issues
29 April 2009	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders	Director of Middle East and Latin America Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Chief officer of Africa Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations	Addressing gaps between mandates and their actual implementation
9 June 2009	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders	Executive Representative of Secretary-General for BINUB Executive Representative of Secretary-General for UNIPSIL Integrated Operational Team Leader of Middle East Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations	Addressing gaps between mandates and their actual implementation
19 June 2009	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders	Director of Africa I Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Director of Africa II Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations	Addressing gaps between mandates and their actual implementation
17 July 2009	Members of Working Group only	—	Report of the Working Group
9 November 2009	Members of Working Group only	Assistant Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations	Organization of work
25 November 2009	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders, Bureau of Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and regional organizations	Director of Middle East and Latin America Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations	Improvement of cooperation mechanism; improvement in implementation of mandates with cooperation of troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders

Date	Participants	Briefer	Subject matter
30 November 2009	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders, Bureau of Special Committee and regional organizations	Director of Policy, Evaluation and Training Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations	Improvement of cooperation mechanism; support to troop- and police-contributing countries for participation in peacekeeping operations
14 December 2009	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders, Bureau of Special Committee and regional organizations	—	Guideline for scheduling a monthly programme of work
26 March 2010	Members of Working Group only	Director of Policy, Evaluation and Training Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations	Organization of work
10 May 2010	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders, Bureau of Special Committee and regional organizations	Assistant Secretary-General for Rule of Law and Security Institutions, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Assistant Secretary-General for Peacebuilding Support Office	Civilian capability gap
24 May 2010	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders, Bureau of Special Committee and regional organizations	Director of Africa I Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Director of Africa II Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations	Military capability gap
2 June 2010	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders and Bureau of Special Committee	Director of Policy, Evaluation and Training Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Assistant Secretary-General for Field Support	Coordination and partnership for capacity development

Date	Participants	Briefer	Subject matter
22 October 2010	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders and Bureau of Special Committee	Under-Secretary-General for Field Support Special Representative of Secretary-General for UNMIT Military Adviser, Department of Peacekeeping Operations	Better use of the Gap List through example of UNMIT Briefing by the Secretariat on the issue of military utility helicopters
3 November 2010	Members of Working Group, major troop- and police-contributing countries and other stakeholders and Bureau of Special Committee	Director of Policy, Evaluation and Training Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations Director of Europe and Latin America Division, Department of Peacekeeping Operations	Transition and exit strategy
10 December 2010	Members of Working Group only	—	Endorsement of the final report of the Working Group

Attachment II

Record of discussion in the Working Group during the second half of 2010

1.   On 22 October 2010, the Working Group met to continue its discussion of gaps and ways to fill these by studying the case of the United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT), the next mission whose mandate was due to expire (February 2011), and also a good example of a mission in the transition phase. Participants were also briefed on the issue of the critical shortage of military utility and attack helicopters that was seriously affecting fulfilment of mandates in some missions, pursuant to the Working Group's interim report of July 2010 (S/2010/424).

2.   At the meeting of 3 November, the Group was briefed on an analytical paper produced by the New York University Center on International Cooperation at the request of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations of the Secretariat, which examined the evolution of and trends in peacebuilding components of multidimensional peacekeeping mandates over the past 20 years. The analysis was based on the five key areas of peacebuilding enumerated in the reports of the Secretary-General on peacebuilding in the immediate aftermath of conflict (S/2009/304 and S/2010/386), namely (a) support to basic safety and security; (b) support to political processes; (c) support to the provision of basic services; (d) support to restoring core government functions; and (e) support to economic revitalization, including employment generation and livelihoods. An interactive discussion was held that included responses from members of the Secretariat who shared experiences from the field.

3.   The following is a summary of views expressed by participants during the two meetings on some of the key aspects on the issues of capability gaps and mandated peacebuilding tasks.

A.   Core function of peacekeeping

4.   The analysis by the Center on International Cooperation revealed that peacebuilding tasks have existed in Security Council mandates over the past 20 years but have become broader and more complex. The more traditional components identified included support to peace processes and provision of a security umbrella to enable reconstruction activities. Early capacity-building, particularly in the field of the rule of law, including police, justice and corrections, was identified as a peacebuilding area where peacekeeping missions had taken on a more direct role and responsibility. Support to economic revitalization and to the provision of basic services were also cited as key peacebuilding tasks that are not properly addressed.

5.   Some comments included concern that the expansion of peacebuilding activities was compromising the core functions of peacekeeping. However, it was stressed by the Secretariat that peacekeeping and peacebuilding must be viewed as existing in parallel and that peacekeeping in today's era had become integrated with other post-conflict activities; therefore a new coherent strategy was required to garner necessary resources and building capacities.

B. Prioritization and integrated planning

6.   Integrated planning and prioritization of tasks were underlined, to focus efforts and resources, ensure coherence of strategy, and avoid duplication of activities. The need to establish priorities among growing mandated tasks in the light of gaps and limited resources, in particular, was expressed.

7.   The Secretariat explained ongoing discussions about setting a smaller number of priorities, but described challenges, including the difficulty of attaining agreement for priorities among Member States and organizations. Ongoing efforts to further develop and improve the post-conflict needs assessment methodology were also described by the Secretariat.

C. Key gaps

8.   Participants enquired about the analysis of the overall state of gaps created between increasingly complex mandates and actual implementation. A holistic analysis had not been conducted at this stage, but while helicopters were recognized as being the most critical military gap, the scarcity of specialized civilian skills was highlighted. The case study of UNMIT revealed gaps in the mentoring capacity of United Nations police and in core administrative functions such as human resources management, finance and budgeting, required for the mission's transition. It was emphasized that, as a response to the growing importance of security, justice and rule of law activities, the Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions had been established in the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. It was noted that such skills were difficult to obtain worldwide and for this reason the civilian capacity review by the Peacebuilding Support Office was highly anticipated. In addition, the need for staff to have relevant language skills and cultural affinity was stressed.

9.   The need to do more for economic revitalization because of the link between security and the economy was also underlined. In particular, participants cited the problem missions faced in dealing with youth and ex-combatant unemployment. It was acknowledged that a major gap existed at the United Nations strategic level in dealing with this issue.

D. Use of the "Gap Lists"

10.   In the discussion of key gaps, the utility of the "gap lists" was taken up. The lists, which cover military gaps, and rule of law and other civilian capability gaps, were first introduced in December 2009 and revised in June 2010. It was explained that the Secretariat was conducting a self-assessment on the usefulness of this practice and would seek feedback from Member States for making this a reliable tool to garner necessary resources. Participants were of the view that there should be further consideration of the development of a mechanism for that end.

E. Use of benchmarks

11.   The utility of benchmarks was also discussed. It was stressed that benchmarks do not work in every setting, but that they could be very useful for monitoring

progress in the implementation of mandated tasks, especially if there existed a shared understanding of the desired end state for the mission. The need to develop benchmarks with relevant stakeholders, in particular host countries, and for them to be nationally owned and aligned to national strategies was emphasized.

12. Haiti, Liberia and Timor-Leste were cited as examples where benchmarks had been effective. The Sudan was cited as an example where benchmarks could be effective in one mission and not so in another because of the lack of agreement on end-state objectives. Caution was also expressed about basing decisions for withdrawal of peacekeeping operations upon simply completing benchmarks.

F. Capacity-building and national ownership

13. Participants emphasized that successful peacebuilding entailed national ownership. The role of the international community in supporting national stakeholders and assisting in the development of national capacity to prevent a relapse into conflict was stressed. In this context, the importance of making arrangements for enabling national staff of the peacekeeping operations as the mission draws down was underlined.

G. Partnership on the ground

14. Various actors are involved in peacebuilding activities, and it was pointed out that to discuss the roles and responsibilities of different stakeholders in the abstract was inappropriate, as specific situations on the ground differed. It was stressed that effective partnerships among stakeholders had to be created for delivering results based on specific needs. Challenges faced in this regard were cited, including the fact that some key partners in delivering on mandates, in particular in the areas of restoration of services and economic revitalization, were not accountable to the Security Council.

Attachment III

Guideline for scheduling a monthly programme of work, especially for setting the dates of meetings with troop-contributing countries and due dates for reports of the Secretary-General

	Secretariat (Secretary-General)	Troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries	Security Council	Basis and desirable timeline of the meetings
Mission planning phase	Meetings between the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries ⬇ Technical assessment mission ⬇ Meetings between the Secretariat and troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries The Secretariat is requested to include *inputs by troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries in reports of the Secretary-General* (Security Council resolution 1353 (2001)) ⬇ Secretary-General's report The Secretary-General should ensure that *reports are issued in good time* to allow for the timely holding of meetings with troop-contributing countries before discussion in the Council (Security Council resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sect. B, para. 5 (b))		Secretariat should brief members of the Security Council Secretariat should brief members of the Security Council	Meetings with troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries to make use of their inputs for technical assistance missions (directives by Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support) Secretary-General's reports, pursuant to the request of the Security Council should be issued *preferably more than one week before the consultation meeting* of the Council and the troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries

	Secretariat (Secretary-General)	Troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries	Security Council	Basis and desirable timeline of the meetings
Mandate discussion phase (renewal/ change/ withdrawal/ termination)	The Secretariat is expected to *make fact sheets available* to all participants at the beginning of meetings (Security Council resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sect. B, para. 5 (c)) The Secretary-General should ensure, where possible, that *briefings are given* by senior personnel working with the mission in the field (Security Council resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sect. B, para. 5 (d)) Participation of the Special Representative of the Secretary-General and using video presentation/conference may be considered to facilitate meetings		In the case of mandate renewals, the President of the Security Council may convene a politico-military briefing with Council members and the Secretariat in advance of mandate renewal discussions The President of the Security Council is expected to *circulate an informal paper setting out the agenda,* including issues to be covered and background information (Security Council resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sect. B, para. 5 (a))	Private meetings should be held *preferably more than one week before Security Council consultations* so that inputs from troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries can be used by the Council for consultations

Consultation meetings of the Security Council with troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries

The President of the Security Council, with the assistance of the Secretariat, is expected to make a summary of the content of meetings (Security Council resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sect. B, para. 6, bullet 1)

⇩

Security Council consultation

⇩

Adoption of Security Council resolutions

13

	Secretariat (Secretary-General)	Troop-contributing countries and police-contributing countries	Security Council	Basis and desirable timeline of the meetings
Other occasions for meetings with troop-contributing countries	• Creation of mandate • A rapid deterioration of the situation on the ground • Significant developments (political, military, humanitarian) • Before/after Security Council missions to peacekeeping operations • Scaling down a peacekeeping operation • If necessary, when concept of operations/rules of engagement are changed (for example, meeting held in May 2009 pursuant to Security Council resolution 1867 (2009), in which the Council requested the Secretary-General to report to the Council and the troop-contributing and police-contributing countries within 90 days on updating the concept of operations/rules of engagement)		(Security Council resolution 1353 (2001), annex II, sect. B, para. 2)	

Note: Concrete schedules will be set in accordance with the circumstances of individual peacekeeping operations and the programme of work for each month.