

Peace Capacities Network Annual Meeting Report 2014

Onur Sazak, Paul Troost and Lotte Vermeij



**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 2014
ISSN: 1894-650X

Any views expressed in this publication are those of the author. 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 author.

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
Fax: [+ 47] 22 99 40 50
Tel: [+ 47] 22 99 40 00

Peace Capacities Network Annual Meeting Report 2014

Onur Sazak, Paul Troost and Lotte Vermeij

Published by Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Overview

On 9–10 July 2014 the Istanbul Policy Center (IPC) and the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) co-organized the Peace Capacities Network Annual Meeting. The IPC hosted this year's conference at its Karaköy headquarters in Istanbul. The Peace Capacities Network partners were represented by:

- Brazil: Dr. Renata Giannini – Igarape Institute
- Egypt: Ashraf Swelam and Wael Abdel Wahab – Cairo Regional Center for Regional Training on Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping in Africa (CCCPA)
- India: General PK Singh and Sandeep Dewan – United Services Institute of India (USI)
- Indonesia: Dr. Lina Alexander and Iis Gindarsah – Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS)
- Norway: Dr. Cedric de Coning, Dr. Lotte Vermeij and Paul Troost – Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)
- Russia: Alexander Lukin and Olga Puzanova – Center for World Politics and Public Diplomacy at the Institute for Contemporary International Studies (ICIS)
- South Africa: Irene Limo – African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD)
- Turkey: Prof. Fuat Keyman, Onur Sazak, Cana Tülüş and Pinar Akpınar – Istanbul Policy Center (IPC).

The primary objective of this year's gathering was to determine the research themes that the Network will deal with for the next two years, after a successful grant bid made to the Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The conference also facilitated the identification of research activities, produced a work plan pertaining to the roles and assignments of the partners, and addressed several coordination matters.

Peace Operations, Security Sector Reform (SSR), and continuation of the work on *Civilian Capacity* are the three central research themes for the Network for the next two years. Each Network member will produce a national baseline study for each theme, which will be compiled into three synthesis reports. In addition, the PeaceCap partners will write four policy briefs related to each research theme, adding up to a total of twelve policy briefs that will be published by the PeaceCap Network. The overall aim of the Network's cumulative research is to raise awareness of outstanding questions in the three thematic areas, as well as to offer insights on the shifting trends and mindsets of emerging powers in peace operations as a whole. A central issue of relevance to all three areas is that the analysis of conflicts unfolding in the Global South is overwhelmingly conducted in the North. Possible reasons for this state of affairs may be that scholarship conducted in the South is predominantly published in languages other than English and is hence not available in internationally known journals. Moreover, writers from the Global South often employ different terminologies and approaches, depending on national policy concepts and contexts. For these and other reasons, it is difficult to mainstream internationally much of the research produced in the Global South. There are very few networks like the PeaceCap network that provide insights into this field (beyond one-off conventions) based on relevant government access and applied research.

An important advantage of the PeaceCap Network, therefore, is that it can situate itself in a changing global order. The Network recognizes that the emerging actors are increasing their influence, relevance and competences in peace operations. The Network also acknowledges that this shift in the global order will eventually dictate a reconceptualization of the terminology. Concepts such as SSR, peacebuilding, or peacekeeping were created and have generally been used by the traditional Western liberal order. This discourse makes it challenging to take stock of the work of emerging actors in these areas. While some of these actors are on track to becoming larger contributors to the scene, their contributions may be ignored because they do not fit the terminology of the traditional actors in referring to their activities and achievements. For instance, asking policymakers from PeaceCap Network partner countries about their SSR, peace operations and civilian capacity activities may not necessarily generate a response, as the governments may not employ these terms to define activities that are in fact functionally equivalent. In order to assess the impact of emerging actors on peacebuilding and peacekeeping, as well as their contribution to the global scene, we need to find out how these terms resonate with the new actors and what we can learn from their own approaches. In researching indigenous methods and approaches of some of these emerging powers, as the Network members, we make clear our intention of understanding their experience and practices and adopting a consolidated language that can incorporate these

experiences originating in the Global South to the wide array of international practices.

Another guiding principle that will shape the Network's research in these three areas for the next two years is engagement with regional organizations, and developing good relations with them. Regional as well as sub-regional organizations have a prospective role and stake in the mediation and peaceful resolution of conflicts. Influential regional organizations include the African Union, North Atlantic Treaty Organization, Organization of American States, Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, and Organization of Islamic Cooperation. Also sub-regional entities like the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation, UNASUR or the Shanghai Cooperation may be useful in the mediation of endemic regional conflicts. It is therefore worth exploring the value-added contributions of the network countries to SSR, peace operations, and civilian capacity as influential members of these organizations. In addition, discussions are underway about engaging a Chinese partner in the network, which it aims to achieve in the course of 2014.

Below are the specific issues that the Peace Capacities Network aims to address within each thematic area:

Peace Operations

The primary focus here is to examine the evolution of peace operations. There seem to be robust changes taking place on the ground that are not reflected in the policy world or scholarship. These changes place new demands and requirements on peacekeeping operations. The role of civilians is a particularly important but little-studied aspect of this transformation. Innovative ways of involving citizens in peace processes, and encouraging them to claim the ownership of reconstruction projects, have been largely neglected. Similarly, incorporating protection of citizens from asymmetric threats, pre- and post-deployment analyses of the impact of peace operations on various communities in conflict zones, and bringing different parties to the table constitute under-explored fields that the Network is keen on studying.

Another important characteristic of this evolution is the changing nature of the network countries' engagement with the United Nations and other multilateral institutions. These shifting patterns of involvement in UN operations and conflict-affected countries are a vital area for study. Most countries represented in the Network have contributed to the UN peacekeeping operations in one way or another. Each member brings different strengths into peace operations due to its memberships in a range of international organizations. For example, Turkey is a NATO member, while South Africa is an influential actor in the peace operations of the African Union. Last, new technologies, and

more peacebuilding activities such as SSR, constitute areas that may take precedence over peacekeeping.

Another evolving element of peace operations is the robustness of mandates and the increased use of force in peace operations. Several participants made reference to the current debate on the use of force and the varying definitions of the concept. While the parameters of the discussion were drawn between no use and the minimal use of force, the term 'robustness' previously included a wide range of military measures, from air support to artillery support, used in peacekeeping operations. Participants underscored that today's understanding of robustness has evolved and that bilateral relations between host and donor countries have developed to a degree where the seconding countries may hold back from robust peacekeeping. In a world where the classical principles of peacekeeping are increasingly contested, how emerging countries see the change in the use of force also makes a highly relevant research topic under the peace operations theme.

The widening gap in the theory and practice of peace operations calls for informed debate about peacekeeping, peacebuilding and enforcement as part of the mandate. The suitability and availability of a global mandate to deal with regional and local conflicts carries significant weight with the Network's research agenda. With the global financial crisis, funding issues become significantly interlinked with questions of who holds the mandate. Given the increasing cross-border reverberations of local extremist groups like the Islamic State (ISIS) and Al-Shabaab, we need to reflect on the application of global mandates to local crises with potential regional fallout effects. Particularly important to this discussion are the capacities and suitability of today's peace operations for eliminating the security threats that emerge amid blurred definitions and principles.

During the discussions on peace operations at the PeaceCap Network Annual Meeting, several partners also noted the developing discourse on the role of regional organizations in mediation and conflict resolution. Both the role of regional organizations and the broader debate on multilateralism vs. bilateralism in approaching conflict-affected countries offer topics that can be further explored under the peace operation theme. Organizations of particular interest here are NATO, OSCE, AU, and other sub-regional entities. Examination of the performance of these organizations should help to clarify whether multilateralism is real, or confined to rhetoric. These studies are also expected to shed light on the individual capacities of key members of these organizations, such as Turkey, Egypt and Indonesia. Further evaluation of the influence of regional actors, building on the

initial findings of Network's CIVCAP baseline study¹, should provide ample grounds for defending a flexible, versatile approach between multilateralism and bilateralism.

In summary, seven strategic areas of research emerged from the discussion on peace operations:

- The issue of new trends related to peace enforcement
- The multilateralism vs. bilateralism debate
- Asymmetrical threats
- Application of new technologies
- Peacebuilding operations and SSR
- Civilian capacity
- Protection of civilians
- Citizens' ownership of reconstruction efforts.

Security Sector Reform

The Peace Capacities Network's research on Security Sector Reform (SSR) seeks to tackle the following questions: What does SSR imply for different stakeholders? Does it work only in post-conflict settings? Though the concept was originally developed for newly independent Eastern and Central European states in the immediate aftermath of the Cold War, to what extent should the broader international community and NGOs claim a stake in SSR? Furthermore, what should be the role of the UN Security Council in the reiteration of SSR's significance? Should it use its political weight with sovereign states to define a more inclusive means of security sector reform, also determining its priorities for citizens? Or, should the Security Council make a stronger case for including policing, border management, and maritime security in the SSR mandate? Two specific departments – the Security Sector Reform Unit within the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), and the DPKO itself – already exist under the Security Council: what other means are available to the UN to engage further in SSR? And what should be the role of the sovereign state? Should it cooperate solely

¹ P. Keating and S. Wiharta, 2012. *Synthesis Report of the Base-line Study on Civilian Capacity*. Oslo: NUPI. Available at: <http://www.nupi.no/Publications/Books-and-reports/2012/Synthesis-Report-of-the-Baseline-Study-on-Civilian-Capacity>.

with international organizations and NGOs – or deploy its capacity through bilateral means?

These questions indicate a roadmap for the Network's research on SSR, as well as several knowledge gaps. Equally important is the perspective of the nation state on SSR. Consequently, emerging actors' involvement in SSR in host countries is an important component of the research. A central question regarding Network countries' SSR activities in beneficiary states is to what degree the donor countries can interfere with domestic politics in recipient countries when implementing Security Sector Reform. Careful analysis of the ground rules of SSR is needed, to analyze and prevent sovereignty infringement problems. Further, all these conventional approaches to SSR issues should be re-evaluated in light of new security threats like organized crime, resource management, cybercrime, border management, and even maritime security. A few participants noted the possible setbacks associated with the combination of these issues and studying them through a one-size-fits all research approach. That is, when investigating SSR financing, one should not look at the overall economic governance of a country, but concentrate on economic or financial conditions that may obstruct funding for SSR. The role of sovereign states in SSR is another recurrent theme as regards establishing the right balance between the state, international and regional organizations, and NGOs. How much of the organizational work in SSR should be handled by sovereign states, the UN, or NGOs? Moreover, as mentioned by several partners, no agency should bypass the host government without a clear mandate or formal agreements. Furthermore, any initiative to be undertaken under SSR should have local ownership, although these initiatives and aid should not hamper institutions that are already in place and functioning properly.

Last, an important fact that the Network should consider in undertaking SSR research is the problematic connotations of security sector reform for the countries represented in the Network as well as for the people in beneficiary countries. As one network partner noted, at the mention of "reform" stakeholders may automatically assume that external actors will be interfering with established structures and processes. One partner also recalled that in several countries where the Network has engaged, 'SSR' is nearly synonymous with the instability that followed the US invasion of Iraq and the reverberations of the destruction of vital institutions for the region.

In brief, the Network's research on SSR is well positioned to make a substantial contribution by addressing several questions identified earlier. Further, a value-added contribution to the literature would be a decisive conclusion on the unsettled question whether SSR is strictly post-conflict. In addition, various definitions and the applicability of SSR within different groups of people and communities should get more attention through the research that the Network will embark upon

in the coming months. Network members should benefit greatly from deliberating on alternative wording options for SSR – for instance, whether Security Sector *Development* would be a more suitable term than *Reform*.

Civilian Capacity

The continuation of the Network's initial successful work on civilian capacity remains of importance. The stakes have increased, especially after the UN CIVCAP initiative has been suspended. The Civilian Capacity name has been retained primarily to indicate to the Norwegian Foreign Ministry that the Network will continue, building on its work in this area. One development that must be confronted is that CivCap as a theme has been losing momentum. Attention at the UN level is fading. However, the UN and African Union are still building civilian rosters. An interesting new subject would be research on the development agencies in the respective network countries: to what degree would their contribution to peacebuilding be relevant for CivCap? The role of regional organizations and multilateral bodies could also be worth investigating. For instance, IBSA has funds worth \$1 million, allocated for development projects. Similarly, the BRICS countries have unveiled a plan to establish their own development bank as an alternative to the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. They are also channeling their resources to infrastructure-specific, macro-level investments. Another dimension of the CIVCAP initiative worth expanding is a comparison of new donor practices with the operations of established (traditional) donors. For example, do new donors see themselves as donors? What of the evolution of the relationship between the new donors and beneficiaries in development cooperation? In particular, one participant linked the relevance of this subject to SSR studies.

Another potential area of investigation would be how the populations of beneficiary countries perceive the UN bureaucracy. The satisfaction of the local people on the receiving end of CivCap assistance also emerges as a particularly relevant field for deeper probing. Also worth further exploration is the mismatch between popular demands for the UN to reduce bureaucracy and the latter's resistance, and the ramifications of this disconnect.

In sum, the key areas that the next phase of the CivCap baseline study will include are: institution building, to be linked to the post-2015 development goals; South/South cooperation; national ownership; the Training for Peace program; deployment and training conditions (regional and UN dimension); and Global South demands for a greater role in planning and decision-making phases pertaining to CivCap deployment.

Research Activities, Methodology and Coordination

Baseline Studies

Each network member is responsible for producing a baseline study on each of the three thematic areas (Peace Operations, SSR, CivCap). Partner organizations may publish their work with their organization's logo, provided that the support and objective of the Peace Capacities Network is acknowledged in each report. The initial research produced by member states in each field will be compiled in three baseline synthesis reports corresponding to the three fields. The methodology for baseline studies will be discussed at the Authors' Workshop in Cairo (see the next section). Each organization is asked to invite the researchers who will be conducting research for the baseline study to this workshop.

There will be one coordinating partner for each baseline study: USI India for the research for the baseline study on peace operations, ICIS Russia on security sector reform, and CCCPA Egypt on civilian capacity. The coordinators for each field will host a dissemination workshop on the assigned theme in their host countries. The tentative dates and locations are shown below.

Authors' Workshops, Dissemination Conferences, Annual Meetings

The Authors' Workshops for all three themes will be hosted by CCCPA in Cairo in December 2014. Two or three researchers per partner will be invited. The member organizations are to make sure that these will be the principal researchers working on the baseline study for each theme.

The first dissemination seminar will be held on SSR in November 2015, hosted by ICIS in Russia. The 2015 Annual Meeting, also hosted by ICIS in Russia, will follow this seminar back-to-back.

The second dissemination seminar will be hosted by USI on peace operations in January/February 2016 in India.

The third dissemination seminar will be held on CivCap and (tentatively) hosted by NUPI and held in New York in March 2016.

This third seminar will be followed back-to-back by the 2016 Annual Meeting to review the entire work and impact of the research undertaken in the three core areas.

Should it not be possible to organize the PeaceCap Network meetings in the indicated partner countries due to unforeseen circumstances, CSIS has offered to host any of these meetings in Indonesia instead.

PeaceCap Network Publications, 2014–2016

	Baseline Studies	Baseline Studies Timeline	Policy Briefs Topics and Timeline (approx. 3500 words, with recommendations)
Peace Operations	All partners, led by USI, India	Dec 2014: Authors' workshop, CCCPA – Egypt 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	Gender and Peacekeeping (Igarapé and NUPI, Aug 2014) Use of Force and Robustness of Peacekeeping: (USI, Aug 2014) Literature review: emerging countries and peace ops (NUPI, Oct 2014) Security Council and voting patterns (CCCPA and NUPI) PeaceOps and changing scenarios: responding to asymmetric threats in Somalia, CAR, Mali (ACCORD and NUPI)
Security Sector Reform/ Development (terminology to be decided)	All partners, led by ICIS, Russia	Dec 2014: Authors' workshop, CCCPA – Egypt Jan–Oct 2015: Network partners produce country-based reports Nov–Dec 2015: Synthesize country reports Jan 2015: Publish and disseminate reports Jan/Feb 2016: Baseline launch, dissemination seminar ICIS – Russia	SSR/Development concept paper (NUPI and ICIS, Nov 2014) Literature review: emerging countries and SSR (CSIS) Role of regional organizations in post-conflict reconstruction (ACCORD and IPC) SSR and organized crime/terrorism (USI)
Civilian Capacity	All partners, led by CCCPA, Egypt	Dec 2014: Authors' workshop, CCCPA - Egypt Jan–Dec 2015: Network partners produce country-based reports Jan–March 2016: Synthesize country reports April 2016: Publish and disseminate reports March 2016: Baseline launch, dissemination seminar, New York	Key policies affecting CivCap (CCCPA and IPC) LAS and CivCap: needs for Arab region (CCCPA, Jan 2015) AU and CivCap (ACCORD and CCCPA) Training and recruitment civilians for peace ops (Igarape and ACCORD) Changing scenarios and asymmetric threats: mission security for civilians deployed in post-conflict areas (USI and NUPI) CivCap as an effective mediation tool (IPC)

PeaceCap Network Meetings, 2014–2016

		Host	Report	Timeline
2014	Annual Meeting 2014	IPC, Turkey	IPC and NUPI	Meeting: 9–10 July 2014 Report publication: July 2014
	Peace Ops, CivCap and SSR authors workshop	CCCPA, Egypt	CCCPA and NUPI	Meeting: early Dec 2014 Report publication: Jan 2015
2015	SSR dissemination seminar	ICIS, Russia	ICIS and NUPI	Baseline study publication: Oct 2015 Meeting: Nov 2015 (connected to annual meeting 2015)
	Annual Meeting 2015	ICIS, Russia	ICIS and NUPI	Meeting: Nov 2015 Report publication: Nov/Dec 2015
2016	Peace Ops dissemination seminar	USI, India	USI and NUPI	Baseline study publication: Jan 2016 Meeting: Jan/Feb 2016
	CivCap dissemination seminar (incl. SSR and Peace Ops)	NUPI, Norway. Tentatively planned to be held in New York to include UN	NUPI	Baseline study publication: Feb 2016 Meeting: March 2016 (connected to annual meeting 2016)
	Annual Meeting 2016	NUPI, Norway. Tentatively planned to be held in New York, to include UN	NUPI	Meeting: March 2016 Final report publication: May 2016

Partner Responsibilities

Partners	Baseline lead	Policy Briefs	Meetings
Brazil		Gender; Training and Recruitment of Civilians	
Egypt	CivCap	Security Council Voting Patterns; Key Policies affecting CivCap; LAS and CivCap	Dec 2014: Authors' workshop Peace Ops, SSR, CivCap
India	Peace Ops	Use of Force; SSR and Organized Crime/terrorism; Mission Security for Civilians	Jan 2016: Peace Ops seminar
Indonesia		Literature Review SSR	
Norway		Gender; Use of Force; Literature Review Peace Ops; Security Council Voting Patterns; Asymmetric threats in Somalia, CAR, Mali; SSR Concept Development Paper	March 2016: baseline launch and AGM New York
Russia	SSR	SSR Concept Development Paper	Nov 2015: SSR and AGM
South Africa		Asymmetric threats in Somalia, CAR, Mali; Role of Regional Organizations in Post-Conflict Reconstruction; AU and CivCap; Training and Recruitment of Civilians	
Turkey		CivCap as an Effective Mediation Tool; Role of Regional Organizations in Post-Conflict Reconstruction; Key Policies Affecting CivCap	July 2014: AGM project planning meeting