



Norwegian Institute
of International
Affairs

Nordiska Afrikainstitutet
The Nordic Africa Institute



Strategic Options for the Future of African Peace Operations 2015–2025

Seminar Report

Cedric de Coning, Linnéa Gelot and John Karlsrud



NUPI Report
[Report no. 1, 2015]

Publisher: Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
Copyright: © Norwegian Institute of International Affairs 2015
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 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
Fax: [+ 47] 22 99 40 50
Tel: [+ 47] 22 99 40 00

Strategic Options for the Future of African Peace Operations 2015-2025 Seminar Report

Cedric de Coning, Linnéa Gelot and John Karlsrud

Published by Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Contents

Executive summary	4
1. African peace operations: trends and future scenarios?	8
2. The context: the contemporary African security landscape	10
a. AU peace operations	11
b. Operationalizing the ASF, the RDC and harmonizing with the ACIRC	13
3. AU peace operations partnerships	14
a. The principle of subsidiarity and the relationship between the UN, AU, RECs/RMs	16
b. Mission support	17
4. Civilian and police dimensions of African peace operations	19
5. Conclusions and recommendations	21
About the authors	23
Appendix	24

Executive summary

An African model of peace operations

Increasingly complex security environments are placing high demands on African peace operations, and complicating efforts at long-term peace- and statebuilding. From the experiences of the African Union (AU) and the sub-regions over the last decade, an *African model of peace operations* has emerged that is at odds with the mission scenarios and multi-dimensional assumptions that underpinned the original framework of the African Standby Force (ASF). The model indicates that:

- The AU has used its peace operations to contain violent conflicts and to help stabilize the security situation in the affected countries. Simultaneously, the AU has used its special envoys and good offices mechanisms to seek political solutions.
- African peace operations always operate alongside some form of sub-regional, UN or EU presence. This creates challenges of duplication, overlap and rivalry, but also provides the AU, sub-regions, EU and UN with opportunities to collaborate, to coordinate their roles and to enter into burden-sharing arrangements.
- African peace operations are funded and supported by the AU, African troop- and police-contributing countries (TCCs, PCCs), and, in the case of the Ebola mission (ASEOWA) also by African private-sector donations. Some sub-regions, like the Economic Community of West Africa (ECOWAS) have been able to support their own missions through community levies. Efforts are also underway at the pan-African level to identify alternative sources of funding. However, for now AU peace operations remain dependent on funding and support from international organizations and partners. This situation affects the ability of the AU to make independent decisions regarding the size, scope and duration of its missions.
- African peace operations are predominantly short-duration missions that are handed over to UN missions as soon as basic stability has been restored. That makes joint planning, analysis and preparedness for handover central issues from the very start.
- The AU experience in Burundi, Central African Republic, Mali and Somalia indicates that the only countries that are willing to contribute troops to missions where high-intensity combat-operations are likely, are those that have a strategic interest in securing stability in that particular country or region. Whilst this may be a necessity, it can also have negative implications for how the mission is perceived by some factions in the host population. The AU should thus anticipate, monitor for, and be ready to

proactively manage the strategic consent, legitimacy and credibility of the mission towards the host population.

The 2003 ASF framework provided for six deployment scenarios, but these have rarely matched actual deployment patterns. This framework needs to be adjusted, to bring it in line with the AU's actual mission experiences. With the ASF due to achieve full operational capability in 2015, the AU could benefit from a *strategic review* of African peace operations. That could enable it to prepare for the next decade on the basis of a shared strategic vision for ASF operations that is relevant to the current and near-future context, and adjusted to the strategic objectives of the *AU's Vision 2063* and *Silencing the Guns*. Key issues such an AU Panel should consider include:

- What adjustments are needed for the ASF to remain relevant to changing conflict trends, and to enhance the effectiveness of AU peace operations?
- How can the ASF's Rapid Deployment Capability (RDC) concept be harmonized with the African Capacity for the Immediate Response to Crises (ACIRC) concept?
- What mission scenarios are most likely to require ASF deployments over the next decade? And on that basis, what specialized and niche capacities will the AU and regions need to develop or enhance?

Strategic partnerships

Regular discussions between *strategic partners* and the AU and RECs/RMs should make it easier to identify medium- to long-term shared norms, objectives and needs. Better inter-departmental coordination and the adoption of common objectives can help to avoid stove-piping and duplication of efforts. To improve day-to-day relations, to minimize the remaining areas of tension, as well as to enable smooth handovers and transitions, joint conflict analyses should be conducted at the earliest possible date – to reach agreement on root causes and triggering factors, and preferably to develop joint strategies for prevention and mediation. Sub-regions, with their in-depth local knowledge, could provide a platform for partners to perform these analyses.

The subsidiarity principle needs further discussion and clarification, not least between the AU and RECs/RMs. African peace operations that entail the use of force require UN Security Council mandates under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Moreover, the deployment of African peace operations is likely to require the further authorization of the AU Peace and Security Council. If a REC/RM is mobilized to undertake such an operation, authorization may also be necessary from the REC/RM own legal authorizing body. For other mission types that do not require legal authority to use force, the body most proximate – the relevant

REC/RM – should be assumed to have responsibility for responding first. All actors responding to a conflict should be in close and regular communication, to enable assessments of comparative advantage, deployed capabilities and available resources, as well as efficiency and legitimacy.

Mission support is critical to the success of African peace operations, but there has been insufficient investment in the planning and management of missions. The support pillar has been particularly neglected. Flexible *ad hoc* models are often developed in response to specific contexts. Because of overreliance on external support, there has been scant incentive to draft sufficient support models at the AU. The *ad hoc* approach is likely to continue, but there should be joint efforts at better planning and implementing support solutions, given the specific nature of African high-intensity peace operations. Although the models to be developed for future missions will be significantly influenced by the political will of partners, both the AU and the UN can identify what has worked and where improvements can be made.

- As structured dialogue should be initiated involving the AU, UN, RECs/RMs and strategic partners, to develop mission-support models coherent with the high-intensity stabilization type of missions that have become characteristic of the African model of peace operations.
- A more predictable international support system for regional operations is urgently needed.
- The AU should consider establishing a dedicated branch within its Peace Support Operations Division (PSOD) to improve its capacity for mission support for African peace operations.
- The AU should explore how it can work together with the UN in developing strategic bases, tools, systems, stocks, procurement and outsourcing agreements.
- The AU and the UN should, *inter alia*, consider options for how the AU can access resources from the UN's regional logistics bases in Brindisi and Entebbe.
- Standardize and harmonize TCC and PCC contributions to African peace operations, to enhance inter-operability and ease mission support.

Civilian and police dimensions

The roles of civilians in mission planning at the AU PSOD should be reinforced, and more civilian planning capacity should be added at the various levels of African peace operations. Planners must keep in mind the distinct nature of civilian roles in African peace operations – for

instance, the particularities of police functions in stabilization contexts. The AU needs to continue to develop the doctrinal framework and provide accepted guidelines on key concepts such as protection of civilians, gender, humanitarian support, and sexual exploitation and abuse. In this doctrinal framework, rule of law, police and civilian aspects should be reinforced. Finally, it is important to consider what core civilian capabilities are needed in high-intensity situations and what capacities could make the most impact. Political officers and human rights officers may be obvious candidates here, but also gender and conduct/discipline officers can help the mission to achieve its objectives as well as to prevent backlashes and unwanted consequences.

- Improve the civilian planning capacity at the AU PSOD as well as at the various levels of African peace operations.
- Identify the distinct challenges of policing in African stabilization contexts and ensure that these are reflected in the doctrine, planning and conduct of policing tasks.
- Prioritize training, rostering and recruitment of appropriate staff for civilian functions in African peace operations.

1. African peace operations: trends and future scenarios?¹

African peace operations have developed considerably over the last decade since the first mission deployed by the African Union to Burundi. The African Union (AU) and the Regional Economic Communities (RECs) / Regional Mechanisms (RMs) have fielded over ten peace operations to Burundi, Central African Republic (CAR), Comoros, Darfur, Mali and Somalia. The AU has shown persistence and strength in the face of significant challenges in Somalia. New missions to Mali and CAR have been mounted on short notice and in challenging circumstances. In 2013 alone, a total of approximately 40,000 uniformed and civilian personnel were mandated to serve in AU peace operations (approximately 71,000, if the joint African Union–United Nations hybrid mission in Darfur is also taken into account).² African regional actors have through these developments shown their indispensability as leading actors and partners in international efforts to enhance peace and security in Africa.

Concurrently, significant institutional capacity and frameworks have been developed. The foundations for the African Standby Force (ASF) were laid over a decade ago. Much has changed since then, and a great deal has been achieved in the development of the ASF. These achievements include a suite of common policy documents, an annual continental training programme, improved in-country training standards, and standby forces that can be used collectively – albeit with only an initial operational capability at the moment, mainly for logistical and institutional reasons. The understanding of the role of police and civilian capacity in African peace operations is evolving. The AU has continued to refine its doctrines and guidelines, e.g. for the Protection of Civilians, Policing and Gender, to be able to respond to the high-intensity operations now common in Africa. Good progress has also been made towards developing the Rapid Deployment Capability (RDC) concept. Further to this, concerted efforts must be made if the ASF is to achieve full operational capability (FOC), as scheduled for 2015. However, the objective of FOC should not detract from existing capabilities, as reflected in AU & REC/RM deployments to Somalia, Mali and CAR.

¹ This report is an outcome of the seminar ‘The Future of African Peace Operations: Strategic Options 2015-2025’, co-hosted by the Nordic Africa Institute and the Training for Peace programme in Cape Town, 17-18 December 2015. The report is based on the proceedings of the seminar. A background paper was commissioned to introduce each of the seminar sessions, and the report and background papers will form the basis of an edited volume on the same topic. Annex 1 provides the agenda and participant list of the meeting.

² See Walter Lotze (2013) ‘Strengthening African Peace Support Operations’, available at: <http://bit.ly/RzPSON> (accessed on 12 May 2014) and the Providing Peacekeepers project’s statistics available at <http://www.providingforpeacekeeping.org/>.

With the ASF due to achieve FOC in 2015, the question is how the ASF will be utilized in future, and more generally, the future direction ASF and African peace operations? The independent panel of experts appointed by the Chairperson of the African Union Commission in 2013 to review the progress made by the ASF towards achieving FOC by 2015 held that the existing ASF Policy Framework should be reviewed, and be aligned with the realities of the African peace operation experience. With the ASF due to achieve full operational capability in 2015, the AU could benefit from a *strategic review* of African peace operations. That could enable it to prepare for the next decade on the basis of a shared strategic vision for ASF operations that is relevant to the current and near-future context, and adjusted to the strategic objectives of the AU's Vision 2063 and Silencing the Guns.

Looking ahead towards the post-2015 period also involves continuous development of the partnerships between African actors and the UN, the European Union (EU) and other actors with vested interests. The past decade has brought new and creative forms of cooperation in every mission, and many of these *ad hoc* collaborations are worth institutionalizing further. Partners are also undergoing change. The EU has established the European External Action Service (EEAS) to oversee foreign policy, including its engagement in peace operations. At the UN, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon has nominated an Independent High-Level Panel to perform a strategic review of UN peace operations. Moreover, the UN will in 2015 undertake a review of its peacebuilding architecture, and establish new goals for global development following the expiry of the Millennium Development Goals. Climate change negotiations will be high on the global agenda in preparation for the Paris Climate Conference. During 2015, several global policymaking processes will highlight contemporary global challenges which form the environment to which peacekeepers are to respond. It is thus timely to focus on the future of African peace operations, and how African countries can best shoulder the 'Africa rising' narrative by continuing to develop effective and legitimate security institutions.

Partnerships with African peace operation actors are recognized as essential from the perspective of the involved policy-makers and institutions. The increasing use of the phrase 'strategic partnership' signals the wish to clarify on all sides the shared long-term political objectives between African and non-African institutions and to regularize or institutionalize mechanisms in support of those objectives.

Based on discussions at *The Future of African Peace Operations* seminar, this report identifies common trends, ongoing developments and contemporary security requirements in the field of African peace operations, offering strategic recommendations to guide further developments for the coming decade.

2. The context: the contemporary African security landscape

Future African peace operations must reflect an understanding of the changing security context in Africa. African peace operations, in collaboration with international partners, are responding to a dynamic and high-intensity environment. A widely recognized lesson is that traditional principles of multi-dimensional UN peacekeeping missions are out of sync with the challenges facing African peace operations on the ground. These principles have informed the African Standby Force doctrine, but will need to be adjusted to reflect today's realities.

Asymmetric and hybrid security challenges, religious extremism and transnational criminal networks intersect in several countries, creating new challenges to peacekeeping. Captured in the term 'glocality', the linkages between extremism, trafficking, smuggling and elite networks raise high demands to African peace operations and further complicate efforts at long-term peacebuilding and state-building.³ Thanks to intensive efforts, piracy off the Horn of Africa has waned – but is on the rise in other areas. Militant groups and jihadist terrorist networks are changing their *modus operandi*; and in some areas, collusion between criminal or militant actors, business actors and state structures brings additional challenges. However, while religious extremism and terrorism are important factors, they should not be over-emphasized or allowed to mask deeper political and socio-economic challenges that are at risk of becoming 'securitized'.

Complex local conflicts with regional and transnational dimensions pose threats to the protection of civilian populations and require careful responses by African institutions. As seen in West Africa, pandemics such as Ebola pose immense challenges to areas with fragile statehood or widespread poverty. With this as an example, rapid intervention may be needed also in cases of instability or pandemics, and not only in extreme cases of mass atrocity crimes. At the same time, conventional threats to security will continue to exist in parallel with unpredictable and fragmented actors and drivers of conflict.

As a result of these developments, the AU and the RECs/RMs have had to respond to increasingly complex security environments over the last decade. Has this resulted in the emergence of an African model of peace operations? And if so, how could we characterize such an African model of peace operations?

³ In recognition of the challenges posed to the African peace and security architecture (APSA), the AUPSC held its first-ever meeting at the level of heads of states and government, devoted to prevention and combating of terrorism and violent extremism. 455th Meeting Communiqué, 2 Sept 2014 Nairobi. See also <http://www.foi.se/Documents/Eriksson%20et%20al%20%28red.%29,%20Illicit%20Flows%20and%20African%20Security.%202014.pdf>

a. AU peace operations

The first characteristic of an AU model of peace operations is that the AU undertakes mostly stability operations. UN peacekeeping operations have traditionally been characterized by monitoring ceasefire agreements and helping to implement peace agreements. The typical UN operation is deployed after a peace agreement has been signed. Whereas the UN has also deployed operations to protect civilians in contexts where there is no peace agreement in place, these missions have been seen as exceptions to the rule. In contrast, all AU operations to date have been deployed amidst ongoing conflict, and have aimed at halting the conflict and stabilizing the security situation.

AU missions have differed in important ways from UN peacekeeping practice and its guiding principles: consent, impartiality and non-use of force. UN peacekeeping must be non-confrontational and transparent, in order to maintain the consent, trust and confidence of the parties to the ceasefire or peace agreement. Therefore, UN peacekeepers are drawn from countries that are not associated with the conflict, and do not undertake covert or stealth operations. They operate in white and blue, so that they can be seen to be transparent and visible, and to show that they are not combatants – and thus not party to the conflict.

By contrast, AU stability operations are ‘offensive’ in that a fragile peace needs to be enforced by suppressing the capability of aggressors to use force for political purposes. This means that AU troop-contributing countries (TCCs) may have to act offensively – for instance, by acquiring intelligence, operating with stealth operations, and as a result operating in green. Often, the only countries that are willing to contribute troops to such missions are those that have a strategic interest in securing stability, usually encompassing stability and order of a whole (sub)region. Thus, the actual experience of AU stability operations has, at many levels, evolved differently from the UN peacekeeping model on which the ASF has largely been modelled.

The second characteristic of an AU model of peace operations is that these are predominantly short duration missions that are handed over to UN missions as soon as basic stability has been restored. All these African peace operations have subsequently been taken over by UN peace operations with six to 18 months, except for the AU operation in Somalia, AMISOM.

AMISOM is the exception, as the AU had to fight an intensive and sustained counter-insurgency campaign to dislodge al-Shabaab. Despite considerable gains, the conditions are not yet ripe for a UN mission to take over. As an exception and in recognition of the international and global significance of the work carried out by the AU, the UN Security Council authorized the use of its assessed contributions to support the AU mission.

The third characteristic is that these missions have been funded and supported by African TCCs and police-contributing countries (PCCs), as well as international partners. This financial dimension has been an important factor in determining the size and scope of the missions, as well as their length. AU missions have had to make do with less personnel and less resources than a UN mission in the same theatre. For instance, in Darfur the UN mission that followed on from AMIS had approximately three times as many personnel and four times the budget. The same trend can be observed in the transitions in Mali and CAR.

As these missions are funded and supported by the international community, the AU and RECs/RMs cannot independently take decisions on the mandate, size and duration of these missions. There is a serious attempt underway to consider alternative ways of funding the AU. A team of experts led by President Obasanjo has proposed various ways in which the AU can raise its own funding. For instance, a levy of USD 10 on plane tickets to Africa and USD 2 on hotel accommodation could raise more than USD 700 million annually.⁴ These measures have not been adopted, but they serve as examples that it is not impossible for the AU to generate at least some of its own funding. The steady rise in the defence budgets of many African member states, with a 65% average increase over the last decade,⁵ also indicates a growing ability to fund and support African peace operations. If this were to happen, it would probably give the AU a considerably wider range of options. However, in the near term the AU seems constrained to the stability operations model.

The African model that has emerged over the past decade is thus one of stabilization missions, relatively short-lived, undertaken alongside UN and other political and humanitarian–development missions before being handed over to UN missions. These missions are financed and supported by the international community, which considerably limits the ability of the AU or RECs/RMs to determine their mandates, scope, size and duration independently.

The AU has not made a strategic choice to focus its efforts on stabilization missions. Rather, it ended up taking on this task because a unique set of push and pull factors converged to create the conditions

⁴ Progress Report of the High Level Panel on Alternative Sources of Financing the African Union, 15 July 2014, SC7749, African Union, Available At: <http://ccpau.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/obasanjo-panel-progress-report-assembly-au-18-xix-2012-e.pdf>

⁵ Perlo-Freeman, Sam and Carina Solmirano (2014) *SIPRI Fact Sheet 2014: Trends in World Military Expenditure, 2013*. Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, p. 4. See also *The Economist* (2014) 'Uppin' arms', 24 November 2014. Available at: <http://www.economist.com/blogs/graphicdetail/2014/11/daily-chart-13>. Accessed 19 January 2015.

in which the AU peace operations model became one of stability operations. Primary influences were the violent nature of the conflicts confronting the AU; the UN peacekeeping model, which prevents the UN from deploying peace operations until a ceasefire or peace agreement is in place; and the support models available for financing AU operations. For this reason, the AU needs to define and enhance conceptual clarity over the term ‘stabilization’.⁶ Internally, that will help in defining strategy and doctrine and in planning for upcoming roles.

If the actual experience of the AU over the last decade has differed so greatly from what was envisaged under the ASF framework, is it not time to adjust the ASF model so that the capacities being developed can better reflect the kinds of missions the AU is likely to undertake?⁷ What specialized and niche capacities will the AU and RECs/RMs need to develop or enhance, so as to ensure they are prepared for the kinds of operations they are likely to be called on to undertake over the next decade? How can the AU achieve the right balance between necessary capacities (including mobility, information gathering, specialized and formed police units, troop protection, political functions) and resource constraints?

b. Operationalizing the ASF, the RDC and harmonizing with the ACIRC

The African Standby Force and its Rapid Deployment Capability are expected to be fully operational by December 2015. Efforts are underway to achieve FOC through the AMANI exercise cycle and the implementation of the revised ASF–African Capacity for the Immediate Response to Crises (ACIRC) Roadmap. The latter attained initial operational capability in December 2014. Despite the decision by the AU Assembly in 2014 to ensure harmonization of the ASF and ACIRC, both processes seem to have proceeded in parallel or at best through selective attempts to harmonize the two mechanisms.

Some have criticized the ACIRC for distracting attention from the goal of operationalizing the ASF; others see the ACIRC as a way of breathing new life into the ASF. With the ASF becoming operational in 2015, its legitimacy will be strengthened, and it will continue to be the main framework for African peace operations. Going forward, there will be a need to harmonize the RDC and ACIRC concepts, and to adjust the ASF to be more focused and more efficient. While the ASF may not be deployed as such, it will continue to be of significant value for future operations as a repository of doctrine, standards and training guide-

⁶ The term ‘stabilization’ has been quite contentious. See Jan Bachmann (2014), ‘Policing Africa: The US Military and visions of crafting ‘good order’,’ *Security Dialogue* 45 (2): 119–136.

⁷ See, for instance, Cedric de Coning (2014) ‘Enhancing the Efficiency of the African Standby Force: The Case for a Shift To a Just-in-Time Rapid Response Model?’, *Conflict Trends* 2/2014, ACCORD, available at <http://bit.ly/1nz8wT6>.

lines, providing a common understanding of a distinctly African approach to PSOs.

Drawing on experience with African peace operations to date, there should be further reflection on the various scenarios most likely for the deployment of African peace operations. Experiences from these operations should also feed into the future development of the ASF. Moreover, the legitimacy of interventions is a central point, and one that requires collective responses on the continent. Actual deployed capability to date testifies to the African contribution and commitment, even beyond the ambitions set out in the ASF concept. The standby brigades as originally conceived were highly dependent on a ‘collective security’ assumption, while in practice African states respond to conflicts more on a case-by-case basis. Ensuring prior AU authorization is important, sometimes for political reasons. Significantly, individual states with stakes involved often choose to act rapidly – usually a coalition of regional states joining in. the AU Peace and Security Council, and the UN Security Council, will often legitimize these missions just as they are deploying, or retrospectively. Thus, a *lead nation concept* seems to match better with evolving practice. Additionally, integrating such a concept into the multilateralist framework of the ASF can help to guard against abuse by strong powers.

Planning and adaptation of the ASF must take into account the fact that most AU missions are handed over to the UN within 6–18 months, making harmonization of standards highly desirable. To enable smoother transitions, the UN Security Council should also consider funding training and equipping forces, and preparing their basis, starting six months prior to the transfer of authority to a UN mission, as was done in CAR. Second, although handover to the UN is the most plausible route, it is not guaranteed, so AU missions should still be planned as distinct and comprehensive but as ‘minimal’ as possible. Most AU operations to date have been stabilization operations that created the conditions necessary for the UN to follow up with a multi-dimensional peacekeeping operation. That said, a transfer of authority to the UN must not become the overriding objective of the operation: the case-specific political objectives in themselves should be primary, and the AU mission must itself include the components and capabilities necessary for achieving them. Therefore, the political objective and peacebuilding process need to be considered at the planning stage, taking into account the vital role of civilians and police for longer-term stability and peacebuilding. However, as yet the AU cannot raise the internal resources it would need to deploy other types of more comprehensive multi-dimensional missions.

3. AU peace operations partnerships

The UN–AU relationship has deepened and evolved, and has facilitated the deployment of a record number of peacekeepers in Africa in recent years. In 2014, the UN Office to the African Union (UNOAU) and the AU

Commission's Peace and Security Department signed a Joint Framework for an Enhanced Partnership in Peace and Security, which will frame and guide their joint work.⁸ The UN has experienced a rise in the number of operations during a period of financial austerity, with increasing deployments to situations that stretch the understanding of what situations UN peacekeeping is intended to cover.⁹ The UN thus understands the value of the AU playing the role that the AU itself wants to play, and there is a shared need to improve cooperation between the AU and the UN. In some circles there is still a perception of an imbalance in the relationship, although on day-to-day planning and management the UN works with the AU as equals. For example, the annual meeting is between the members of the two councils, not between the two councils, as some UNSC permanent members are keen to stress.

Still-remaining areas of tension include: differing ideas on the preconditions for deployment and transitions (as the AU is often called upon to deploy to active conflicts, where there is no viable ceasefire and/or peace agreement); differing interpretations of norms such as 'protection of civilians' or 'unconstitutional' changes of government; differing conceptualizations and approaches to the use of force and combat roles in peace operations; challenges and conflicts surrounding the principle of subsidiarity; and proposals and expectations for financing AU peace operations. Identified shared purposes help actors stay committed, which is the aim of having a strategic partnership. For the AU to be an effective partner, what is needed is a forward-looking perspective – not continuing turf battles and competition.

The situation on the ground has created a general interest in closer cooperation among the AU, the UN and the EU, as well as subregional organizations. This has been exemplified in recent meetings between these bodies, and bilaterally as well. More trilateral cooperation between the AU, EU and UN could be pursued to ensure that common objectives are reached.

To improve the strategic relationship between the AU and its partners, there is a need for a predictable, systematic and institutionalized partnerships. This will gradually reduce the negative effects of the underlying inequalities and asymmetries in power. Also essential are regular conversations and discussions on common norms, goals and needs – this will be of mutual benefit for the partners. There is also a need to promote inter-departmental coordination and adoption of

⁸ See AU (2013) Report of the Chairperson of the Commission on the African Union–United Nations partnership: the need for greater coherence (AU doc. PSC/AHG/3.(CCCXC VII), 23 September 2013).

⁹ John Karlsrud (2015) 'The UN at War: Examining the Consequences of Peace Enforcement Mandates for the UN Peacekeeping Operations in the CAR, the DRC and Mali', *Third World Quarterly* 36 (1): 40–54.

common objectives to avoid stove-piping and duplication of efforts. While recognizing the value of diversity, efforts to develop more joint conflict analyses should be central, to enable agreement on root causes, on triggering factors and on how to prevent conflict and work with mediation. The RECs, with their in-depth subregional and local knowledge, will be important partners and could provide a platform for partners to perform these analyses.

There is growing acceptance for increased burden-sharing between the AU and its partners. African peace operations should not be solely internationally funded nor African-funded. African countries will need to increase their financial support to African peace operations.

a. The principle of subsidiarity and the relationship between the UN, AU, RECs/RMs

The principle of subsidiarity lies at the heart of the debate on UN, AU, RECs/RMs relations, resurfacing at regular intervals. Two fundamental principles are in tension when dealing with conflicts on the African continent – also elsewhere in the world. First, authority is drawn from the global to the local level, with the UN Security Council as the source of origin. Second, ownership runs in the opposite direction from the local to the global level, where proximity is a decisive factor. These lines of authority, accountability and ownership follow each other closely, but are strengthened in opposite directions. At the intersection of these lines we find the African Union. The experience of the African Support Mission to Mali (AFISMA) highlighted many of the unresolved tensions and unclear divisions of roles between the UN, AU and, in this case, the Economic Community of West Africa (ECOWAS). The transitions from MICOPAX, the mission of the Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), to the AU's African Support Mission in Central Africa Republic (MISCA) in December 2013, followed approximately six months later by the transition from MISCA to the UN Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA), reflected a significant improvement and showed how quickly the UN, AU and RECs learn from previous experiences and adapt to new realities.

These experiences show that, when it comes to the authority to use non-consensual force,¹⁰ all peace operations require authorization from the UN Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The AFISMA experience further confirmed that the UN Security Council will

¹⁰ In this context, the non-consensual use of force refers to those cases where the AU or a REC/RM is not requested by a state to intervene on its behalf. If a state requests another state or a regional body to assist in acting against an insurgency, no UN Security Council authority is needed, because the state is acting under its own sovereign authority. However, if the AU or a REC/RM should wish to mobilize and deploy a peace operation under the auspices of the ASF to respond to such a request, then it is conceivable that the Peace and Security Council would need to authorize the use of the ASF.

no longer authorize an African REC/RM to undertake a peace operation, as with ECOMOG and ECOMIL in the past, without the consent and authority of the AU Peace and Security Council. All African peace operations to date have been undertaken by the African Union Commission, in close cooperation with the relevant REC/RMs and troop- and police-contributing countries. However, should a scenario arise where a REC/RM is called on to undertake a peace operation that requires the use of non-consensual force, authorization by the UN Security Council and the AU Peace and Security Council would be required. From the perspective of international law, the authority to use force thus resides with the UN Security Council, and practice as well as precedent indicate that the deployment of African peace operations will require the further authorization of the AU Peace and Security Council. If a REC/RM is mobilized to undertake such an operation, further authorization may be necessary from the REC/RM's own legal authorizing body.

In addition to the legal dimension, the principle of subsidiarity also has a practical dimension: the body nearest to the problem is likely to have the greatest practical and operational credibility and know-how to solve the problem. Thus all conflict management approaches in Africa will rely, in the first instance, on the advice, local knowledge and capacity of immediate neighbours, the regional body and the continental body. In some cases, due to conflicts of interest or the distraction of other crises, the REC/RM may not be able to act as a first responder – but, as a general rule, the body closest to the problem will have responsibility for responding to an emerging crisis. If necessary, help can be sought from the next-highest authority or bilateral partners, until eventually the assistance of the UN may be sought. In reality, it is acknowledged that in most conflicts today, the relevant REC, the AU and the UN are all likely to be present and to have prior existing engagements and commitments. However, whenever the question arises as to who should lead a particular initiative, and provided that it does not require legal authority to use force, the body nearest to the problem – the relevant REC/RM – should be assumed to have responsibility for responding first. That said, all the actors should coordinate closely with each other; and while the principle of subsidiarity should be a guide, it should not prevent the relevant REC/RM, the AU or the UN from choosing a different course of action, on the basis of comparative advantages, deployed capabilities and available resources.

b. Mission support

A well-functioning system for mission support is a critical factor for the success of peace operations, but continues to be the weakest and most neglected pillar of African peace operations. The difficult security environments in which African peace operations operate entail various challenges as regards mission support. Efforts are underway to further increase the support provided by AU member states for African PSOs,

but it is also important to ask whether a more predictable international support system for regional operations could be developed. Globalization in this context implies that all conflicts have causes and effects linked to developments in the global system, and it is thus in the interest of the maintenance of global peace and security to find better and more predictable ways in which regional and international partners can work together in mandating and undertaking regional operations.

There has been insufficient investment in planning and management of missions, in particular the support pillar. It is obviously difficult to plan for operations when the context is rapidly changing and there is little knowledge of what assets and capabilities will be available. Compounding these challenges, everything – from aviation and fuel to communications – has been dependent on the partners, which is an obvious impediment to mission planning and execution. Greater capacity for mission support is needed at the level of the AU and RECs/RMs. The AU should consider establishing a dedicated branch within its Peace Support Operations Division for this purpose. The UN has been improving its model for mission support and the AU and the UN should, *inter alia*, consider options for how the AU can access resources from the UN regional logistics bases in Brindisi and Entebbe. The AU should explore how it can cooperate with the UN on the development of strategic bases, tools, systems, stocks, procurement and outsourcing agreements.

On the ground, parallel standards exist for troops deployed to UN and AU in the same theatre. Reimbursement rates and support are provided according to the mission to which one belongs, not the country or situation to which one is deployed. The inequality of reimbursements also impacts on what member-state contributions are made available to what missions (AU vs UN). The life-span of equipment decreases and maintenance costs increase because of the nature of the African peace operations. For example, in Somalia the budget for fuel or tyres for vehicles becomes exhausted as tyres are frequently rendered useless because of the prevalence, far beyond mission-planning assumptions, of improvised explosive devices (IEDs).

To date, none of the invented support models are coherent with the type of high-intensity stabilization/peace enforcement missions that the AU is performing. There has not been structured dialogue on this matter between the AU, UN, RECs and partners, and new models are developed for each mission. Flexible models are developed in response to specific contexts, reflecting continued *ad hoc* inventions here and now. At the AU, there has not been much incentive to draft sufficient support models, because of the reliance on external support. UNSOA, in support of AMISOM, has been the best model to date, and can be further developed. In this security context there are advantages to having models that are ‘lean and mean’, with less staff working in an

integrated manner with AU. However, the UNSOA model could be improved by separating civilian from military personnel to a lesser degree. The *ad hoc* approach is likely to continue, but there should be joint efforts at better planning and implementing support solutions. Although the models that will be developed for future missions also will be significantly influenced by the political will of partners, the AU and the UN can identify what has worked and where improvements can be made.

Contingent-owned equipment (COE) remains a significant challenge. Not all TCCs and PCCs have their own equipment, so one option would be to establish a pool of equipment that these can draw from. TCCs could be provided with loans to buy equipment delivered directly to the missions, for subsequent reimbursement.

Only the USA and the NATO countries combined can undertake strategic airlifts, and commercial strategic airlifts are beyond the financial limits available to the AU or the UN. Commercial logistics is considerably more effective than the UN in combat situations, given the increasing risk-aversion of the UN system.

New and bold ideas for funding mechanisms are needed from AU officials as well as partners. The 2008 Prodi Panel made such a bold and practical suggestion for more systematic and predictable financing mechanisms, opening up for the establishment of trust funds and use of UN assessed contributions to fund African missions during short time-limited periods and based on UN Security Council and General Assembly approval.¹¹

There is a need to further standardize and harmonize TCC and PCC contributions to African peace operations. This will enhance interoperability and facilitate support. The development of standards should not merely replicate standards for UN peacekeeping, but take into account the particular nature of African high-intensity PSOs.

4. Civilian and police dimensions of African peace operations

Multi-dimensionality remains critical to African peace operations, but it is important to articulate more clearly what the AU means by 'multi-dimensional' and what roles civilians and police can play. Military solutions should be used as a last resort – and even then, they have their limitations in facilitating sustainable political outcomes or set the stage for longer-term peacebuilding activities. All AU missions have military, police and civilian components under civilian leadership. However, the military dimension currently outweighs the other, in numbers as well as in importance, even though both the police and the

¹¹ A/63/666-S/2008/813 Comprehensive review of the whole of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects, 31 December 2008.

civilian components are central for facilitating the transition to longer-term stability and mission exit.

The civilian dimensions of African peace operations are likely to be somewhat slimmer than in UN missions due to the high-intensity environment. Civilian functions thus tend to be gathered under broad headings – like *Protection of Civilians*, which integrates perspectives on human rights, international humanitarian law, gender, sexual exploitation and abuse, and management of detainees; *Stabilization*, which integrates perspectives on security and governance, conflict management, quick-impact projects and institution-building; and *Humanitarian Support*, which integrates issues related to civilian–military coordination, and security of internally displaced persons and refugees. All the same, it is the officers who conduct work in these areas that will be of paramount importance to the successful conclusion of the missions they support.

To ensure that missions improve their chances of success, civilians have been given an increased role in the planning elements of the AU. This is a positive trend that should be supported and reinforced. It is necessary to continue to develop the doctrinal framework and provide accepted guidelines on key concepts such as protection of civilians, gender, humanitarian support, and combatting sexual exploitation and abuse. The military dimension of stabilization has been over-emphasized, to the detriment of a focus on rule of law, police and civilian aspects. Planning must also reflect the various realities existing in parallel on the ground – one part of a country may enjoy relative stability while another could be embroiled in conflict.

Police support in stabilization contexts will necessarily provide distinct challenges that should be reflected in the doctrine, planning and conduct of policing tasks. Merely copying and pasting UN doctrine will not be sufficient: it is essential to understand and reflect upon the specifics of policing in African peace operations. Missions in high-intensity environments need Formed Police Units (FPUs) equipped with armed personnel carriers (APCs), to be relevant to the tasks of the mission. Police contributions should be deployed with the training they need, and training should focus on strengthening the capacity of the local police. It is also important to address the larger range of rule-of-law challenges, of which the police are only one part.

Further work is needed to provide the right people at the right time and at the right place. Guidance on training, rostering and recruitment needs has been developed, but more efforts are needed to generate appropriate staff on time. Finally, it is essential to consider what core civilian capabilities are needed in high-intensity situations, and what capacities could make the most impact. Political officers and human rights officers are obviously important – but also gender and conduct

and discipline officers can help the mission to achieve its objectives, while also preventing backlashes and unwanted consequences.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

The AU and the RECs/RMs have had to respond to increasingly complex security environments over the last decade, and the original African model of peace operations is now at odds with the mission scenarios and assumptions that underpinned the ASF framework. A *lead nation concept* could improve ASF efficiency. Also in the future, the ASF should remain the main framework of African peace operations. It is important to harmonize the RDC and ACIRC concepts, to reflect further on the various mission scenarios most likely for deployment of African peace operations, and to focus on the specialized and niche capacities the AU and RECs/RMs need to develop or enhance.

There is a need for regular conversations and discussions among strategic partners on common norms, goals and needs. Further, it is important to promote inter-departmental coordination and the adoption of common objectives to avoid stove-piping and duplication of efforts. Efforts to develop more joint conflict analyses should be central on this agenda, to enable agreement on root causes, on triggering factors and on how to prevent conflict and work with mediation. The RECs, with their in-depth subregional and local knowledge, could provide a platform for partners to perform these analyses.

The subsidiarity principle will require further discussions and clarification, not least between the AU and RECs/RMs. Because of their offensive nature, stability operations require UN Security Council mandates: in line with international law, all peace operations that may use non-consensual force need authorization from the Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. Practice and precedent indicate that the deployment of African peace operations will require the further authority of the AU Peace and Security Council. If a REC/RM is mobilized to undertake such an operation further authorization may be necessary from the REC/RM's own legal authorizing body. For other mission types that do not require legal authority to use force, the body nearest to the problem – the relevant REC/RM – should be assumed to have responsibility for responding first. However, all actors should coordinate closely, and response should be based on assessments of comparative advantages, deployed capabilities and available resources.

A structured dialogue should be initiated among the AU, UN, RECs and partners to develop support models that are coherent with the high-intensity stabilization/peace enforcement type of missions that the AU is performing. A more predictable international support system for regional operations is urgently needed.

For improved capacity for mission support at the AU level, the RECs/RMs and the AU should consider establishing a dedicated branch within its Peace Support Operations Division (PSOD) for this purpose. The AU and the UN should consider, *inter alia*, options for how the AU can access resources from the UN regional logistics bases in Brindisi and Entebbe. The AU can work together with the UN on the development of strategic bases, tools, systems, stocks, procurement and outsourcing agreements.

The roles of civilians in mission planning at the AU PSOD should be reinforced, and more civilian planning capacity should be added at the various levels of African peace operations. These planners need to keep in mind the distinct nature of civilian roles in African peace operations – for instance, the particularities of police functions in stabilization contexts. The AU should continue to develop its doctrinal framework and provide accepted guidelines on key concepts such as protection of civilians, gender, humanitarian support, and combatting sexual exploitation and abuse. Within this doctrinal framework, it will be important to reinforce the rule of law, police and civilian aspects.

About the authors

Cedric de Coning (South Africa) is a Senior Researcher with the Peace Operations and Peacebuilding Research Group at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) and he is also a Senior Advisor on Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding for ACCORD. He serves on the editorial boards of the journals *Global Governance* and *Peacebuilding*. Cedric has a PhD from the Department of Philosophy at the University of Stellenbosch in South Africa. His research focus is on peace operations and peacebuilding policies and practices. A sample of publications include: “The BRICS and Coexistence” (Routledge, 2014), “Rising Powers and the Future of Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding” (NOREF, 2013), “Understanding Peacebuilding as Essentially Local” (*Stability Journal*, 2013), “Coherence & Coordination: The Limits of the Comprehensive Approach” (*Journal of International Peacekeeping*, 2011) and “The Unintended Consequences of Peacekeeping” (UN University Press, 2007).

Linnéa Gelot is a senior researcher at the Nordic Africa Institute in Uppsala, Sweden, a senior lecturer in peace and development studies at the School of Global Studies and an affiliated NUPI fellow. She has published on the African Union - United Nations relationship and the strengthened role of regional organisations in international peace and security. She has an interest in the norms and practices of the AU particularly the usages of the protection of civilians norm, and more broadly in issues of ethics and legitimacy surrounding international military interventions. She has also delivered professional trainings on the protection of civilians in peace operations for UNITAR's peacekeeping training programme in various partner institutions around the African continent.

John Karlsrud is Senior Research Fellow at the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI) working on peacekeeping, peacebuilding and humanitarian issues. In his PhD, conducted at the University of Warwick, he explored the role of think tanks and academic scholars in norm change processes in UN peacekeeping. He has published peer-reviewed articles in e.g. *Conflict, Security and Development*; *Disasters*, *Global Governance* and *Third World Quarterly*. He previously served as Special Assistant to the UN Special Representative of the Secretary-General to Chad and has done research and field work in Bosnia, Chad, Haiti, and South Sudan.



The Future of African Peace Operations: Strategic Options 2015-2025

Cape Town, 17-18 December 2014

Wednesday, 17 December

09:00 – 09:30 Introduction & overview of key issues

Brig.Gen. (Rtd) James Machakaire, Coordinator: Peacekeeping Unit, ACCORD

Mrs. Iina Soiri, Director, Nordic Africa Institute

Prof. Ibrahim Gambari, Co-Chair: High-level Commission on Global Security, Justice, & Governance, and Advisory Board: Training for Peace

09:30 – 11:00 Session 1: Stabilisation Missions and Mandates – Implications for the ASF?

The ASF framework provided for a number of scenarios but its doctrine was premised on multi-dimensional peacekeeping. However, most of the AU operations to date has been stabilization operations that created the conditions necessary for the UN to follow-up with a multi-dimensional peacekeeping operation? Is there a need to change the AU doctrine and approach to reflect this experience?

Chair: Dr. Funmi Olonisakin, Director: Conflict, Security and Development Group, King's College and Advisory Board: Training for Peace

Background paper: Dr. Solomon Dersso, Head: Peace and Security Council Report, Institute of Security Studies (ISS)

Panel:

- Mr. Oliver Ulich, Head: Partnerships Team, Division of Policy, Evaluation and Training, UNDPKO
- Col. (Rtd) Festus Aboagye, Executive Secretary, APSTA
- Dr. Cedric de Coning, Senior Research Fellow, ACCORD & NUPI

11:00-11:30 Photo & Coffee/Tea Break

11:30-13:00 **Session 2: Responding to New Asymmetric and Hybrid Security Challenges: Terrorism, Organised Crime, Piracy, Pandemics (e.g. Ebola)**

Africa's security landscape is rapidly changing with 'old' security threats and challenges mutating and transforming into 'new' and difficult challenges, undermining societies and exposing the weaknesses of national, (sub) regional economic communities and risk and vulnerability assessment methodologies to predict and respond to asymmetric and hybrid security challenges. Several critical issues arise with the rise in terrorist groups and the disturbing growth of organized criminal activities. Are the African Union and the respective regional economic communities' responses strategies nuanced enough to tackle these asymmetric and hybrid security challenges? What restructuring, if any, should occur to make African security institutions more responsive to the rapidly changing security environment?

Chair: Prof. Maxi Schoeman, 2014 Claude Ake Visiting Professor, Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University

Introduction: Dr. Kwesi Aning, Dean & Director, Academic Affairs & Research Department, Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training centre (KA IPTC)

Panel:

- Prof. Mark Shaw, Research Chair: Justice and Security in Africa, University of Cape Town
- Dr. Tim Murithi, Justice and Reconciliation in Africa Programme, The Institute for Justice and Reconciliation
- Dr. Thomas Mandrup, Assistant Professor, Institute for Strategy, Royal, Danish Defence College

13:00 – 14:00 Lunch

14:00 – 15:30 **Session 3: AU PSO Partnerships: Strategic Considerations**

A feature of modern Peace Support Operations in Africa is that there are always a number of actors involved, including the host country, neighbours and others with a strategic interest, the African Union, the relevant RECs/RMs, the UN, the EU as well as a number of global actors. It is important for the AU and its partners, including especially the host country, to strategically align themselves around a common framework that provided a road map for the future of the country and that spells out the support that will be provided by the various regional and international actors. What needs to be done to further improve the strategic relationship between the AU and its partners in the PSO context?

Chair: Dr. John Karlsrud, Head: Training for Peace Programme, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)

Introduction: Dr. Linda Akua Darkwa, The Legon Centre for International Affairs (LECIA), University of Ghana

Panel:

- Mr. Colin Stewart, Deputy Head and Director, Peacekeeping Planning and Management, UNOAU
- Col. Bernard Friedling, Senior Peace and Security Advisor, European External Action Service, EU
- Prof. Ibrahim Gambari, former SRSG UNAMID, and chair of the 2013 ASF Assessment Panel

15:30 – 16:00 Coffee/Tea

16:00-17:30 **Session 4: AU PSO Partnerships: Mission Support**

Whilst efforts are underway to further increase the support that is provided by AU Member States for AU PSOs, it is also important to question if it is possible to develop a more predictable international support system for regional operations? Globalization in this context implies that all conflicts have causes and effects linked to developments in the global system, and it is thus in the interest of the maintenance of global peace and security to find better and more predictable ways in which regional and international partners can cooperate when mandating and undertaking regional operations?

Chair: Dr. Linnea Gelot, Researcher, The Nordic Africa Institute and Research Associate, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)

Introduction: Dr. Walter Lotze, Civilian Advisor, Peace Support Operations Division & AMISOM

Panel:

- Mr. Brian Boucher, Chief JSOC / Acting Head of Mission Support, AMISOM
- Mr. Mike Hanrahan, Head Mission Support, MINUSCA

19:00 **Welcome Dinner**

Thursday, 18 December

09:00- 10:30 **Session 5: Operationalization of the ASF & RDC and harmonization with the ACIRC**

The African Standby Force and its Rapid Deployment capability are expected to be fully operational by December 2015. Efforts are currently being made to achieve full operational capability through the AMANI exercise cycle and the implementation of the revised ASF-ACIRC Roadmap. At the same time, the African Capacity for the Immediate Response to Crises (ACIRC) has attained initial operational capability with the expectation for FOC by December 2014. Despite the decision by the AU Assembly to ensure the harmonization of the ASF and ACIRC, it seems that both processes have been occurring in parallel or at best through selective attempt to harmonize these two mechanisms. What does harmonization between the ASF and ACIRC mean in practice? Is harmonization of the ACIRC and the ASF possible?

Chair: Ms. Rania Dagash, Chief of Staff, UNOAU

Introduction: Dr. Jide Martyns Okeke, Senior Civilian Planning and Coordination Officer, Peace Support Operations Division, African Union

Panel:

- Maj.Gen. Robert Kibochi, Assistant Chief of Defence Forces Operations, Plans Doctrine and Training, Kenya Defence Force
- Dr. Malte Brosig, Senior Lecturer, Department of International Relations, University of the Witwatersrand
- Mr. Azeez Nurudeen, Head of Operations Section, UNOAU

10:30 – 11:00 Coffee/Tea

11:00 - 12:30 **Session 6: What role for Civilian and Police Dimensions in African PSOs?**

When the ASF was first conceptualised the principle of multidimensionality was understood as an important determinant for success in African peace operations. Since then the role of civilians and police in stability instruments such as the RDC of the ASF and the African Capacity for the Immediate Response to Conflict (ACIRC) has been questioned. Some in the AU and many of the partners has also questioned whether the civilian and police roles in AU peace operations like AMISOM, AFISMA and MISCA is not duplicating the roles played by the UN and others. The question is thus whether the AU should only invest in a military PSO capacity, or if AU missions continue to be civilian led, which civilian and police functions are the most critical areas where the AU need to continue to have civilian and police capacities?

Chair: Brig.Gen. (Rtd) James Machakaire, Coordinator: Peacekeeping Unit, ACCORD

Introduction: Mrs. Yvonne Akpasom, Civilian Advisor, Peace Support Operations Division & ECOWAS

Panel:

- Dr. Benjamin Agordzo, Police Training & Development Coordinator, AMISOM
- Mr. Abu Sherif, Senior DDR Officer, MISCA
- Lt.Col. (Rtd) Andre Roux, Senior Researcher and Training Coordinator, Institute for Security Studies (ISS)

12:30 – 13:30 Lunch

13:30 - 15:00 **Session 7: The Relationship between the UN, AU and RECs/RMs, and the Principle of Subsidiarity**

In recent years the AU and ECOWAS was involved in deploying the AFISMA mission in Mali, and the AU mission MISCA followed on the ECCAS mission MICOPAX in CAR. Similarly, these AU missions in turn transferred to UN missions: from AFISMA to MINUSMA and from MISCA to MINUSCA. These experiences revealed that more needs to be done to clarify the roles and division of responsibilities between the UN, AU and the RECs/RMs when it comes to Peace Support Operations.

Chair: Mr. Ashraf Swelam, Director, Cairo Regional Centre for Training on Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping in Africa (CCCPA)

Introduction: Ms. Michelle Ndiaye Ntab, Director, Africa Peace and Security Programme, Institute for Peace and Security Studies (IPSS)

Panel:

- Mr. Samuel Gahigi, Head of the AU Peace Support Team, DPKO
- Dr. Solomon Dersso, Head: Peace and Security Council Report, Institute of Security Studies (ISS)
- Dr. Istifanus S. Zabadi, Dean: African Centre for Strategic Research and Studies, Nigeria National Defence College

15:00-15:30 Coffee/Tea break

15:30-16:30 **Session 8: The Way Forward: Strategic Options for African PSOs: 2015-2025**

Facilitated discussion generating recommendations for the focus and scope of future African PSOs

Chair: Dr. Cedric de Coning, Senior Research Fellow, ACCORD & NUPI

16:30-17:00 **Summary & Closing**

Chair: Prof. Ulf Sverdrup, Director, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (NUPI)

Panel:

Dr. Kwesi Aning, Dean & Director, Academic Affairs & Research Department,
Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training centre (KAIPTC)

Mrs. Iina Soiri, Director, Nordic Africa Institute

PARTICIPANTS LIST

**The Future of African Peace Operations: Strategic Options 2015-2025
17-18 December 2014, in Cape Town, South Africa**

Title	Name	Surname	
Col. (rtd)	Festus	Aboagye	Executive Director, African Peace Support Trainers Association (APSTA)
Dr.	Benjamin	Agordzo	Police Training Coordinator, AMISOM
Ms.	Yvonne	Akpasom	Civilian Planning and Coordination Officer, ECOWAS
Mr.	Martin	Albert	Communication, Press and Political Affairs, French Consulate in Cape Town
Dr.	Kwesi	Aning	Dean & Director, Academic Affairs & Research Department, Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training centre (KAIPTC)
Mr.	Sebastian	van Baalen	Intern, Swedish Embassy in Pretoria
Mr.	Eric	Berman	Managing Director, Small Arms Survey
Mr.	Brian	Boucher	Chief JSOC and Acting Head of Mission Support, AMISOM
Dr.	Malte	Brosig	Senior Lecturer, University of the Witwatersrand
Ms.	Melissa	Cawthra	Political-Economic Affairs and Media Officer, French Consulate in Cape Town
Ms.	Rania	Dagash	Chief of Staff, UNOAU
Ms.	Olivia	Davies	Programme Officer, Peacekeeping Unit, ACCORD
Ms.	Adriana Lins	De Albuquerque	Researcher, Swedish Defence Research Agency
Dr.	Cedric	de Coning	Senior Research Fellow, Peacekeeping & Peacebuilding Advisor, NUPI & ACCORD
Dr.	Solomon	Dersso	Head of the Peace and Security Council Report, ISS
Dr.	Mikael	Eriksson	Researcher, Swedish Defence Research Agency
Mr.	Andries	Fokkens	Faculty Manager: Military Science, Stellenbosch University
Col.	Bernard	Friedling	Senior Peace and Security Advisor, EU
Ms.	Anne Kjersti	Frøholm	Deputy Director General, Section for Global Security and Crisis Management, Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Mr.	Samuel	Gahigi	Head of the AU Peace Support Team, DPKO
Mr.	Christian	Gahre	Second Secretary, Royal Norwegian Embassy in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Prof.	Ibrahim	Gambari	Founder & Chairman of Board of Directors, Savannah Centre for Diplomacy, Democracy and Development
Dr.	Linnéa	Gelot	Senior Researcher, Nordic Africa Institute (NAI)
Mr.	Michael	Hanrahan	Director Mission Support, MINUSMA
Dr.	John	Karlsrud	Head of TfP Programme, Norwegian Institute for International Affairs (NUPI)
Maj. Gen.	Robert	Kibochi	Assistant Chief of Defence Forces Operations, Ministry of Defence, Kenya
Mr.	Runar	Kvamme	Military Advisor, Royal Norwegian Embassy in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Dr.	Walter	Lotze	Former Civilian Advisor, AU Peace Support Operations Division & AMISOM
Brig. (rtd)	James	Machakaire	Coordinator, Peacekeeping Unit, ACCORD
Mr.	Gerhard	Mai	Sector Manager Peace and Security, GIZ African Union Office
Dr.	Thomas	Mandrup	Associate Professor, Royal Danish Defence College
Mr.	Jason	Moore	Deputy Permanent Representative of the UK to the African Union
Dr.	Tim	Murithi	Head, Justice and Reconciliation in Africa Programme, The Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR)
Ms.	Michelle	Ndiaye Ntab	Director, Africa Peace and Security Programme, Addis Ababa University
Ms.	Susan	Nelson	Training for Peace, Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training centre (KAIPTC)
Ms.	Precious	Ngcobo	Administrator, Peacekeeping Unit, ACCORD
Mr.	Azeez	Nurudeen	Head of Operations Section, UNOAU

Dr.	Jide Martyns	Okeke	Senior Civilian Planning and Coordination Officer, Peace Support Operations Division, AUC
Dr.	Funmi	Olonisakin	Director, Conflict, Security and Development Group, King's College
Dr.	Linda Akua	Opongmaa Darkwa	Research Fellow, University of Ghana
Mr.	Jens W.	Pedersen	Humanitarian Policy Adviser, MSF
Mr.	Rafael	Peralta	Somalia Desk, UN DPKO
Lt. Col. (rtd)	Andre	Roux	Senior Researcher and Training Coordinator, ISS
Prof.	Maxi	Schoeman	Head, Department of Political Sciences, University of Pretoria
Prof.	Mark	Shaw	Research Chair, Justice and Security in Africa, University of Cape Town
Mr.	Abu	Sherif	Senior DDR Officer, MISCA
Ms.	Iina	Soiri	Director, Nordic Africa Institute (NAI)
Mr.	Colin	Stewart	Deputy Head, United Nations Office to the African Union (UNOAU)
Dr.	Ulf	Sverdrup	Director, Norwegian Institute for International Affairs (NUPI)
Mr.	Ashraf	Swelam	Director, Cairo Regional Centre for Training on Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping in Africa (CCCPA)
Col.	Leif	Torin-Carlsson	Swedish Embassy in Pretoria
Mr.	Alexander	Uggla	Research Communicator, Nordic Africa Institute (NAI)
Mr.	Oliver	Ulich	Head, Partnerships Team, Division of Policy, Evaluation and Training, UNDPKO
Dr.	Kudrat	Virk	Senior Researcher, Centre for Conflict Resolution
Dr.	Francois	Vrey	Associate Professor, Faculty of Military Science, Stellenbosch University
Col.	William	Wyatt	Senior Military Attache, United States Mission to the African Union
Dr.	Istifanus S.	Zabadi	Dean, African Centre for Strategic Research and Studies, Nigerian Defence College (NDC)



Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Established in 1959, the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs [NUPI] is a leading independent research institute on international politics and areas of relevance to Norwegian foreign policy. Formally under the Ministry of Education and Research, NUPI nevertheless operates as an independent, non-political instance in all its professional activities. Research undertaken at NUPI ranges from short-term applied research to more long-term basic research.

NUPI

Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
C.J. Hambros plass 2D
PO Box 8159 Dep. NO-0033 Oslo, Norway
www.nupi.no | info@nupi.no