

IPI

INTERNATIONAL
PEACE
INSTITUTE

Peacekeeping Operations and the Durability of Peace: What Works and What Does Not?

MAY 2013

Introduction

The modern incarnation of peacekeeping can be traced to United Nations interventions starting in 1948. Yet the underlying premise of peacekeeping and peace support operations has a long pedigree extending back at least another ninety-nine years. In 1849 Sweden and Norway—which then constituted a union—deployed a neutral force of close to 4,000 troops in a territory disputed by Germany and Schleswig-Holstein on one side and Denmark on the other. The force was tasked to maintain law and order in the disputed territory until a peace agreement could be established, which was achieved in July 1850.¹ Peacekeeping has gone through many changes since 1948, but arguably the most significant and far-reaching changes have occurred in the two decades after the end of the Cold War.

Over the past twenty years, peacekeeping operations (PKOs) have expanded in number and scope, with the latter comprising some 300 functions that fall under more than twenty broad categories, including disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR); electoral assistance; peace process management; human rights monitoring; security sector reform (SSR); justice reform; and rule of law.² This has resulted in complex operations with mandates bordering on statebuilding and with an expectation that they will more effectively build the foundations of long-term peace and stability.³ Another shift since the early 1990s is the growing contributions of regional arrangements. Regional and sub-regional organizations, as well as regional ad hoc coalitions of states, and even individual states, have in recent years assumed a larger peacekeeping role both within and occasionally outside their regions (as with the case of the European Union). Meanwhile, the UN has promoted, and sought to coordinate and align such contributions alongside its own efforts since the early 1990s.⁴

The third International Experts Forum (IEF) considered whether, to what

This meeting note was drafted by Robert Muggah, principal at the SecDev Group and research director at the Igarapé Institute, Birger Heldt, director of research at the Folke Bernadotte Academy, and Christian Altpeter, research assistant at the Folke Bernadotte Academy. It reflects the *rapporteurs'* interpretation of the discussion and does not necessarily reflect the view of all participants.

The International Expert Forum was originally launched at IPI in New York on December 15, 2011. It is a joint collaboration of the Folke Bernadotte Academy, IPI, the SecDev Group, and the Social Science Research Council (SSRC). The third International Expert Forum was held at IPI on December 10, 2012.

1 Björn Gäfvert, "Swedish Troops in International Cooperation—North Africa, 1802 and Fyn-Schleswig, 1848–1850," in *Solidarity and Defence: Sweden's Armed Forces in International Peace-Keeping Operations During the 19th and 20th Centuries*. Stockholm: Swedish Military History Commission, edited by Lars Ericson (Stockholm: Swedish Military History Commission 1995), pp. 23–33.

2 Jack Sherman and Benjamin Tortolani, "Implications of Peacebuilding and Statebuilding in United Nations Mandates," in *Robust Peacekeeping: The Politics of Force* (New York: New York University Center for International Cooperation 2009), p. 15.

3 At least one indicator of more ambitious mandates is the dramatic increase in the average word count of UN Security Council Resolutions, with the 2009 average of 1,675 words per resolution more than double that of 2006 (793).

4 See Hikaru Yamashita, "Peacekeeping Cooperation Between the United Nations and Regional Organizations," *Review of International Studies* 38, No. 1 (2010), 165–186; and Birger Heldt, "Trends from 1948–2005: How to View the Relation Between the United Nations and Non-UN Entities," in *Prospects for Peace Operations: Institutional and National Dimensions*, edited by Don Daniel (Washington DC: Georgetown University Press 2008), pp. 9–26.



FOLKE
BERNADOTTE
ACADEMY



TheSecDevGroup



SSRC

extent, and under what conditions PKOs contribute to the durability of negative and positive peace and how it shapes organized violence.⁵ It brought together top-level researchers to discuss recent insights with policymakers and practitioners. An important goal was to highlight challenges confronting peacekeeping and ways in which peacekeeping has adapted to achieve short- and long-term dividends. Another objective was to synthesize lessons learned and policy implications for enhancing peacekeeping efficacy. It featured sessions on the past effectiveness of peacekeeping, the conditions for successful peacekeeping operations, and on the importance of partnerships and exit strategies.

The Track Record of Peacekeeping Operations

Speakers in the first session discussed the empirical evidence base for evaluating peacekeeping and peace support operations. A key question was whether peacekeeping can be successful in preventing the resumption of civil war. A related question was what are the causal mechanisms that connect peacekeeping and the absence of violence. An overarching finding is that peacekeeping is effective in promoting negative peace (absence of violence) since it extends the duration of post-civil war peace. Both speakers—Virginia Page Fortna and Nicholas Sambanis—stressed that peacekeeping is robustly correlated with a reduction in the onset of war, and this finding has withstood statistical replication attempts. Moreover, it seems that there is not a major difference between enforcement or robust peacekeeping interventions (Chapter VII) and consent-based operations (Chapter VI) in this regard. However, researchers noted that peacekeeping is not a silver bullet and exhibits many dysfunctions.

Fortna covered Chapter VI and VII missions and interventions involving both UN and regional organizations. While excluding mediation missions and humanitarian and peacebuilding activities, she considered ninety-four cases in fifty-nine civil wars between 1989 and 2000. It is meanwhile important to recognize that peacekeeping is not random—

indeed there are inherent biases since troops are assigned to the hard cases where there is no decisive victory, rebel groups are strong, there are many factions, etc. Yet, Fortna's study shows dramatic reductions in the re-onset and outbreak of violence by 80 percent when PKOs are deployed.

Given that peacekeeping extends peace, a critical question is *why* is this so. One reason, the speakers suggested, is that peacekeeping makes peace more valuable and war more costly. The prospects of political and economic gains for rebel and government leaders from the so-called “peacekept,” together with international aid and trust funds, are seen to change the calculus of prospective spoilers. The speakers also stressed that deterrence by peacekeepers requires the capability and use of force to be considered credible. Second, it was suggested that peacekeeping alleviates mistrust and builds confidence by monitoring behavior and allowing parties to signal intentions. Third, peacekeeping allows for the control of sensitive territory and processes (e.g., disarmament) in addition to providing critical security and training to buy time. In other words, peacekeeping takes “risks off the table.”

A number of policy implications arise from Fortna's work. One key implication is that peacekeeping not only works, but it is also cost-effective. Another policy implication is that Chapter VII enforcement is not always necessary. Such enforcement is only effective when a deterrent is credible. This indirectly supports the notion that Chapter VI interventions are often just as effective, if less politically contentious. For policymakers, a critical issue is to identify political and economic levers of influence in ceasefire settings—it may be worth “buying off” the peacekept by making peace more valuable and war more costly. Related policy implications are connected to the (less) effective results of peacekeepers in areas where there are contraband sources of income (e.g., diamonds and drugs).

One critical finding of Sambanis's work is that the UN is effective in engendering not just negative peace (as found by Fortna) but also positive peace, which extends beyond violence reduction. More to the point, UN peacekeeping has significant effects

5 For a review of studies, see Page Fortna and Lise Howard, “Pitfalls and Prospects in the Peacekeeping Literature,” *Annual Review of Political Science* 11, (January 2008): 283–301.

on engendering participatory (i.e., democratic) peace, reducing low intensity violence, resolving sovereignty disputes and the like. However, according to Sambanis, during the early post-war period many societies cannot “absorb” massive democratic transitions: achieving positive peace is difficult—occurring in just 30 percent of all cases in first five years after a war is brought to a close. Another finding is that externally-promoted democratization may sometimes have generated violence and backtracking in war-to-peace transitions.

Sambanis also finds that although multidimensional peacekeeping is especially successful, just like Fortna, he sees value in observer missions. One of his critical findings is that peacekeeping relies heavily on consent, and less on enforcement. Moreover, peacekeeping plays an important role during the critical, high-risk first 4–5 years following a civil war. In addition, Sambanis has detected a positive net UN effect: countries with some UN involvement simply do better than those without. But again, the effects are short term, often within the first years of an intervention. Another insight from the presentations is that non-UN operations appear to be more effective at ensuring negative peace—stopping violence—than in generating net dividends beyond this. A possible reason is that non-UN operations focus almost exclusively on traditional peacekeeping tasks and do not deal with nation-building.

Both speakers stated that more research is required to assess the macro- and micro-level outcomes and causal effects of peacekeeping and peace support operations on both negative and positive peace. Differentiating between these levels is important since mandates can be successfully implemented overall at the national level, but still fail at the local level. At the macro-level, the evidence is supportive of PKOs in promoting negative and positive peace. At the micro-level, however, there are still disagreements over what types of PKOs are most effective, how to manage micro-level power dynamics, and how to maintain the legitimacy and credibility of peacekeeping missions after the first few years. A better understanding of micro-level outcomes and effects will require more investment in generating data, including on when wars start and end, classifying cases, managing endogenous variables and

explaining sub-national variation in policies and outcomes. In this context both speakers highlighted a number of future horizons for research and how mandates can be designed to be successful not only at the macro-level, but also the micro-level.

First, they called for researchers to engage with development economics research on the effects of foreign aid. The results of these studies are important, despite some limitations in extrapolating to different contexts and aggregating results to develop policy guidelines. Second, there are opportunities to study implications of different intervention strategies. Researchers should consider the substitution and displacement effects of discrete activities—from peacekeeping to elections, humanitarian assistance, and counter-insurgency. Third, there are insights emerging from social psychology that may assist in explaining peacekeeping success and failure. Indeed, it may be critical to gain a better understanding of group and individual identity, the ways in which interventions shape inter-group status, and questions of political affiliation.

A key conclusion from comments by the discussants Sarah Cliffe and Sharon Wiharta is that whereas peacekeeping has created breathing space for economic and social recovery and transition, it is not a panacea. Its track record is mixed, especially in the area of rule of law reform, which has been a focus area during the past ten years. The reason is a lack of clarity regarding what objectives—and lack of coherence regarding those objectives—PKOs are supposed to achieve. For instance, do we place the bar for PKOs too low, and what do fragile states really need? In addition, during the last decade there have been discussions on end states, but there is a need for more discussions on objectives. There is also a need for a discussion on tool kits. For instance, do PKOs have any added value after five years, and if not, should we then start to think of other models of operations, and do we need other forms of engagements? One commentator suggested that most PKOs do well in the beginning, and this begs the research questions of what happens after the initial period. How can those missions be “unstuck”? What should PKOs do after ten years on the ground? A related issue is that the peacekeeping community has not been good at monitoring and evaluating PKOs. What is needed, it was suggested, is a “new deal” initiative in these

regards, but also in the areas of evaluating the importance of spoilers and gender.

There is a need, both discussants contended, for more institutional investment over the long term to supplement gains made during peacekeeping interventions. Moreover, peacekeeping needs to engage with a wider range of violence types, not just political violence, but also, for example, transnational organized crime as a form of postconflict violence that is present when peacekeepers are deployed. Problems arise when peacekeeping and counter-insurgency roles are conflated, but at the same time it is unclear whether a sequencing approach in these regards is feasible since PKOs often have to deal with several issues at the same time. But perhaps the biggest challenge according to Cliffe is how to enhance civilian capacities, particularly national institutions in host states, to shore-up dividends of peacekeeping.⁶ This involves at a minimum:

- 1) working with national authorities to ensure an inclusive political process for institutional reform;
- 2) prioritizing institutions most linked to conflict recurrence (e.g., core administrative functions, police, justice, and institutions of governance); and
- 3) promoting knowledge and exchange about realistic paths—there is a need to recognize political constraints to particular kinds of reforms (this requires experienced actors).

Although the shift in peacekeeping from a narrow focus on military and police activities and other state institutions to wider political, social, and economic outcomes is important, this trend also raises new mandate-related questions. While the last decade saw a consensus among the traditional actors in peacekeeping on liberal peacebuilding, the role of emerging actors (e.g., the BRIC countries) might change the focus and put more emphasis on social and economic factors. Finally, there are still, as many acknowledged, challenges of integration and sequencing, even if they are being gradually addressed within the UN.

One participant stressed that history suggests that transitions to stable peace take 15–25 years, and that this has to be kept in mind when assessing short- and long-term effects of PKOs. There was agreement that the economic growth-peace connection is not sufficient on its own to secure peace. Participants raised questions about whether economic distribution is more important than economic growth, and they called for more research on how and to what extent there are economic and political policy equivalents to the roles played by PKOs.

Conditions for Successful Peacekeeping Operations

Whereas the first session dealt with whether PKOs are successful, the second session focused on under what conditions they are successful. Also while the first session focused on strategic level issues through national-level data, the second session focused on the tactical or operational level. Particular attention was given to challenges such as mandate implementation; the role of the host country; issues of military, policy, and civilian capabilities; and political factors.

DDR programs represent an important component of many ongoing peacekeeping operations and the UN can look back at a rich track record since the early 1990s when DDR became an integral part of many missions.⁷ While DDR is widely used and well-funded by donors, there is limited knowledge about its impact on peacebuilding. The first speaker Jonah Schulhofer-Wohl stressed the need for a clearer focus on assessing impacts as a means of measuring effectiveness or success and the contributions of DDR programs. Moreover, DDR programs would be well served by assessments concerning sequencing and potential adverse effects such as status reversals in society, which could lead to new conflicts.

Over time, the term DDR has evolved to cover a broad range of complex programs. The considerable variation among DDR programs and the heterogeneity within DDR programs both within

⁶ A question, then, is whether there are ways to either expand the PKOs further or identify equivalent “rapid economic missions” that could bolster positive peace.

⁷ See Robert Muggah, ed., *Security and Post-Conflict Reconstruction: Dealing with Fighters in the Aftermath of War* (London: Routledge 2009) and Jonah Schulhofer-Wohl and Nicholas Sambanis, “Disarmament, Demobilization, and Reintegration Programs: An Assessment,” Stockholm: Folke Bernadotte Academy Publications, 2010.

countries and over time pose methodological challenges when it comes to measuring outcomes, isolating effects, and generalizing.⁸ In order to assess DDR's value for peace operations, it is necessary to reframe successful DDR processes in terms of peacebuilding outcomes or dimensions of interest. These outcomes of interest relate to the conflict-development nexus, violence and crime prevention, civic and political participation, and healing of wartime trauma. Focusing on these outcomes instead of studying the implementation and performance of individual program tasks will place DDR programs as part of the larger picture. Such an approach requires a question-oriented approach, explicit comparisons, and programs designed to allow systematic evaluation.

Offering a practitioner's point of view, speaker Arthur Boutellis stressed that the failures of peace operations are often due to mistakes at the political and strategic level. In particular, PKOs are often a substitute for a political strategy rather than an enabler for political strategies. Such mistakes also explain the fall of Goma, which is mostly a case of a failed political strategy instead of a military failure. In absence of a political strategy, operations quickly lose leverage and legitimacy vis-à-vis local actors and the civilian population. Therefore, the consent of the host country, though a challenge to attain, is pivotal, but the consent needs to be managed over time, and this requires that missions have political mandates. There is, it was suggested, a need to rethink PKO mandates.

Moreover, the expansion of mandates combined with moral imperatives as laid out by, for example, the Brahimi Report has pushed UN PKOs to take on broader and increasingly ambitious missions.⁹ Boutellis suggested there may be a need to rethink the design of mandates and to adopt more modest goals and missions. This relates to the necessity to adapt and develop security and justice strategies, DDR, and stabilization.¹⁰ Instead of solely focusing on numbers, the question of capabilities may deserve a stronger emphasis. There also remains work to be done in the mission planning process to

better integrate civilian and military components and to include and prioritize political and economic tools and issues such as organized crime. Civilian capacities are of particular importance and more relevant than bringing troop numbers up to level. In this regard, leaner and more rapid response interventions may be the way forward, and stronger engagement by regional organizations needs to be considered. There is also a need for defined exit strategies, otherwise PKOs may lose their overall direction without such plans in place.

Discussant Leanne Smith pointed to the progress that has been made since the 1990s within the UN system in terms of collecting experiences and best practices from missions. The Brahimi Report and the New Horizon process have been instrumental in that regard.¹¹ The challenges lying ahead concern knowledge regarding the long-term value of peacekeeping operations and how we can know whether peacekeeping is successful. It is complicated by the overall lack of consensus or agreement on what we even mean by "success." In a sense, this key concept at the center of an entire research area has no generally agreed upon meaning. This raises challenges for benchmarking and whether benchmarking should be focused on the local rather than the national level. The introduction of benchmarks, as applied by the UN Mission in South Sudan, contributes to understanding whether peacekeeping is successful and to an assessment of its long-term impact. However, it remains unclear whether peacekeeping operations can be effective not only for keeping the peace, but also for early peacebuilding activities.

Peacekeeping partnerships and integrated missions share important burdens and responsibilities. Major issues in this regard relate to assuring the consent of the host state and national ownership. While the former can become problematic in relation to human rights, the latter might indeed involve more than just talking to the government in power. In addition, the UN is struggling to catch up with the challenges of UN reform and multidimensional missions. Here,

8 See Robert Muggah, "No Magic Bullet: A Critical Perspective on Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration and Weapons Reduction During Post-Conflict Contexts," *The Commonwealth Journal of International Affairs* 94, No. 379 (2005): 239–252.

9 UN General Assembly, *Report of the Secretary General on the Implementation of the Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations*, UN Doc. A/55/502, October 20, 2000, available at www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations/docs/55_502e.pdf.

10 See Robert Muggah, *Stabilization Operations, Security and Development: States of Fragility* (London: Routledge, 2013).

11 UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support, "A New Partnership Agenda: Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping," New York, DPKO, 2009, available at www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/documents/newhorizon.pdf.

important lessons still have to be applied, and it is too early to rethink those models that have not yet been put into practice to a full degree. The dynamic context in which PKOs operate remains the major challenge, politically as well as on the ground.

The second discussant Renata Dwan welcomed debate within the UN on the definitions of peacekeeping and peacebuilding. These concepts should not be taken for granted. There is a risk that the approach to peacekeeping has become too technical an exercise with overly ambitious goals. The political nature of the undertaking is often glossed over. Currently, DDR and SSR issues have become too technical. There is a need, it was claimed, to not lose sight of the fundamentals of these missions. The real objectives of DDR are basic: does it lead to more legitimate institutions, and does it facilitate SSR and state institutions? These micro-level priorities are particularly important in countries with a history of strong and oppressive state institutions where the level of public trust for the states' security institutions is very limited. How do we design DDR programs designed to reinforce weak institutions? In general, how do we adapt complex programs to shifting realities on the ground? Can there be a methodology for this? According to Dwan, the research community could assist in addressing such questions by conducting relevant studies, e.g., providing the UN with risk-analyses on the drivers of conflict processes or how socio-economic conditions have changed during and due to the international presence.

Regarding the planning process of peacekeeping operations, there is considerable confusion about how and why operations are created, which can be detrimental for sustaining political support for missions. Also, insufficient attention is devoted to maintaining support in the long run. Starting an operation based on half-hearted consent will make it difficult if not impossible to create a sustainable basis for political support down the road. In addition to political actors, civil servants are important actors in the early stages and need to be onboard.

During the ensuing discussion, several participants suggested a need to reframe DDR as a concept since it is by many wrongly treated as a goal in itself and has turned into a catch phrase for

everything. Uprisings, such as in Libya or Syria, require a different approach than ones used with rebel groups or the scenario in Mali, where the international presence, once deployed, will face traffickers, rebels, and terrorist groups. Learning how to draw general lessons from case to case and how to differentiate between intended and unintended outcomes are major challenges. The collection of best practices from missions is one possible avenue to improve learning processes, which so far have not been carried out in a sophisticated way.

Moreover, insights from micro-level research projects can provide valuable insights. While several research studies have utilized micro-level data and efforts to randomize interventions (e.g., in Sierra Leone, Liberia, and Aceh), more experimental work is needed. Although DDR is an important tool, not all outcomes can reasonably be attributed to it. It is therefore important to examine not only the effect of certain instruments, but also the constellation of instruments in a specific context. Finally, when discussing the impact of certain instruments and the success or failure of peacekeeping, political interests need to be brought back in and the question of what is politically feasible needs to be asked.

Partnerships and Exit Strategies

The final session addressed exit strategies and transitions as well as the criteria for successful shifts to other forms of international support such as peacebuilding missions (PBMs). Also, the issue of partnerships and joint peace operations was discussed.

The first speaker, Richard Caplan, highlighted the general lack of attention and care given to the endgame strategy of international operations. It is crucial to treat the transition as a process and not as an event. This is valid when operations change shape, e.g., from a PKO to a PBM, and when responsibilities are handed over to national counterparts at the end of an international presence. In both cases, a prerequisite for a successful transition is a sustainable outcome. This, in turn, requires meaningful measures of progress towards agreed upon goals based on benchmarks as

opposed to a fixed timetable, since the latter may serve as an invitation for spoilers. On the other hand, a fixed timetable may also create buy-in and predictability.

Caplan stressed that criteria for transition need to be concrete and measurable. This means, for example, clear distinctions between outcome and impact, between measuring improvements and achievements, and a differentiation between what is necessary and what is desirable. It is also important to differentiate between core benchmarks that measure progress towards the basic goals of missions, and contextual benchmarks that measure the development of factors that may reignite the conflict. Above all, actors need to refrain from politicizing the evaluation process and results. In reality, however, the timing and nature of exit strategies and transitions are affected by political events and pressures rather than an assessment of actual developments on the ground. However, there is little consistency across missions when it comes to benchmarking, there is little documentation of such processes, and generally organization of benchmark processes is ad hoc.

The second speaker Huria Ogbamichael addressed the UN policy on transition, the prime objective of which is to hand over power to national actors. Generally, there is a lack of guidance on mission drawdown and withdrawal, and this is mainly due to the interests of the member states. Based on experiences from previous missions, there are many lessons identified by the UN. The challenge remains to transform these experiences into lessons learned that can better define the scope of a policy of transition. In order to develop a transition policy, there is a need for key policies; a clear role of actors, rules, and procedures on how to manage political processes and expectations; inclusion of stakeholders for national capacity development and mission support; and integrated assessment and planning.

Among the key principles that have been identified for successful transition are early and flexible planning, the integration of the UN in the process, national ownership and communication, national capacity development, and communication of strategies and practices to manage expectations. Meanwhile, there are major challenges. For instance, although these are commonsense principles, how do we get the entire UN system to agree

on fundamentals when it does not work in an integrated manner? Second, early planning is easier said than done because of short mandates that do not induce a mindset to think ahead, and because budget cycles are short. Third, a reactive—not proactive—organizational culture in the UN presents a major problem. Fourth, there is a need for regular reviews of mandates built on shared analysis, instead of isolated adjustments. We are presently not seeing exits, but rather follow-up activities or transitions to other missions. This has frustrated the international community's ability to predict the direction of transition processes. A case in point is the UN's engagement in Burundi that has witnessed several "exits" over time. Fifth, there is a need to manage the political process. This is not just a matter of will but also of capacity. A positive political dialogue may not sufficiently look at the risk factors involved. In Timor-Leste, often described as a textbook example for withdrawal, the handover to the national police was a political decision. Because of the political dimension of transition, national institutions need to be engaged in a political process to plan for the time following the presence of the PKO. Moreover, it is indispensable to ensure that peacebuilding priorities remain high on the agenda despite unpredictable changes in national priorities. Continuing financial and political support is thus necessary. In these regards, the international community, the Peacebuilding Commission, and Groups of Friends have important roles to play.

Discussant Haydewych Hazelzet discussed partnerships and transitions primarily from an EU perspective. An initial question raised was whether we need sequencing and a division of labor among actors based on who is best suited to certain tasks. Another question relates to the specific conditions that ensure that partnering is the best solution. According to Hazelzet, the main task of partners is to provide support and to fill in where the UN is not able to implement its mandate. Partnerships and the distribution of tasks should be guided by the principle of added value, namely who is best at doing what. Meanwhile, multiple memberships in regional and international organizations can cause challenges with regard to joint operations and partnerships in relation to competition for resources. The handovers from the EU to the UN in the Democratic Republic of the Congo in 2003 and

Chad in 2008/9, as well as the handover from the UN to the EU in Kosovo and in Georgia in 2008, are cases in point that provide lessons for the future. When it comes to partnering in these cases, it may be more suitable to speak of a permanent reconfiguration of involvement instead of clear-cut handovers or transition. This is also true when responsibilities for missions change between different instruments within organizations.

When considering who does what best, it is important to return to the reasons why an organization became involved in the first place. There is also a need to map out who can do what, and actors need to pay more attention to what other parties are doing already before getting involved. There is scope for complimentary approaches and partnering with regional actors as the cooperation between the EU, the AU, and ECOWAS has shown. Joint planning and joint lessons-learned procedures would offer major improvement for partnerships and handovers, but are often prevented by political and institutional reasons and organizational cultures.

With regard to ambitious mandates and timing of exits, participants called for a more modest approach. Outsiders eventually cannot stop the resumption of war if actors so prefer and it is thus dangerous to assume that external actors are in a position to do more than influence—but not control—the process. It was also noted that there has been an escalation of goals in terms of PKOs mandates, while at the same time broad social transformation is very difficult to achieve. In short, the UN and international actors have taken on tasks that they are unlikely to fulfill, and this over commitment makes it difficult to deliver on even the most basic tasks. For instance, we have limited knowledge of conditions for successful peacebuilding and even less knowledge of how to promote economic development. Nevertheless, it was also pointed out that the UN has become more realistic in terms of PKO goals compared to ten years ago.

Practitioners often remarked there is a need to take into account that practitioners often follow more feasible goals despite the very ambitious goals adopted by mandates. The question is whether there is a readiness to have open political discussions on what is achievable in peacebuilding, rather than on what would be ideal. Another question is

whether we are ready to accept failures, as long as it does not involve resumption of war. Even though benchmarks will always be a subject to political discussions, benchmarking will probably never become a science. Moreover, a major problem of mission drawdown and transition is the lack of financial support and interest. A UN policy on transition needs to create a common understanding about permanent reconfigurations of UN presence rather than exiting.

In terms of partnerships, it was suggested that new frameworks for improved coordination are needed since the UN, however significant, is by no means the only actor. Other international and regional organizations, bilateral initiatives, and NGOs have to be taken into account and coordinate their activities. However, the right mechanisms to pull together the diverse range of international actors has yet to be found, as the case of Somalia amply shows. Regarding the partnership between the UN and the EU, several models were suggested. For one, the EU can deploy missions in cases when the UN (or other actors) lack adequate capabilities. Second, EU operations can be deployed in response to a specific demand, and instead of the UN, by for example providing a regional response, as was the case in Georgia. It is important to discover the type of missions the EU is willing and able to undertake. The EU's role is rarely peacekeeping in active conflict environments, but rather it focuses on training, monitoring, and advising, i.e., capacity-building missions (CBMs) that lack an executive mandate. Such missions have a strong focus on rule of law, SSR, and human rights. These chosen roles show that the EU has in general intervened in cases where the likelihood of success is favorable.

Concluding Reflections

The third IEF generated a provocative debate on the relationships between peacekeeping and peace. It highlighted new research, facilitated an exchange between researchers and practitioners, and identified new pathways of research while cultivating a growing network of senior professionals. The discussion began, however, with a reflection on the overwhelming positive outcomes of peace support operations in preventing and reducing violence and promoting transformative change and ended with problematization and emerging challenges.

The research presented at the third IEF found that peacekeeping works, but not always. It appears to work particularly well in the context of a limited window of opportunity—namely the first years. It also seems to work in particular settings and in the context of more expansive and complex peace support mandates. The question of sequencing and coordination is critical, particularly as peacekeeping in and outside the UN increasingly depends on a wide range of partnerships. But despite some angst and frustration among peacekeeping proponents, some conventional wisdom holds: Chapter VI and VII mandates are effective, political pacts and agreements are critical, fixed timetables are important, and confidence building mechanisms can keep the peace.

The seminar revealed that there is growing confidence in positive macro-level patterns of peacekeeping promotion (the what), but also that a new generation of scholars is trying to understand the micro-dynamics of change (the why). Many of these researchers are moving away from game theory to models that allow for a much wider consideration of motivations and means of armed groups. Many of these scholars are also exploring temporal dynamics of peacekeeping, the ways in which such interventions lose steam after a few years. These are critical questions for practitioners who are seeking ways of promoting effective transitions in situations of complex violence.

One additional insight is that while we know something about whether and under what conditions PKOs are successful, there is very limited knowledge on whether and under what conditions PBMs are effective. This is particularly important since in many cases of transitions PKOs are handing over responsibilities to PBMs.

In closing, the third IEF raised some new questions for the policy and research communities working on peacekeeping:

- **How do policymakers and decision makers manage complexity?** How do you learn and apply lessons? How are tricky processes of transition managed? What kinds of guidance would help?
- **Can we elaborate a more consistent nomenclature?** There are a bewildering array of definitions

of peace, peacebuilding, peacekeeping, DDR, SSR, etc. It is critical that definitions be clear and focused in both academic and policy circles in order to test causation.

- **In what ways can we measure success and effectiveness?** How narrow and how broad should the criteria be? How much can we impute beyond what is explicitly stated in the peacekeeping mandate?
- **What are the ways we can improve information collection, monitoring, and evaluation?** How do we start developing analytics for assessing new kinds of risk and volatility—before and during peace support operations? This information is critical for pre-deployment of peacekeeping. How can we do experimental or quasi-experimental design and randomized controls (in spite of warnings that they backfire)?
- **How can the process and management of transitions be improved?** This is a critical concern of practitioners, particularly given the absence of guidance in situations where personnel are expected to engage with new forms of violence and corruption, negotiate complex political interests, and manage practical issues of integration, among other things.
- **What is the next generation of tools—beyond or parallel with peace support operations—that can address wider issues of instability?** There is a need to move beyond military considerations and to account for social and economic factors, engage in more flexible ways with armed groups, and conduct new forms of joint analysis and partnership. Structural challenges will remain but new frontiers of possibility will need to be tested.

The emergence of new threats, from organized crime to contests over resources, are major challenges for future peacekeeping operations. The speed at which crises unfold and the multiple demands on peacekeepers are likely to accelerate. This suggests an ever greater imperative on developing sophisticated analytics and long-term research agendas to anticipate and respond. The International Expert Forum demonstrated unequivocally that peacekeepers cannot be expected to keep the peace on their own.

Agenda

Peacekeeping Operations and the Durability of Peace: What Works and What Does Not?

The International Expert Forum

Monday, December 10, 2012

09:00 – 09:20 **Welcome and Introductory Remarks**

Mr. Francesco Mancini, *Senior Director of Research, International Peace Institute*
Dr. Birger Heldt, *Director of Research, Folke Bernadotte Academy*
Dr. Robert Muggah, *Principal, SecDev Group and Research Director, Igarapé Institute*

09:20 – 10:50 **Session 1: The Track Record of Peacekeeping Operations**

This session presents data and analysis about peacekeeping operations. Particular consideration will be given to the question of whether—and to what extent—peacekeeping operations are effective in securing peace (i.e., the absence of violence or “negative peace”), and in achieving other goals such as transition to stable and democratic institutions, or even whether peacekeeping promotes post-conflict economic recovery and development (i.e., “positive peace”). Attention will also be given to the influence of peace operations in shaping trajectories (onset, duration, and termination) of organized violence.

Chair

Dr. Robert Muggah

Presenters

Dr. Page Fortna, *Professor, Department of Political Science, Saltzman Institute of War and Peace Studies, Columbia University*
Dr. Nicholas Sambanis, *Professor, Department of Political Science, Yale University*

Discussants

Ms. Sarah F. Cliffe, *Special Adviser and Assistant Secretary-General for United Nations Civilian Capacities*
Ms. Sharon Wiharta, *Head, Policy and Best Practices, Challenges Forum, Folke Bernadotte Academy*

10:50 – 11:15 Coffee Break

11:15 – 12:45 **Session 2: Conditions for Successful Peacekeeping Operations**

This session features the insights of practitioners and scholars regarding the conditions for successful peacekeeping operations. Particular attention is given to challenges such as mandate implementation; role of the host country; issues of military, policy, and civilian capabilities; and political factors.

Chair

Dr. Birger Heldt

Presenters

Mr. Jonah Schulhofer-Wohl, *Assistant Professor, The Woodrow Wilson Department of Politics, University of Virginia*

Mr. Arthur Boutellis, *Research Fellow, International Peace Institute*

Discussants

Ms. Leanne Smith, *Deputy Chief, United Nations Policy and Best Practices Service*

Dr. Renata Dwan, *Senior Project Officer, Civilian Capacities Project, United Nations*

13:00 – 14:45

Working Lunch—Session 3: Partnerships and Exit Strategies

The session addresses the issue of partnerships—what works and what does not—in joint peace operations, and of exit strategies and transitions, including what are the criteria for successful exit and transition to other forms of support, including peacebuilding missions.

Chair

Mr. Francesco Mancini

Presenters

Ms. Huria Ogbamichael, *Policy and Best Practice Service, United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations*

Dr. Richard Caplan, *Professor, Department of Politics and International Relations, Oxford University*

Discussant

Dr. Hadewych Hazelzet, *Head of CSDP Section—Crisis Management and Planning Directorate, European External Action Service*

14:45

Closing Remarks

Mr. Youssef Mahmoud, *Senior Adviser, International Peace Institute*

Dr. Birger Heldt

Dr. Robert Muggah

Participants

Alexis Aquino

Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations

Christian Altpeter

Folke Bernadotte Academy

Isali Axberg

Folke Bernadotte Academy

Alexis Aquino

Permanent Mission of Peru to the United Nations

Mónica Bolaños-Pérez

Permanent Mission of Guatemala to the United Nations

Kristen Boon

Seton Hall University

Arthur Boutellis

International Peace Institute

Henk-Jan Brinkman

United Nations Peacebuilding Support Office

Eve Burnett

United Nations Department of Field Support,
Field Personnel Division

Richard Caplan

Oxford University

Nicolas Chapdelaine

Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations

Sarah F. Cliffe

United Nations Civilian Capacities

Renata Dwan

United Nations Civilian Capacities Project

Jean-Pierre Esnault

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations

Page Fortna

Columbia University

Carlos Enrique Garcia Gonzalez

Permanent Mission of El Salvador to the United Nations

Panagiotis Geroglis

Permanent Mission of Greece to the United Nations

Megan Gleason-Roberts

Center on International Cooperation

Hadewych Hazelzet

European External Action Service

Birger Heldt

Folke Bernadotte Academy

Adrian Hills

United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti

Andrew Hyslop

United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations

Ingjerd Jensen

Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations

Peggy Kerry

United States Mission to the United Nations

Mustafa İlker Kılıç

Permanent Mission of Turkey to the United Nations

Paal Zandstra Krokeide

Permanent Mission of Norway to the United Nations

Roy S. Lee

Columbia Law School

Matti Lehtonen

United Nations Environmental Program

Adam Lupel

International Peace Institute

Youssef Mahmoud
International Peace Institute

Francesco Mancini
International Peace Institute

Erin McCandless
Graduate Program in International Affairs

Yoshimitsu Morihito
Permanent Mission of Japan to the United Nations

Robert Muggah
Igarapé Institute

Christopher O'Donnell
United Nations Department of Peacekeeping
Operations

Madalene O'Donnell
United Nations Department of Peacekeeping
Operations

Huria Ogbamichael
United Nations Department of Peacekeeping
Operations

Shola J. Omoregie
Africa Peace Support

Tomislav Pavčić
Permanent Mission of the Republic of Croatia
to the United Nations

Rafal Rohozinski
The SecDev Group

Nicholas Sambanis
Yale University

Lisa Sharland
Permanent Mission of Australia to the
United Nations

Taimi Strehlow
International Peace Institute

Oliver Ulich
United Nations Department of Peacekeeping
Operations

Pol Vanden Berghe
Permanent Mission of Belgium to the
United Nations

Naomi Weinberger
Columbia University

Jonah Schulhofer-Wohl
The Woodrow Wilson Department of Politics,
University of Virginia

Leanne Smith
United Nations Policy and Best Practices Service

Sharon Wiharta
Folke Bernadotte Academy

Trond Egil With
Permanent Mission of Norway to the
United Nations

Vanessa Wyeth
Center on International Cooperation

Sergey P. Yakushev
Permanent Mission of the Russian Federation
to the United Nations

The **INTERNATIONAL PEACE INSTITUTE (IPI)** is an independent, international not-for-profit think tank with a staff representing more than twenty nationalities, with offices in New York, facing United Nations headquarters, and in Vienna. IPI is dedicated to promoting the prevention and settlement of conflicts between and within states by strengthening international peace and security institutions. To achieve its purpose, IPI employs a mix of policy research, convening, publishing, and outreach.



777 United Nations Plaza, New York, NY 10017-3521, USA

TEL +1-212-687-4300 FAX +1-212-983-8246

Freyung 3, 1010 Vienna, Austria

TEL +43-1-533-8881 FAX +43-1-533-8881-11

www.ipinst.org