Civil-Military Cooperation in UN Peace Missions – The Need for a New Holistic Mission Approach

Cedric de Coning

ACCORD
Umhlanga Rocks
4320 South Africa
e-mail: cedric@yebo.co.za

Cedric de Conig is the Programme Manager: Peacekeeping at ACCORD, and is responsible for the Norwegian funded Training for Peace in Southern Africa Project – a peacekeeping training and capacity building project in southern Africa. He was a South African diplomat and served abroad at Expo '92 in Sevilla, Spain; Washington D.C.; and the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia. He served on OAU Election Monitoring missions to Ethiopia, Algeria, and Sudan. Cedric has degrees in Political Science and Philosophy from the RAU University in Johannesburg, South Africa. His focus is on the civilian roles in peace missions, civil-military coordination and building capacity for conflict management and peacekeeping in Africa. He planned and coordinated the civilian aspects for the April 99 Exercise Blue Crane, the largest peacekeeping exercise ever in Africa. Cedric is the President (1999/2000) of the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centres (IAPTC).

ABSTRACT

Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC), like so many other concepts in the peacekeeping field, means different things to different people. There is a need to develop greater consensus in the peacekeeping fraternity on our use of the CIMIC concept. The one common element among the various different interpretations attached to CIMIC is the need to coordinate in peacekeeping missions. In a UN peace mission, the need for coordination is two-fold. On the one hand it is within the UN mission, i.e. among all the multidisciplinary components. On the other it is coordination between the UN mission and all the other international and local actors who operate in the same conflict theatre.

This is where coordination in the UN context differs from our understanding of CIMIC as it has been developed by NATO in former Yugoslavia. NATO sees CIMIC as a military activity aimed at coordinating its activities with the civilian actors in the conflict area. This is understandable and acceptable in a scenario where NATO or any military organization is the primary actor. That CIMIC approach is, however, too narrow for the UN context where coordination should not only take place, per definition, between the military and other mission elements, but rather between all the mission elements equally.

In the UN context, mission coordination should take place under the overall political direction of the Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG), and between the

_____
–

various multidisciplinary mission elements. No one element, be it the military, civilian police, humanitarian or any other should be the central gravitational focal point around which the others are coordinated. Instead, the Office of the SRSG or a specific body created for this purpose, such as the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), should be given the responsibility to ensure overall mission coordination. As such, coordination should be understood and recognized as a crucial factor for mission success in modern multidisciplinary UN peace missions.

In southern Africa, this was realized during the planning phase of Exercise Blue Crane — a SADC brigade level peacekeeping field exercise that took place in April 1999. The exercise scenario was based on a typical modern UN peace mission. When the planners tried to implement CIMIC concepts however, including the utilization of a Joint Civil Military Operations Centre (CMOC), they realized that the CIMIC concept only provides for a scenario where the military coordinates the other actors as part of its CIMIC function. There was no doctrine or mechanisms, below the Mission HQ level, focussed on achieving a holistically managed and coordinated UN mission. The paper will elaborate on the problems experienced at Exercise Blue Crane, and discuss some of the potential solutions that was developed during this exercise.

The paper will conclude with a warning against blindly applying NATO CIMIC doctrine in UN peace missions. It will urge further analysis and debate on how coordination can best be achieved in UN peace missions, and emphasize the need to develop policy and mechanisms focussed on practical implementation of the new holistic mission management approach.

THE CIMIC CONCEPT

The concept 'civil-military co-operation' (CIMIC), like so many others in the peacekeeping field, means different things to different people. Some understand it as the relationship between a peacekeeping force and the local population. Others understand it as the relationship between the military and civilian members of a peacekeeping mission. Still others see it as encompassing all activities where the peacekeeping mission interacts with other international and local actors in the conflict area. What is obvious from this confusion is that we need to develop greater consensus in the peacekeeping fraternity on our understanding and use of the CIMIC concept. The focus on the Analysis of Civil Military Interactions, at this fourth meeting of the Cornwallis Group, is thus both a timely and much needed contribution to this process.

The one common element among the various different interpretations mentioned above is the need to co-ordinate between the military and others. In fact, the need for improved coordination among the various multidisciplinary elements that make up modern UN peace missions has been one of the key findings of almost all lessons learned studies to date.

NATO understands CIMIC as the resources and arrangements which support the relationship between military commanders and the national authorities, civil and military, and civil populations in an area where military forces are deployed, or plan to be deployed. Such arrangements include cooperation with non-government or international agencies,

_____
_

organisations and authorities[i]. From this perspective, CIMIC is the tools and structures the military force establish and use to manage and support its relations with all the other actors in its area of operations, or intended area of operations.

It is important to note that there is another concept and field of studies – 'civil-military relations'- that fall outside the peacekeeping realm. The study of Civil-Military Relations focuses on the relationship between the military and civil society and on the role of the military in a democracy. This field of study is usually focussed on societies that are undergoing transformation from military rule to civilian rule, or where the military played a particular domestic role. Civil-Military Relations has no relevance to CIMIC in the peacekeeping context, and thus falls outside the scope of this paper.

CIMIC IN FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

CIMIC, as we understand it today, has been largely shaped by NATO's experiences in former Yugoslavia[ii]. In former Yugoslavia, NATO found itself in a situation where the military, contrary to modern developments in the UN peace mission context, was deployed as the lead organization. NATO soon realized however, that it would not be able to achieve its objective – formulated as the 'End State' - on its own. Although its success depended on the implication and maintenance of all aspects of the Dayton Peace agreement, it only had the means and capability to address the security aspects of the agreement[iii]. To achieve objectives such as the return of Refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs), it needed to co-ordinate with other actors such as the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and numerous non-governmental organisations (NGOs)[iv] of various shapes and sizes. It also needed to co-ordinate these kinds of objectives and activities with the local government and civil society organizations. The only way this could be done was to establish structures and mechanisms for co-operation and coordination between the NATO force and all the other role players in former Yugoslavia[v]. There is also another, more self-serving, motivation for a CIMIC campaign from a military perspective. Good relations with the local population is a force protection multiplier.

NATO realized it would need to dedicate some of its human and other resources to CIMIC, and it soon became an important part, if not one of the most crucial elements, of the NATO missions in former Yugoslavia[vi]. Admiral Leighton Smith, the overall Commander of NATO's Implementation Force (IFOR) in former Yugoslavia perhaps best summarized this development in April 1996 when he said: "In November we never heard of CIMIC, we had no idea what you did ... now we can't live without you."

CIMIC as we understand it today, and especially the use of specific Staff Officers assigned as CIMIC Liaison Officers, either in Mission, Force, Sector or lower headquarters, or as seconded officers to other agencies and organizations, is a direct result of the development of the CIMIC concept in former Yugoslavia. Part of its success was also that it was not just a strategy thought out and handed down from NATO headquarters in Brussels or Force Headquarters in Sarajevo. Once understood and embraced, CIMIC made sense and paid dividends to those who had to deal with the real problems on a daily basis. A view supported by Brigadier General Gunnar Lundberg, the Commander of the NORDPOL

_____
–

Brigade in former Yugoslavia from December 1996 to June 1997, when he says: "While I was serving with the NATO force in former Yugoslavia, I quickly came to the conclusion that Commanders in complex peace operations absolutely require a dedicated CIMIC capability."

This does not mean, however, that CIMIC was first developed by NATO in former Yugoslavia. Similar activities took place in many UN peacekeeping missions through the years, and especially in peacekeeping missions since 1989. In fact, one can argue that the experiences of the UN in its peacekeeping missions in Namibia, Cambodia, Mozambique, and especially in Somalia and during UNPROFOR in Former Yugoslavia, laid the groundwork for the development of the CIMIC concept. What we now call CIMIC was more or less the same kind of things that UN commanders developed over the years to coordinate their activities with the other UN, international and local actors in their environment. For instance, in Somalia the various contingents were inundated with requests for security escorts for food convoys. As the demand grew the American contingents, and others, requested the humanitarian agencies and NGOs to convey their requests at formal coordination meetings, and then arranged such meetings on a regular – normally weekly - basis. When the demand warranted it, the American contingents created Civil-Military Coordination Centers (CMOCs) to ensure this coordination on an ongoing basis. In Somalia these coordination structures, procedures and policies were not uniform among the contingents and the range and limitations of military support to humanitarian operations were unclear and at times inconsistent[vii].

It is during the NATO mission in Former Yugoslavia, however, that the CIMIC concept was coined, unpacked and developed into doctrine, and where specific staff positions, mechanism and structures were developed for its operationalisation.

In fact, it is probably the first time since World War II, that a new position has been added to the classic staff structure in a military command team. A typical military command structure normally comprises staff officers representing the following disciplines: Personnel and Administration, Intelligence, Operations, Logistics, Planning, Communication, Training and Finance. NATO has now added a CIMIC Officer to its generic command structure for all future peace support operations[viii].

CIMIC AS A MILITARY DOCTRINE

CIMIC was developed for the military by the military over many years of UN peacekeeping operations, but especially by NATO in former Yugoslavia. In essence it was developed because the military realized that in peacekeeping operations, their success depended, at least in part, on their ability to co-ordinate their activities with the other international and national actors to achieve success.

A number of other factors further contributed to the military assuming the coordination role. The military is usually the only actor with an overall view of the conflict situation, the only actor with the spare time and human resources to dedicate to coordination, and has an organizational culture that promotes planning and preparing for possible contingencies. Most of the other actors, especially the humanitarian agencies, are highly specialized, under

staffed, poorly coordinated, and normally only deploys in those areas where they are most needed. The peacekeeping force, on the other hand, is normally responsible for the whole geographical area and thus often the only body with an overall view of all the various international activities taking place in the conflict area. The military — because it has to be prepared for all contingencies - normally has enough human resources to dedicate to coordination whilst most humanitarian agencies normally don't even have enough staff to carry out their core activities. For the same reasons, the military dedicate a lot of time and human resources to planning for all kinds of contingencies whilst most of the humanitarian agencies do not have the time and resources to dedicate to planning activities.

The point is that CIMIC was developed by the military because it identified the need and because it had the ability — the spare resources, organizational background and culture — to do so.

From a military point of view, all its activities aimed at coordination and co-operation during peace missions are part of its CIMIC campaign, and it would use Civil-Military Liaison Officers for this purpose. CIMIC is thus a specific doctrinal approach to coordination developed by the military, managed by the military and implemented by the military.

CIMIC IN THE UNITED NATIONS CONTEXT

CIMIC makes so much sense and has proven so successful that the CIMIC contagion has now also affected the UN concept of peace missions. One can probably go so far as to say that CIMIC is now so widely accepted that it would be part of any future UN peace missions. The UN has not taken any formal decisions in this regard, but most of the NATO member states have now adopted CIMIC as part of its peace missions policy. A significant number of the personnel of the United Nations' Department of Peacekeeping Operations (UNDPKO) are from Western countries that are also members of NATO or of its Partnership for Peace. Because of their influence, CIMIC is widely accepted as something which should be part of UN peacekeeping doctrine. Apart from the policies and doctrine developed for NATO however, very little if any CIMIC doctrine exists for UN peace missions.

The UNDPKO has not developed any specific doctrine for CIMIC in the UN context, nor has it developed any training courses for CIMIC. A number of UN troop contributing countries, however, who are also members of NATO, have copied their NATO CIMIC doctrine and structures in their training and preparations for UN peacekeeping. In fact most NATO countries make little difference between the training they give to their soldiers for NATO peacekeeping and UN Peacekeeping. As a result, CIMIC doctrine are widely understood to be generically acceptable, and little distinction, if any, is made between CIMIC in the UN context and CIMIC in the NATO context. The Danish SHIRBRIG Brigade is perhaps one such example where NATO-type CIMIC doctrine is applied, both in the SHIRBRIG structures and in its training, for a UN stand-by force. This can probably be explained because there has not been a major UN peace mission since the NATO mission in former Yugoslavia and because most of us in the peacekeeping field probably assume that the CIMIC concept, as developed in the NATO context, is equally applicable in the UN context.

_____
–

Is such an assumption valid? Is NATO peacekeeping so different from UN peacekeeping that it would warrant a different CIMIC policy?

MODERN MULTI-DISCIPLINARY PEACE MISSIONS

The scope and complexity of modern UN peace missions (hence the proliferation of terms trying to capture this complexity, e.g. Multi-functional Peace Keeping; Multi-dimensional Peace Operations; New Generation Peacekeeping; Wider Peacekeeping, Chapter Six-and-a-half Peace Operations, etc.) set them apart from Classical UN Peacekeeping. The scope and complexity differential derives from the new found enormous 'scope' (quantity) of the problems, e.g. millions of refugees in Rwanda with refugee camps the size of a small city, and 'complex' (quality) because of the deep rooted ethnic, religious, language and other root causes that defy political agreements and negotiated settlements. It is relevant because this type of conflict require a specific response, namely a political and humanitarian driven response.

If we compare the Classical Peacekeeping tasks with the diverse range of tasks carried out in modern peace missions it is clear that whilst the military tasks have stayed more or less the same, the additional tasks derive from the new political and humanitarian challenges and are thus largely civilian in nature. If we look at United Nations peace missions since 1989 we see that the responsibilities of the peacekeepers have changed from their traditional military duties of inter-positioning, monitoring of cease-fire lines, etc. to include a whole range of new duties, most of which go beyond the military sphere. Modern peace missions include tasks such as human rights monitoring and education; civilian police monitoring and education; electoral assistance in the form of arranging elections and election monitoring; demobilization and the reintegration of ex-combatants into civil society; repatriation of refugees and internally displaced persons; rehabilitation and relief efforts; and in some cases, e.g. in Cambodia and now in Kosovo, include temporarily taking over the whole state bureaucracy, including the judiciary, administration, education, etc. In contemporary peace missions each of these disciplines are intimately linked to each other and form a holistic network or system of inter-related and mutually supportive functions that combine to become the complex modern peace mission.

As the demands for these political and humanitarian tasks grew, the UN increasingly turned to civilian experts in these fields and as a result modern peace missions have large numbers of civilian personnel. This was not always the case, certainly not to the extent, size and proportionality that is typical of peace missions today. One of the ways in which this change has manifested itself is in the management of modern peace missions. Since 1989, appointing a civilian head of mission, normally in the form of a Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG), has become the norm. A typical management structure in a classical peacekeeping operation would see a Force Commander at the head of the operation. A typical modern peace mission, in contrast, will be headed by a civilian Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG), normally assisted by a Deputy SRSG[ix]. The SRSG will have a Mission Management Team made up by the divisional heads of all the components that make up the peace mission. These will differ from mission to mission depending on the specific mandate and circumstances but a generic Mission Management Team can be said to include, apart form the SRSG and Deputy SRSG: the Force Commander;

_____

the Chief Military Observer if there is a separate military observer mission; the Civilian Police Commissioner; the Head of the Election Component where relevant; the Humanitarian Co-ordinator[x]; the Head of the Human Rights Component[xi] and the Chief Administrative Officer. The latter are all equals in terms of their level of seniority from an organisational point of view, but in practice, their power and influence in the peace mission would be influenced by the amount of resources they control.

The type of civilian role players present in a given peace mission depends on the particular demands of that conflict situation. Some modern peace missions, for instance UNAVEM II in Angola, had a large election unit because an election was regarded as an essential part of bringing peace to Angola, whereas others, such as UNAMIR in Rwanda[xii], did not include an election unit at all. This diversity has often resulted in uncertainty as to what the civilian roles in a peace mission are. There is an urgent need to de-mystify, clarify and professionalise the civilian roles in modern peace missions. One of the most important contributing elements to this dilemma is the fact that most of the civilian tasks, such as election monitoring or human rights monitoring, do not only occur during peace missions. The same tasks are also performed in almost all situations of crisis and transformation, whether a peace mission has been deployed or not. Once a peace mission has been established, however, all the peace tasks — preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding — come under one broad umbrella and are coordinated as one comprehensive holistic peace mission.

With such a large number of diverse disciplines represented in one Mission, it is not strange that co-ordination has become one of the most critical success factors of modern peace missions. It is also not strange that such an organisational make-up, left unchecked, will result in inter-agency conflict over resources, position and power. In the early 1990s, when the process of transforming peacekeeping into its modern form was initiated, one of those early conflicts were between the humanitarian mandates on the one hand, and the security mandates on the other[xiii]. There was a (short) period where people believed the two to be incompatible as humanitarian mandates were carried out regardless of the political context, whilst the security mandate was set in a specific political context, especially in conflict situations like Somalia and Rwanda where one side was identified as the aggressor. In a paper approved in 1996 by the UN Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC), "Respect for Humanitarian Mandates in Conflict Situations," it is argued that "Given the interrelated causes and consequences of complex emergencies, humanitarian action cannot be fully effective unless it is related to a comprehensive strategy for peace and security, human rights and social and economic development as proposed within the framework of the Agenda for Peace"[xiv]. At the same time the paper argues that within the framework of this overall comprehensive strategy, humanitarian activities should maintain a certain degree of independence from the mission's political and military activities, taking into account their humanitarian mandates.

Thornberry[xv] argues that where problems arise they are over means, not ends: "There is unlikely to be conflict between the mandates of UN political and UN humanitarian and aid agencies; there is not much chance that the Security Council will direct a peacekeeping operation to contravene humanitarian principles, and there can be few instances in which humanitarian agencies might be mandated to take action incompatible with a peacekeeping mandate". Thornberry does make the point, however, that under Chapter VII enforcement operations, there is, indeed, the real possibility of a clash of mandates. In cases where

_____

_

enforcement takes the form of economic sanctions or military action, it is not unlikely, despite the best efforts of the Security Council's Sanctions Committee for instance, that those who will suffer most under these actions are the innocent civilians, placing an even greater burden on humanitarian agencies, or directly countering humanitarian objectives in the same theatre.

A review of the Lessons-Learned from the United Nations experience in Somalia (April 1992-March 1995) reveals a number of coordination issues the soldiers, civilians, humanitarian agencies and NGOs struggled with[xvi]. I will just select a few to highlight the need for improved co-operation and coordination in modern UN peace missions:

- UNOSOM's mandate was vague, changed frequently during the operation and was open to different interpretations. The mandate changed from protecting the delivery of humanitarian assistance, to encouraging and assisting in political reconciliation, to establishing and maintaining a "secure environment," to capturing a leader of one of the factions at one stage and, later, to encouraging negotiations with that same leader. Mandates should be as clear as possible to allow it to be translated into a detailed operational plan, leaving no room for ambiguity or differing perceptions as to the roles and tasks of the various elements.

- In the establishment of UNOSOM I and II, integrated planning was limited to two short visits to Somalia by interdepartmental technical teams. The UNOSOM experience emphasised the need for integrated planning and coordination of all elements in peacekeeping operations. It is essential to enunciate a coherent vision, strategy and plan of action that integrate all the relevant dimensions, be they humanitarian, political, security, information or other.

- Both UNOSOM I and II suffered from lack of unity among the components of the operation. A co-ordinated overall plan should be defined before the deployment of an operation, and ongoing co-ordination among the components is crucial.

- Whilst Reconciliation and Institution-building are crucial elements of the peace-building agenda of peace operations, operations are often hampered by problems of "sequence." For instance, a police force can not function without a judicial system, which in turn can not function without a secure environment guaranteed by a police force. Also, disarmament and demobilization are unrealistic in the absence of economic opportunity for ex-militiamen, but economic recovery in turn is stymied by banditry and chronic insecurity. In these circumstances only simultaneous progress across the board can create the necessary synergy to break the 'vicious circle.' Reconciliation and Institution-building are greatly strengthened when information is shared, advice sought and programmes co-ordinated. The United Nations must pursue an integrated strategy aimed at supporting the judiciary, police, local government, the economy, reconciliation, disarmament and demobilisation. The resurrection of a web of civic, professional, business, and other associations is a crucial component of the reconciliation process in war-torn

_____
_

societies. UNOSOM was unable to create enough of a safe 'political space' for elements of civil society to build bridges across lines of conflict and improve lines of communication.

- UNOSOM faced a number of "conflict constituencies" with a vested interest in continued instability, communal tension and an economy of plunder. Their marginalization, whether intentional or not, entail the risk of a violent backlash. An alternative strategy would be to work incrementally to enhance their stake in peace. UNOSOM offers unique lessons-learned as to what happens when the mission becomes involved in sustained peace enforcement actions against one such conflict constituency.

- The descent into anarchy, with the concomitant lack of security, was the main reason why a large scale and well coordinated relief operation could not be mounted in Somalia in 1992. Thus, adequate security arrangements are an imperative in order to safeguard the humanitarian space needed for successful relief operations. The need to improve coordination among humanitarian agencies and NGOs, and the involvement of the military in humanitarian assistance were apparent in UNOSOM.

The overriding lesson from the above is clear: the need to improve coordination and co-operation among all the various multidisciplinary elements in a modern UN peace mission, and to do so during all the phases of the mission, i.e. during the planning phase, during the execution, and at all the levels of the mission, i.e. strategic, operational and tactical.

We need to understand the new conflict-paradigm as one where peace makers are confronted with continuously evolving complex conflict systems. To manage them, we need to develop an equally complex conflict management response — one that addresses the conflict system holistically and in a coordinated fashion. Hence the modern peace mission formula that combine military, police, humanitarian and various other disciplines in one united effort to achieve one combined and interrelated objective — a meaningful and lasting peace, normally described in mission terms as the 'end state.'

Some would argue, however, that each conflict is unique and that our lessons from one conflict, e.g. Somalia or former Yugoslavia, will be of little use when we face the next conflict, e.g. in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. They argue that we have to caution ourselves to give universal application to lessons learned from a specific conflict. On the one hand this paper shares this view and cautions against the universal application of the CIMIC lessons learned in the NATO mission in former Yugoslavia in future UN peacekeeping missions. On the other hand this caution is based on the lessons learned from 50 years of UN peacekeeping, and especially the trends and changes that occurred over the last ten years. Larry Minear[xvii] of the Thomas J. Watson Jr. Institute for International Studies at Brown University, has developed more than a dozen case studies under the Humanitarian and War Project, focusing, amongst others, on Sudan, Cambodia, Liberia, Georgia, Haiti, Rwanda, Chechnya and Nagorno-Karabakh. One of their conclusions is that contrary to the commonly held view that each conflict situation is unique, their findings suggest that no situation was unique. "In our view, each crisis pits the same institutions (the United Nations, governments, NGOs) against the same protagonists (governments and insurgent groups, civilian and military host officials) in a continuing effort to find solutions to recurring problems (the

_____
–

obstruction of humanitarian access, the manipulation of relief, inequitable economic relationships, the absence of viable and accountable local structures).”

PRIMARY LESSON LEARNED — THE
NEED FOR IMPROVED COORDINATION

In fact, the findings of the Humanitarian and War Project support the key finding of almost all the United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations Lessons Learned studies undertaken to date. The most significant failure of modern peace missions, with their complex mix of political, civilian and military personnel and objectives, have been their inability to integrate these various components in a single holistic effort.

The need for synergy between the political, civilian and military contingents in modern peace missions also extends to the multitude of non-UN international organisations and NGOs who have become part of the reality of any modern complex emergency. The international relief and rehabilitation effort in Kosovo is perhaps a good example. Here the mission's overall objectives of establishing an interim administration, including an interim policing system; organising a referendum; monitoring human rights; and economic reconstruction are being shared between the UN, the OSCE, and the EU. This is done through a new unique mission management team structure that sees a UN SRSG, supported by Deputy SRSGs that represent the various UN, OSCE, and EU efforts. NATO provides the peacekeeping force but it is not part of the UN mission, and is thus not part of the UN mission management team[xviii]. The success of each is dependent on the success of the other. Any factor that impacts negatively on any of the elements of the overall mission, whether it is in the political, military or humanitarian areas, eventually impact negatively on the mission itself. If one element fails, e.g. the election in Angola during UNAVEM II, then everything achieved in the other sectors will be meaningless. One of the major challenges of modern peace missions, if not the major challenge, is thus the overall management and co-ordination of a complex, multifunctional, multidisciplinary and multinational mission.

If one places this enormous management challenge into perspective — most UN peacekeeping missions are established and deployed in 4 to 9 months; most of the people who make up the peacekeeping mission will meet each other for the first time in the mission (on the job) and have not trained or worked together before; most of the personnel are rotated every six months; missions are normally carried out under hostile conditions – it is not at all difficult to understand why most UN peace missions have failed to achieve the cohesion and synergy necessary to achieve unity of effort and purpose.

One of the ways in which the office of the SRSG was strengthened to address these complications, was to appoint a Deputy SRSG. The idea was that the Deputy SRSG would be more of a hands-on day-to-day manager of the peacekeeping mission, freeing the SRSG to focus more on peacemaking between the belligerent parties and for diplomatic missions to neighbouring countries and regional organisations to muster support for the peace process. The most recent proposal is that the Deputy SRSG should be the UN Country Representative, i.e. the Head of the UNDP country office who was already in the country before the UN peace mission was established. This proposal should ensure that the Deputy SRSG is an experienced UN bureaucrat, manager and development expert, who, depending on the time

_____

–

he or she has spent in the country prior to the establishment of the UN mission, should have an intimate knowledge of the conflict situation. The UNDP Head should also be in a position to bring the existing in-country UN resources and assets under the management and coordination of the newly formed UN peace mission.   This may prove very useful if one takes into account that the SRSG is normally a senior diplomat chosen for their conflict management skills and acceptability to all the belligerent parties, not necessarily for their management skills and experience or familiarity with the UN bureaucracy. The potential drawbacks in this proposal is that UN bureaucrats, trained and experienced in the art of bureaucratic control and constraint, are expected to play a key role in a dynamic conflict management response that require a totally different form of management and coordination. By utilizing the existing management resources one may create the perception that it is business as usual. However, it would appear as if this proposal has potentially more advantages than disadvantages, and hopefully the UN system would prepare its senior UNDP staff with the necessary, system management, conflict management and change management training in preparation for this new role.

The Office of the SRSG has also developed over time into a more complex organization. Initially, and in some modern cases, e.g. MINURCA, the Office of the SRSG is little more than a handful of support staff in the form of a Personal Assistant, a Secretary and a Political Affairs Officer or advisor. In larger missions the office was enlarged to include various other areas of specialization such as a public information office and a spokesperson for the SRSG; a legal office; etc.

The SRSG, the Deputy SRSG and the Office of the SRSG as a management construct have, however, not yet developed the concentration of effort to meaningfully co-ordinate and manage complex modern peace missions. We need to further develop the management support tools available to the SRSG and his office.

What we have learned is that peace missions need to be understood as a holistic system, i.e. that all of its elements need to interact in a complex manner to achieve the overall objective. Multidisciplinary peace missions are a complex continuum — as opposed to a linear time-line - of processes and actions, with the various campaigns, projects and initiatives overlapping in time and space, while continuously interacting with each other, influencing each other and impacting on each other in a complex feed-back loop of relationships.

In order to manage such a complex system one needs to: (1) continuously exchange information between all the sub-systems or elements that make up the peace mission; (2) continuously co-ordinate all the sub-systems or elements so as to ensure that all are working together; and (3) continuously monitor the effect your specific and overall efforts are having on the conflict system; and (4) this feedback needs to be carried back into the coordination mechanism of the peace mission so that the mission's activities can be continuously refined and adjusted to maintain overall maximum effect. Such a continuous intelligent feedback system is a basic hallmark of any complex system and we need to improve the modalities of how this is done in modern UN peace missions.

IMPLICATIONS FOR MISSION COORDINATION

The need for improved coordination between the various multidisciplinary elements that make up modern UN peace missions has been one of the key findings of almost all lessons learned studies to date. In contrast to a NATO-type of peacekeeping mission — where the focus is on the military coordinating with the civilian role players, hence CIMIC — coordination in a UN peace mission is two-fold. On the one hand it is within the UN mission, i.e. among all the multidisciplinary components. On the other it is coordination between the UN mission and all the other international and local actors that operate in the same conflict theatre.

The latter is not under UN control, and thus not technically part of the UN peace mission, but it is in the UN mission's interest to be aware of what all the other actors intend to do, to co-ordinate activities, support each other where possible, and to share information about the UN mission's intent and activities. In most cases, these non-UN actors, e.g. the various NGOs working in the humanitarian relief field or a regional political body such as the OSCE or the OAU, are crucial to overall mission success and it is thus in the UN mission's interest to coordinate, cooperate and collaborate with these non-UN actors. These actors are normally poorly coordinated with each focussing on its own area of specialty, e.g. children in the case of a NGO like 'Save the Children' or a specific geographic location. The UN, with its overall presence and holistic mission approach, is ideally placed to co-ordinate these efforts and resources into one overall effort, and focussed on one common end state. The important difference is that the cooperation and coordination efforts with the non-UN actors have to occur on a voluntary basis. The UN has to encourage such cooperation on the basis of the mutual benefit that can be derived from it, but should take care to do so in ways that always recognize their autonomy, so that these non-UN actors do not feel that coordination with the UN mission is a threat to their independence in anyway.

Whether it is in the UN or NATO context, CIMIC is still the military act of coordination with the civilian elements. In the UN context, however, we would have to admit that the 'Civil-Military Cooperation (CIMIC)' concept — which only provides for coordination by the military with the civilian components — is problematic because, from what we have discussed above it is clear that in the UN context, all the various mission elements have to be integrated into one holistic mission. If we use CIMIC in both the narrow context, i.e. military coordination with the rest, and the broad context, overall coordination among all, we may cause confusion among the two and wrongly equate the first with the second. At the least, this potential confusion points to the need for research and policy development to be focussed on the role and place of CIMIC in UN missions.

The primary coordination function in UN peace missions is to ensure the overall holistic cohesion of the Mission. A secondary role would be to co-ordinate the activities of the UN Mission with those others in the field who are not under the direct control of the UN, but whose co-operation is crucial to the overall success of the mission.

In a typical UN peace mission, the Special Representative of the Secretary General (SRSG) is responsible for the holistic management of all the UN elements making up that mission. At mission headquarters level the SRSG is responsible for the overall management of the mission, and the heads of the various components — the peacekeeping force, military observers, civilian police, humanitarian relief agencies, election unit, human rights, etc. — form his mission management team. In most post-Cold War UN peace missions this kind of coordination did take place at mission headquarter level.

_____
–

Below HQ level, however, little or no formal coordination took place and as a result the military commanders at sector level often stepped in and tried to co-ordinate in their sectors or areas of responsibility — hence the development of CIMIC as we know it. Coordination has taken place in most modern UN peace missions in the following ways:

- At Mission HQ level, a multidisciplinary mission management team has developed that represent various elements, according to the specific needs of the conflict situation, of a modern peace mission.

- Below Mission HQ level no formal coordination mechanism has been developed. The military identified the need for coordination, and developed CIMIC as a way to co-ordinate all the actors that share their geographical areas of responsibility.

- The UN humanitarian agencies have developed various mechanisms to co-ordinate their activities, for instance, through joint logistic centers that assists UN and other humanitarian organizations with port and custom clearances, co-ordinate transport and conveys, etc. but this coordination is only focussed on the needs of the humanitarian community. The UN created the Department of Humanitarian Affairs, and later the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs to ensure coordination within and among the UN and other humanitarian agencies.

- In the UN mission in Haiti, and in a handful of other examples, coordination between the peacekeeping force, the civilian police and other mission elements, such as an election unit, occurred through the temporary co-location of HQ elements and the creation of joint – in reality temporary access for the police or other civilian elements to the military - operations rooms.

- The political element, in the form of the political affairs or civil affairs projects; the human rights element, where the UN and/or other bodies have created a specific Human Rights Monitoring Mission; the electoral element, where the UN and others have established an election assistance and monitoring mission; and other civilian specialized monitoring missions, e.g. sanctions, media, judicial, chemical and biological, etc., are not currently included in any of these coordination efforts.

There is thus a need to formalize and structure the overall coordination of UN peace missions below the Mission Headquarter level. There is a need to re-think and broaden our understanding of the CIMIC concept. If Classical (NATO-type) CIMIC refers to civil-military cooperation in situations where the military initiate and host the interaction, we need to find a new concept or understanding that reflects the UN scenario where coordination should take place equally among all the components that make-up the mission, and which will probably be political, or mission management driven. CIMIC will of course remain part of the military doctrine for peace support operations, including UN doctrine, but we can not simply continue to use the same concept for mission-wide coordination. The military role in, and support for, the overall mission coordination efforts should be undertaken as part of its CIMIC campaign. The UN holistic mission management approach, however, requires a

_____
_

different effort, a different methodology and different structures than that developed in the purely military NATO CIMIC context.

The desired coordination role in a UN peace mission would be to replicate the type of cooperation taking place at Mission HQ level throughout the rest of the UN mission. It would only be natural that if any of the main mission elements, such as the peacekeeping force or the humanitarian lead agency, were given that coordination task, that they would focus that coordination around their own purpose, e.g. the military around security and force protection and the humanitarian around humanitarian relief delivery. Because of this reality, it would make sense for coordination to be undertaken by a neutral body such as OCHA, or perhaps by regional/sector political affairs officers tasked with coordination as representatives of the SRSG.

OCHA was formed to co-ordinate relief efforts during humanitarian crises. One possibility would be for their role to be widened to coordination among all aspects of the UN Mission. Another is for the Office of the SRSG to assume primary responsibility for mission-wide coordination, and to introduce a political coordination/management function at the regional and sector levels in the form of regional or sector Political Affairs or Coordination Managers. The latter would represent the SRSG in the region/sector and will be primarily responsible for coordinating the UN mission effort in that area. At the same time, such Political Affairs or Coordination Managers should be responsible for monitoring the implementation of the political aspects of the peace agreement/cease-fire and assist with political issues such as nation building, re-instating government control over territories previously held by rebels, re-building government institutions, etc.

Coordination is a management issue and responsibility, and as such it would be the responsibility of the SRSG and his office to find creative, but practical ways in which this can be best achieved in future UN missions. The United Nations and UN peacekeeping nations need to recognize the central role coordination plays in mission success and they need to place the primary responsibility for coordination with the SRSG and his office. The SRSG and his office must understand that overall mission coordination is their responsibility and a crucial, if not the critical, element of mission success.

At the same time the UN must recognize that this is primarily a management challenge, and one that reflects the worldwide management trend away from hierarchical linear management structures to systems oriented management networks. As such, the UN should make sure that it prepares its potential SRSGs, or if that is too elusive a task, at least its Deputy SRSGs. Another option is to train a specific group of mission specialist in this area, and to make such Mission Coordination Advisers available to each SRSG. Mission Coordination should become a central part of mission planning and should be integrated into the planning process from the start. Such Mission Coordination Advisers, or what ever one may wish to call such coordination specialists, should also form part of the developing rapidly deployable headquarters contingent at the UNDPKO. The policy development and planning for mission coordination should be done at the UNDPKO and developed into SOPs or built into specific mission plans before they are launched.

Apart from the various coordinating positions mentioned above, specific coordination structures need to be developed. These can serve as nerve centers or focal points for mission coordination and information exchange and can be established at every level in a mission

_____
_

where coordination is needed.   One such example, a Mission Coordination Centre (MCOC) was developed for Exercise Blue Crane, a peacekeeping exercise that was held in South Africa in April 1999. It is only one example of how such mission coordination structures can function, and the experience is conveyed using the findings of Blue Crane Lessons Learned Seminar[xix].

CASE STUDY: LESSONS LEARNED
FROM EXERCISE BLUE CRANE '99

Exercise Blue Crane was a SADC peacekeeping exercise that was hosted by South Africa during April 1999. The Brigade level peacekeeping exercise took place in the semi-desert Kalahari region at the South African Army Battle School from 9 to 30 April 1999. It was the largest peacekeeping exercise held in Africa to date, and the first time that an exercise of this nature included a significant civilian role. The exercise consisted of 6 stages, involving over 4500 people from SADC, and included a peacekeeping force, military observers, civilian police and civilian personnel representing the UN, OAU, SADC, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), and various Non-Governmental Organizations(NGOs).   The exercise scenario was based on a multinational UN led operation deployed in a classic interpositional role between two warring factions on a mythical island in the Indian Ocean called Naraland.

The Peacekeeping Programme at ACCORD, as part of the Norwegian funded Training for Peace in Southern Africa Project[xx], was tasked to design, plan and co-ordinate all the civilian aspects of the Exercise.
The objective was to design the civilian participation in Exercise Blue Crane in such a way that both the civilian and military participants would:

- develop an understanding for each other's roles and mandates;

- develop an understanding for the need for joint problem solving and joint initiatives;

- develop an understanding for the need to exchange information and create liaison channels at all levels; and

- develop an understanding of the need for holistic management of the overall mission.

From a civilian point of view, the Exercise was not so much focussed on the technical procedures and techniques it would apply in such situations, as on the coordination and liaison with the other mission components. The technical procedures vary little whether there is a peacekeeping mission or not, e.g. the UNHCR will carry out its normal tasks vis-a-vis refugees regardless of whether there is a peacekeeping operation or not. The difference is that when specialized civilian agencies become part of a larger peacekeeping mission, the need arises to co-ordinate activities, exchange information and establish liaison channels at all levels. The focus for the civilian participants in Exercise Blue Crane was on the latter aspect.

_____
–

The civilian component was designed to reflect a UN led peacekeeping mission with UN humanitarian and human rights actors. It also included parallel missions such as an OAU Observer Mission and a SADC Human Rights Observer Group. In addition it included the ICRC and a number of NGOs. The media was included under the civilian component to perform the dual function of simulated press for exercise purposes and their normal real-time media responsibilities. These various civilian roles were simulated by diplomats from most SADC countries or were performed by real-time UN, OAU, ICRC, and NGO personnel.

During the planning process we started to implement CIMIC concepts, including the utilization of a Joint Civil Military Operations Centre (CMOC), but soon realized that the current common wisdom around these mechanisms were not fully compatible with the vision of a holistically managed and coordinated UN mission. As discussed above, the current CIMIC doctrine only provides for coordination below mission headquarter level to take place as an extension of the military's CIMIC campaign. All the planning and coordination is thus relegated to the planning function of the CIMIC cell and its structures, e.g. the CMOC, are organizationally and structurally part of the military command system. The only other precedent was the OCHA type of joint logistical centers that only focussed on coordination among the humanitarian actors. There was no precedent or tool with which one could achieve overall coordination of all the mission elements.

Despite considerable research and networking we could not find a viable CIMIC or mission coordination model which would incorporate the whole range of civilian and military actors we wanted to co-ordinate in Exercise Blue Crane. We thus decided to establish, apart from the now standard multidisciplinary Mission HQ, a Mission Coordination Centre (MCOC) where all the UN elements would be formally coordinated. The MCOC was developed along the lines of what in CIMIC terms would probably be called a joint Civil-Military Coordination Centre (CMOC), with one major difference in that it was not placed under the Force HQ as a military driven effort, but was placed at the Mission and Sector HQ levels under the overall coordination of the SRSG. The MCOC also served as a vehicle for voluntary coordination with all the non-UN actors in the exercise scenario, i.e. the OAU Observer Mission, the SADC Human Rights Observer Group, the ICRC and the NGOs.

THE MISSION COORDINATION CENTRE (MCOC)

The Mission Coordination Center (MCOC) was created at Mission Headquarters level, and later duplicated at Sector HQ level, to act as a central clearinghouse for the various elements of the UN Mission, and as a point of contact for all the non-UN actors in the Exercise.

Initially it was planned that the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) would act as the facilitator of the MCOC. Unfortunately OCHA had to withdraw their participation at the last moment because of the unfolding crisis in Kosovo and the responsibility for coordination shifted to the UN lead agency, i.e. in Exercise Blue Crane the UNHCR. The resources necessary to run the MCOC was provided by the (military) Force, including the physical structure (tent); furniture; stationary; telephone communication with

_____
_

the rest of the UN Mission and radio communication among all the civilian elements and the MCOC; as well as vehicles and drivers.

The MCOC was established as an operations room where all the various components of the UN mission were represented, i.e. the Office of the SRSG, the Force HQ, the Chief Military Observer, the CIVPOL HQ and the UNHCR. In addition, the MCOC served as the primary point of contact with the UN Mission in Naraland (UNMIN) for the various non-UN actors such as the OAU Observer Group (OAUMIN), the SADC Human Rights Observer Group (SADC-HROG), AFRONET and the other NGOs and the ICRC. All these players had direct radio communication with the MCOC and when personnel strength allowed, had at least one liaison officer placed at the MCOC.

Unfortunately the CIMIC concept was brought into the planning process so late that it was no longer possible to amend the various headquarters (force, sectors, battalions) to include CIMIC liaison officers. The result was that some officers, usually the operations officer or his deputy, had to double as the CIMIC officer as well. None of these officers have been previously trained in CIMIC. As a result CIMIC did not really function well during the exercise, except at Mission HQ level[xxi] where the deputy operations officer had to interact with the MCOC.

Although the need to co-ordinate is acknowledged, most coordination in modern peacekeeping missions have taken place either between the military and others (CMOC concept in Somalia and former Yugoslavia), or among the humanitarian agencies (JLOC, etc.) themselves. There has been no formal coordinating mechanism established for UN (or other) peacekeeping missions where all the various mission elements come together in a joint operations room setting, to date. The MCOC was an attempt to experiment with such a joint operations centre. As a first, it had to develop its own SOPs, communication methods and staffing structures. All of this had to happen under pressure of time during the first hours and over the first days of a four day exercise. As a result the MCOC in Exercise Blue Crane served as a very interesting laboratory for how such a coordination mechanism can function in the future. Some of the key characteristics of the MCOC and lessons learned with this experiment were:

- *Overall Objective:* From a Mission HQ perspective the MCOC should be a tool to support overall mission coordination in order to achieve unity of effort and a joint understanding of the ways in which the mission is going to achieve its end state. At the operational and tactical level the MCOC act as the focal point for the exchange of information and coordination. All requests for assistance and cooperation between mission elements should be channeled through the MCOC and all joint activities should be monitored by the MCOC. General information about movements, dangerous areas, mines, etc. should be communicated to each other through the MCOC.

- *Concept:* The defining characteristic of the MCOC concept (as opposed to the CMOC, for example, which is military driven) is that all the mission elements are represented on an equal footing. It is, in essence, a carbon copy of the Mission Management Team (SRSG, Deputy SRSG, Force Commander, CIVPOL Commissioner, Chief Military Observer, Human Rights Component,

_

Election Component, etc.), in an operations room format with liaison officers representing the various mission elements.

- *Facilitator:* The MCOC should be facilitated (or coordinated) by the OCHA, or by a regional Political Affairs Officer tasked with coordination by the SRSG. It should not be the responsibility of one of the main mission components such as the military (regional commander or CIMIC), humanitarian (humanitarian coordinator or UN lead agency), or any other mission component.

- *Liaison Officers:* All the mission components should second liaison officers to the MCOC, and these officers and civilian personnel need to be mandated and empowered to exchange information and co-ordinate activities with their counterparts. The Liaison Officers should not only be messengers, they should be problem solvers who have the aptitude, ability and seniority within their own sending organizations to effectively and speedily mobilize resources, cut through bureaucracy, and invent solutions.

- *Coordination with Non-UN Actors:* The MCOC should also serve as the contact point for non-UN actors with the UN mission and vice-versa. NGOs, the ICRC, and other international and regional actors can obtain and exchange information with the UN mission at one central point. In Exercise Blue Crane all the non-UN actors had unrestricted access to the MCOC, and was asked to place liaison officers to the UNMIN at the MCOC. They also had direct radio communication with each other and the MCOC. This did not cause any problems in the Exercise setting, but it probably resulted in an unrealistically high degree of coordination. It can be anticipated, however, that this would not be possible in actual UN missions and policies would need to be developed on, for instance: what level of access non-UN actors should have to the MCOC?; should non-UN actors, especially other governmental bodies such as the OAU or OSCE and some of the big humanitarian NGOs, have liaison officers at the MCOC?; if not unrestricted access to the MCOC's central operations room, what should the interface with the non-UN actors look like, e.g. a daily briefing?, a second *én clair* operations room?, etc.

- *Location:* At Mission HQ, at Sector HQ and at lower HQs depending on mission design. An essential requirement is that all the various mission elements need to use the same geographical sub-division of the area of operations. In Exercise Blue Crane the MCOC was initially only located at the Mission HQ level. As most of the coordination needs were tactical driven, however, the MCOC first held a daily briefing at the Sector level and later moved its interaction with the force to the Sector level. The lesson learned is that coordination is best done at the level where it needs to be executed, but that it should be duplicated and supported at higher levels if a decision is required from that higher authority.

- *Flow of Information:* It is crucial that all the UNMIN components and non-UN actors bring as much meaningful information to the MCOC as possible. In Exercise Blue Crane, initially most of the information flowed from the civilian

_____
_

organizations to the military. It was only later in the Exercise, once the
military realised the utility of the MCOC, that it also started to use it as a
vehicle to exchange information to other mission components. Like in any
system, what you get out of it is directly related to how much you are willing
to commit, and thus contribute, to it.

- *Secretariat:* Another lessons learned at Exercise Blue Crane is that it is
unrealistic to expect the liaison officers from the various mission components
to 'man' the MCOC as 'staff officers.' The MCOC needs a small number of
permanent staff to log all activities and to act as a secretariat for the facilitator.
This function can best be carried out by the military as part of its CIMIC
campaign. A typical team should probably comprise of a team leader, staff
officers, clerks and drivers and a small security detail. It may be advisable,
however, if personnel strength allows, to also have CIVPOL and other
civilians in the secretariat staff.

- *Communication:* Depending on the size of the mission and the type of
communication equipment used, the Secretariat may need a small number of
signal staff to manage the MCOC's communications function.

CONCLUSION

We need to develop common understanding of what we mean with Civil-Military
Cooperation (CIMIC). This should include more of a differentiation between NATO-type of
CIMIC needs, where NATO is the primary actor as during IFOR and SFOR in former
Yugoslavia, and UN-type peacekeeping operations where the peacekeeping force is part of a
larger multidisciplinary peacekeeping mission under the overall management of the UN
Secretary General's Special Representative (SRSG).

The one common element among the various different ways in which CIMIC is being
used is the need for coordination among the various actors in peacekeeping missions.
Although the need for coordination is stressed in almost all UN, NATO and other lessons
learned studies to date, coordination is still not recognized as something that is an integral
part of the overall holistic management of a mission.

In the UN context this implies that the mission coordination that has been developed at
the mission HQ level — where the Force Commander, Chief Military Observer, CIVPOL
Commissioner, Humanitarian Coordinator, Head of the Human Rights component, Election
Unit Chief, etc. all meet on an equal footing under the overall management of the SRSG and
Deputy SRSG — should be replicated at the regional, sector and, where relevant, sub-sector
levels. In order to make mission coordination an integral part of overall holistic mission
management it needs to take place at all the various levels.

In UN peace missions this coordination is best done by the SRSG and his/her designated
regional and sector Political Affairs Officers, or by a neutral body specially created for the
task, such as OCHA. If the former, it would imply that the SRSG's overall management
function is replicated at the regional and sector levels, and that regional and sector Political

_____

_

Affairs Coordinators be appointed and tasked with mission management and coordination in that region/sector. This would ensure that the overall political control which is currently limited to mission HQ be devolved to the regional and sector levels as well. If the latter, OCHA's role as humanitarian coordinator should be broadened to encompass overall mission coordination and OCHA should be tasked with creating Mission Coordination Centers or other similar structures in all the regions, sectors and sub-sectors in the peace mission. These two possibilities are not necessarily mutually exclusive as the regional and sector Political Affairs Heads could possibly benefit from the specialist support OCHA could render, whilst OCHA would probably need the political authority of the SRSG to be an effective coordinator. It is also important to note that coordination does not imply control. Each mission component remains in operational control of its own, but coordination implies the creation of structures such as Mission Coordination Centers that provide the opportunity for contact, information exchange, joint planning and joint monitoring. Coordination is thus a management support function that serves all of the multidisciplinary mission elements and the SRSG without imposing on the authority or mandates of each of the mission components.

An attempt was made to experiment with such a Mission Coordination Centre during Exercise Blue Crane in April 1999 in South Africa, and the experience has resulted in valuable lessons about the shortcomings and potential of such structures. Key to its success is a common understanding of the critical role coordination plays in overall mission success. If this is understood and accepted by all mission elements the necessary resources and effort will be applied to mission coordination. At the end of the day somebody needs to assume overall responsibility. Mission coordination is a management support tool and the responsibility should lie with the SRSG to ensure overall mission coordination, not only at the mission HQ level, but at all levels. At the same time, and as all the mission elements are focussed on their own areas of specialization, the SRSG would require the support of a specialist agency such as OCHA to facilitate the actual coordination structures on the ground. OCHA is well positioned to broaden its scope to overall mission coordination, and to train, plan, design and develop expertise in this regard.

CIMIC has now developed as an integral part of peacekeeping doctrine. It should be welcomed and encouraged, but more policy development and research is needed to further differentiate between CIMIC in the NATO-type context where the military is the primary actor and CIMIC in the UN context. The military will always have the most resources and thus the most powerful and influential partner in any peacekeeping mission. As such, CIMIC will always be a crucial part of mission coordination in the UN context. Having said that it is important to note that CIMIC is not mission coordination. CIMIC is just the military contribution to overall mission coordination in the UN context. The simultaneous UN and NATO missions in KOSOVO should be an interesting research area in this regard. The EU and OSCE efforts have been folded into the overall UN mission that creates new and exiting possibilities for mission coordination but there is no formal organizational link with the KFOR NATO mission. It will be very interesting to see how coordination develops — out of necessity — on the ground despite the larger political autonomy issues at play.

The Mission Coordination and CIMIC experiences discussed in this paper, if anything, speaks of the urgent need for further analysis and debate on how coordination can best be achieved in UN peace missions. It is hoped that the various international and regional organisations, peacekeeping nations and independent research institutes active in the peacekeeping field, will take up this challenge and focus some of their research on the need

to develop policy and mechanisms, focussed on identifying best practices for achieving optimum mission coordination.

FOOTNOTES

i   Maj. Stein Ellingsen, AFIC-N, CIMIC Presentation to Exercise Blue Crane CIMIC Seminar, SA Army Battle School, 18 April 1999.

ii   The North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO) Implementation Force (IFOR) and Stabilization Force (SFOR).

iii   Although various IFOR and SFOR units were involved in small humanitarian related projects as part of its CIMIC activities, this was not NATO's role or objective, but rather seen as a CIMIC tool employed to ensure good relations with the local population and thus as enabling force protection.

iv   When IFOR started, a survey was done of the various International Organisations, NGOs, etc. active in former Yugoslavia and it was found that there was over 600 organisations in the field.

v   See Lessons Learned in Peacekeeping Operations, NATO, 1997, para. 22 – 35.

vi   "Whatever we call these operations, peace enforcement or peace keeping, they will require a civilian component and a civilian-military interface. That's been the case in all of these operations in the past and most certainly in Bosnia, and it will be one of the key lessons learned for the future." Carl Bildt, The High Representative, May 1996.

vii   Comprehensive Report on Lessons-Learned from United Nations Operations in Somalia, UN, 1995, p.10.

viii   According to NATO doctrine (AJP-01 (A)) the Cells found in a modern NATO joint force HQ are: J1 Personnel and Administration; J2 Intelligence; J3 Operations; J4 Logistics & Health; J5 Plans and Policy; J6 CIS (Communication and Information Systems); J7 Doctrine and Training; J8 Resource and Finance; and J9 CIMIC.

ix   Nowadays normally the UNDP Country Representative, thereby ensuring that the Deputy SRSG is an experienced UN bureaucrat, manager and development expert. This is very useful if one takes into account that the SRSG is normally a senior diplomat chosen for her/his conflict management skills and acceptability to all the belligerent parties, not for her/his management skills and experience and or familiarity with the UN system.

x   Normally in the person of the Head of the UN lead agency, e.g. the UNHCR, or sometimes a senior officer of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA).

xi   A new proposal is to place the Human Rights component in the Office of the SRSG. The argument is that Human Rights issues should not be a separate issue, but should permeate throughout the mission, in every sector. One would have to wait for this suggestion to be implemented in a couple of missions to see to what extent this is a feasible option.

xii   Comprehensive Report on Lessons Learned from United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda, UN, 1996.

xiii   See Humanitarian Assistance and Conflict in Africa, David R. Smock, Journal of Humanitarian Action, http://www-jha.sps.cam.ac.uk/a/a016.htm, reposted on 4 July 1997.

xiv   Humanitarian Action in Peacekeeping Operations, Larry Minear, Journal of Humanitarian Assistance, http://www-jha.sps.cam.uk/a/a016.htm, posted on 4 July 1997, p.3.

_____

–

_____

xv   See Peacekeepers, Humanitarian Aid, and Civil Conflicts, Cedric Thornberry, Journal of Humanitarian Assistance, http://www-jha.sps.cam.uk/a/a016.htm, re-posted on 4 July 1997, p.3.

xvi Comprehensive Report on Lessons-Learned from United Nations Operations in Somalia, UN, 1995.

xvii Minear, *ibid*, p.16.

xviii Although the NATO KFOR mission is authorised by the UN, it is not part of the UN mission, i.e. the NATO Force Commander does not report to the UN SRSG.

xix A Blue Crane Lessons Learned Seminar was held on 8 and 9 July 1999 in Pretoria, South Africa. A copy of the Blue Crane Lessons Learned Report can be obtained from ACCORD. It is also available on-line on the ACCORD web site at http://www.accord.org.za

xx   The Peacekeeping Programme was established in late 1995 when ACCORD, ISS (Institute for Security Studies), and NUPI (The Norwegian Institute for International Affairs) initiated the Training for Peace in Southern Africa (TfP) Project with funding from the Royal Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The Project is aimed at enhancing the capacity for international conflict management and peacekeeping in the Southern African region. The TfP Project is the largest African NGO peacekeeping training and capacity building project, and is one of the largest NGO driven peacekeeping training projects in the world. Learn more about the TfP partners from their respective web-sites: ACCORD: http://www.accord.org.za, ISS: http://www.iss.co.za; NUPI: http://www.nupi.no.

xxi One of the lessons learned from Exercise Blue Crane was the need to introduce CIMIC in SADC's SOPs and peace mission doctrine and to introduce CIMIC training. The first CIMIC Course in SADC is being presented by ACCORD in November 1999 as part of the UN Staff Officer's Course at the SADC Regional Peacekeeping Training Center in Harare, Zimbabwe.