

Canadian Centre
for Foreign Policy
Development



Centre canadien
pour le développement
de la politique étrangère

125 Sussex Dr. Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2

**REPORT FROM THE ROUNDTABLE ON EXPERT
DEPLOYMENT TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE OPERATIONS**

CCFPD

12 September 2000 (Ottawa)

1006.12E

ISBN: E2-218/2000E-IN
0-662-30056-4

REPORT FROM THE ROUNDTABLE ON EXPERT DEPLOYMENT TO INTERNATIONAL PEACE OPERATIONS

September 12, 2000
Ottawa

On September 12, 2000, the Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development brought together NGOs, government officials, experts, and professionals to explore how to broaden the range of resources and professional expertise involved in peace-support operations. The roundtable focussed particularly on three sectors: justice, public administration and child protection. Participants included Justice Ellen Macdonald (Ontario Superior Court), Paul Larose-Edwards (CANADEM), Marianne Wightman (Deployment for UNMIK), Susan Brown (CIDA), and Peter Oldham (Deputy Director, Regional Security and Peacekeeping Division, DFAIT).

I. Summary of Key Recommendations

Key issues and recommendations from the day-long roundtable:

1. In order to facilitate the involvement in peace-support operations and peacebuilding of Canadian judges (and the judicial/legal community in general), public servants, and other Canadians, systemic barriers to their participation should be examined. Participants were especially concerned about an age limit imposed by the UN, barring people over 63 years of age from participating in peace-support operations. Some recommended that immediate steps should be taken by the Canadian government to address this issue.
2. An enabling environment for civil servants (and others) wishing to contribute to Canadian peace-support operations should be created. Outreach will be important to foster willingness to contribute for those inside and outside the government.
3. There are vast resources in Canada from which to develop rosters of child protection experts for peace-support operations. Other possible areas of Canadian expertise could include disarmament, demobilisation, and re-integration and re-training of ex-combatants. Canada could also develop a niche in building capacity before elections. Some pointed out that rather than electoral monitoring, which, in their opinion, rarely accomplishes much in the longer-run, Canada could facilitate power sharing negotiations between conflicting parties standing for election.
4. Issues and recommendations related to the overall governance of peace-support operations were discussed at length, including:
 - Developing rosters
 - Management of candidates at home
 - Ground rules for candidates
 - Pre-deployment training and briefing

- The management of contracts between parties at home
 - Equal treatment and compensation for those deployed
 - Competition versus Coordination
 - Due recognition of civilians upon their return home.
5. Some participants said that the role of DFAIT should be to carry the Canadian flag and open doors for civilians abroad. They also pointed out that the selection of candidates for deployment should remain outside of government due to possible political interference and nepotism (although this may apply to non-governmental organisations as much as the government). Furthermore, some said that the government should build safety nets and communication links for civilians on the ground. To this end, some argued, Canadian missions abroad should be regularly briefed on Canadian civilian activity, for instance (keeping in mind the responsibilities of parent agencies, such as the UN or the OSCE). DFAIT was challenged to help with visas (including the visa requirement for Canadians in Macedonia) and other matters on the diplomatic side.

II. Context and Existing Mechanisms

The Chair outlined the goal for the day: to draw on the diverse expertise around the table and to think together about outstanding issues, approaches, and new opportunities in peace-support operations.

There has been an apparent shift in focus from peacekeeping to peace-support. While there is usually a need for some military or police force to keep hostile belligerents apart, monitor borders, or maintain order; other skills are also necessary. The recent experiences in Kosovo and East Timor signal that *all-encompassing interventions may become more common*. In both cases, the international community undertook broad responsibilities including the administration of municipal affairs, (re)building basic infrastructure, the development of health and social policies, as well as the creation of judiciaries. To be able to adequately respond to this trend, diverse expertise is needed.

The UN has attempted to keep abreast of the changing demands. This spring, the UN Secretary General requested a high-level panel to make recommendations on the reform of peace-support operations. The Brahimi Panel's Report assessed impediments limiting the UN's capacity to respond rapidly and effectively. It drew attention to the civilian element of peace-support operations and identified problems, including inadequate personnel practices. It recommended to move more aggressively on the civilian element of the UN's Standby Arrangement System and revamping the UN Volunteers programme.

Besides the UN, regional organisations are also concerned with security issues. Among them, the most active is the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). The OSCE has experience in areas such, for instance: election observation, human rights monitoring, the promotion of free media, and border monitoring. In some ways, this new era of peace-support operations was ushered in with the Kosovo Verification Mission – an unarmed civilian mission

in which the OSCE was mandated with monitoring a cease-fire between the Yugoslav forces and the Kosovars, monitoring human rights, helping to establish democratic structures, and preparing for an eventual vote on Kosovo's future status. *Despite the fact that the mission ended in an evacuation, the lessons learned from the experience were crucial in developing an understanding of the needs and dynamics of today's peace-support operations.* The OSCE has moved away from its earlier, *ad hoc* methods of staffing missions and is developing a mechanism known as REACT (Rapid Expert Assistance and Co-operation Teams). It is streamlining its staffing processes and introducing new information technology to be able to field missions more effectively.

Some of the general characteristics which distinguish peace-support operations from peacebuilding, technical and other initiatives are:

- extremely short response time
- optimal skill set includes: previous experience in a conflict (immediate) post-conflict mission, personal security training, first aid, stress management, etc.
- mission-oriented rather than objective-driven tasks
- short-term nature.

Much of the current mission mandates are echoed in Canada's human security policies. Among the Canadian mechanisms for peace-support operations is the Canadian Resource Bank for Democracy and Human Rights (CANADEM). Established in 1997, CANADEM operates at arm's length from the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) and maintains rosters of Canadians available for international service. However, CANADEM is not a deployment agency. In the case of Kosovo, CARE Canada provided deployment services for Canadians. The Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) has also been intimately involved in peace-support operations, providing funding and programming insights, as well as its network of partners. The RCMP and Correction Services Canada have also contributed.

Weaknesses of the Canadian mechanism include :

- unclear lines of responsibility
- holes in the rostering system
- lack of a flexible, quick disbursing funding mechanism
- uneven vetting of candidates
- questions about appropriate training
- differing legal status of those deployed
- little systematic co-ordination among Canadian deployment (and deployment-related) organisations, leading to overlapping mandates and gaps in deployment.

To address especially the last weakness, DFAIT established a Deployment Coordination Unit. While the Unit is still in formative stages, its primary role would be to identify gaps in

deployment practices and work with others to fill them. Second, it would function as a long-term coordinating (assisting *versus* competing) agency. More specifically, the Deployment Coordination Unit will :

- respond to requests for personnel for peace-support operations
- help determine the level of Canadian participation and sectors in which to participate
- coordinate briefing materials for candidates
- coordinate efforts with partner states, domestic partners and diplomatic posts abroad
- on occasion, fund deployments (with an extremely modest deployment budget)
- develop and raise the standards for Canadian deployment (including training, compensation, etc.)
- work closely with CANADEM to facilitate the identification of experts
- work with specialists and experts on how to tap into their networks, identify candidates for deployment, and so on.

Peacebuilding activities including conflict prevention and good governance programmes, mostly funded through CIDA, could occur in parallel or subsequently to peace-support operations. Therefore, attention should be paid to developing a link between peacebuilding and peace-support, which will require close cooperation between DFAIT and CIDA. The partnership between the Canadian government and NGOs will also have to be re-evaluated, including the legal and contractual aspects.

III. Themes and Canadian Niches

Justice is one area where Canadian expertise could bear on peace-support operations. There is a broad agreement that (re)establishing the rule of law is a key element of peacebuilding. Building fair and functional judicial and legal structures, promoting confidence in how justice is administered, and so on, are considered key to building democracies. Canadians are in a position to help since their judicial and legal systems are highly regarded abroad. Moreover, Canadians are perceived as modest and sensitive to diverse cultural and socio-economic contexts.

The Office of the Commission for Federal Judicial Affairs is one body which aims to promote Canadian judicial expertise abroad. Established in 1995, the Office is separate from the Department of Justice. Since 1995, it has been working on judicial and legal reform in Ukraine, learning lessons and gathering expertise. Despite significant systemic barriers, Canadian judges have participated in the project, providing their expertise on issues such as independence of the judiciary and a code of ethics. Among the difficulties in involving judges in peace-support and peacebuilding are stipulations relating to their extra-curricular activities. For instance, Canadian judges may not receive a salary for activities other than judging in Canada. Relief of a Canadian judge from his/her duties requires serious procedural efforts. (For example, Louise Arbour, former Chief Prosecutor of the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia and International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda, was released only after specific amendments to

Judges Act). The Canadian Bar Association is also involved in international development programming. It focusses on legal practice (case management) and the general administration of justice.

Some may be concerned that by taking on roles in peace-support and peacebuilding, Canadian judges may bring into question the independence of the judiciary. While it is imperative that judges preserve their independence, impartiality and neutrality, their duty to serve society and the public corresponds well with the objectives of Canadian peace-support and peacebuilding goals.

In order to facilitate the involvement of Canadian judges (and the judicial/legal community in general) in peace-support and peacebuilding, systemic barriers to their participation should be examined. This applies to domestic laws and regulations (i.e., the Judges Act) as well as procedures within organisations which mandate peace-support operations or deploy personnel (i.e., the UN maximum age limit for deployment which effectively bars retired people from field operations). Meanwhile, it could be useful to explore whether judges could be recruited for peace-support and peacebuilding during their judicial study leave and after they have retired. The Chief Justices of the Provinces should be convinced of the great potential impact of Canadian judicial expertise abroad. Some participants recommended developing a roster of able and willing Canadian judges for deployment. Others identified a gap between military and judicial/legal objectives during peace-support operations and pointed to a need for a more integrated approach and better planning. The judicial/legal community was encouraged by the government participants to initiate projects and come up with innovative ideas. Justice Ellen Macdonald of Ontario is taking up this task.

Trust and confidence in public administration are also key in building democratic societies. Canada has a long-standing and internationally recognised experience with **public service and administration**, some of which may be transferable. Canada could share its own trials with developing good governance (i.e., accountable, accessible, and transparent governments) around the world. It could help develop administration systems that would enable rather than intervene.

The Canadian Executive Service Organisation has been trying to increase the involvement of Canadian public administrators in peace-support and peacebuilding. This broad-based volunteer organisation, made up mostly of retired public servants, has programmes aimed at reforming public administrations in South America and Eastern Europe. The programmes emphasise a co-operative approach and aim at building closer and long-term relationships. The overall principle is to share a life-time of experience (i.e., skills, knowledge). Moreover, the programmes recognise the need for follow-up and support (even from a distance) during the implementation of policies and advice. Immediate impact-based assessments are often inadequate evaluating tools, since impact of these programmes is rarely apparent in the short-term. Programmes aimed at strengthening **local governance** are often useful. Among those organisations in Canada presently involved in local governance issues is the Federation of Canadian Municipalities, for instance.

As in justice, a major concern raised by the participants was the need to identify and address systematic (i.e., bureaucratic, Treasury Board, etc.) barriers to deployment of public servants to peace-support operations. A balance should be found between the government's accountability and transparency measures (such as, for instance, legal and contractual frameworks for dealing with client NGOs) on the one hand, and the ability to deploy government employees quickly and efficiently on the other. An enabling environment for civil servants (and perhaps others) wishing to contribute to Canadian peace-support operations should be created. Such an environment exists in Ireland or Denmark, for instance. Corrections Canada shared their experience with helping and encouraging employees to participate in peace-support operations. The need to educate Canadians about their privileged position in the world and the responsibility that accompanies this position was emphasised. Employers should understand that working abroad often makes for more experienced and valuable employees.

Another area where Canada could contribute is **child protection**. Experience from the field demonstrates the importance of having the right people on the ground. Good will and good intentions are often not enough. Peace support initiatives aimed at the well being of children must be well thought out and take into account cultural and contextual issues. Setting up a comprehensive child protection system anywhere is a complex task. Internationally accepted standards of Children's Rights and needs including and beyond food and shelter are often a foreign concept in situations where the rights of the individual have yet to be recognised. Establishment of a child protection system is not viable before rule of law is established and before trained professionals from the community are in place to implement such a system. Beginning steps, to establishing a system, would include education about the value of children and the components of healthy child development with respect to internationally accepted standards. Early social and mental health interventions should be focussed on projects that would be aimed at:

- restoring childhood for children who have lost this right through war, poverty and abandonment (i.e., reintroducing play into the lives of these children)
- respecting and supporting the integrity of the family and caregivers; programmes to support and strengthen families.

At the same time Canada can offer expertise in the areas of education and training for child welfare and child and family mental health practitioners. Expertise can be drawn from the Canadian mental health community, the Canadian child welfare system, professional associations, Canadian colleges and universities and the community of NGO's who have experience in the field. It is important not to impose inappropriate values and practices but to train and prepare professionals well before deployment to the field in programmes that are going to be useful. We should apply learning from our own mistakes through history and offer help in a planned way.

Other possible areas of Canadian expertise could include disarmament, demobilisation, re-integration and re-training of ex-combatants. Canada could also develop a niche in building capacity *before* elections. Rather than electoral monitoring which, some argue rarely accomplishes much in the longer-run, Canada could facilitate power sharing negotiations between conflicting parties standing for election.

IV. Governance of Peace-Support Operations

Issues related to the overall governance of peace-support operations were raised including:

- *Developing rosters of candidates for peace-support operations:* There was a broad agreement among the participants that the right personnel are key in carrying out any peace-support operation successfully. Rosters of properly screened and assessed candidates, on the line of CANADEM, could be developed around the world and Canada could take the lead in building this tool. Special rosters of stand-by public sector employees, justice/legal professionals and others would be very useful. Roster of immigrants wishing to participate in a peace-support operation in the country of their origin could also be developed, recognising their potential vulnerability on the ground and the need for special attention to their security. Ways to get candidates ready for deployment have to be found. The Red Cross model, where candidates pay for their training in order to obtain a standby status, could be an option.
- *Management of candidates at home:* Government agencies take an unreasonably long time in reacting to requests (applications) of candidates who are often responsive and work short-term assignments. The government has to be faster, more flexible and more understanding in dealing with these clients to minimise slippage and forge stronger partnerships. More responsiveness is also necessary on the part of the receiving agencies (i.e., the UN and the OSCE).
- *Ground rules for candidates:* General rules (guidelines) for candidates should be created. (Stipulations should, for instance: state the need for prior experience for deployment to a war zone, address confidentiality, etc.).
- *Pre-deployment training and briefing:* Many participants raised civilian pre-deployment training as critical and presently lacking. How to prepare the right personnel in extremely short time including: immunisation shots, land-mine awareness, first aid training, cultural sensitisation, and so on? While some participants called for a universal training facility, which would be funded by the government, others supported the reliance on independent education/training institutions like the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, where the government could help fund individual candidates. With regard to the latter case, participants raised concerns about the lack of a universal accreditation system, different levels of preparedness based on the quality of a training institution, and related issues.
- *The management of contracts between parties at home.* Participants broadly agreed that the government should be liable for some aspects of peace-support operations and its liability should be legally reflected in contracts it undertakes with clients.

- *Equal treatment and compensation for those deployed:* Some participants pointed out that the government does not value civilians that have gone outside of the government-led programmes. There are differences in compensation, availability of resources and status. Most participants agreed that there should not be different tiers of people going to the field. All civilians should have a kit before they are deployed which includes travel insurance and a deployment allowance. Until now, insurance costs were not covered by CIDA's programmes. It is time that the Canadian government assumed liability for these civilians. The deployment allowance provided by the DND for their personnel is large, while NGOs have a difficulty obtaining minimum funds for civilians. However, others pointed out that streamlining deployment in such a way would be unmanageable and that "government can not be all things to all people for all deployments." Therefore, they suggested, only government-funded deployments (including, perhaps, those indirect deployments like UNVs) ought to have a common base (i.e., insurance, travel cost, pre-deployment allowance, access to briefing/debriefing sessions and material, etc.).
- *Competition versus Coordination:* Many participants pointed out that the competition for funds (and recognition) and the lack of a coordinative mechanism often hinder effective deployment. While some participants called for a better coordination (through DFAIT or a large deployment NGO) others discouraged these efforts and emphasised the entrepreneurial spirit of individual candidates.
- *Role of DFAIT:* The role of the government should be to carry the Canadian flag and open doors for civilians abroad. Some participants pointed out that the selection of candidates for deployment should remain outside of government due to possible political interference and nepotism (although this may apply to non-governmental organisations as much as the government). Furthermore, some said that the government should build safety nets and communication links for civilians on the ground. To this end, some argued, Canadian missions abroad should be regularly briefed on Canadian civilian activity, for instance (keeping in mind the responsibilities of parent agencies, such as the UN or the OSCE). DFAIT was challenged to help with visas (including the visa requirement for Canadians in Macedonia) and other matters on the diplomatic side.
- *Due recognition of civilians upon their return home:* There was a general agreement that public awareness about the work of civilians in peace-support and peacebuilding is very low. There is a need to recognise their contributions and make their stories known.

The Chair concluded the roundtable with a promise of a report. He thanked the participants for their valuable contributions and promoted continued cooperation. He also reminded them of the CCFPD's mandate to help Canadians engage in foreign policy development and encouraged policy proposals for funding.

Roundtable on Expert Deployment to International Peace Operations

List of Participants

September 12, 2000

**Lady Elgin Room, Lord Elgin Hotel
Ottawa, Ontario**

Stephen Bierbrier

International Cooperation Group
Department of Justice

Suzanne Labbé

Director, International Cooperation
Commission for Federal Judicial Affairs

Ellen Macdonald

Ontario Superior Court Justice

Shereen Miller

Director of International Special Projects
Correctional Service Canada

Louis Perret

Dean of Law
University of Ottawa

Alison Redford

Project Director, International Development
Canadian Bar Association

Don Brownell

Senior Manager
Public-Private Development Initiatives &
Performance Management
Federation of Canadian Municipalities

Steve St. Michael

Director
Association of Universities and Colleges of
Canada

Ann Wardrop

Senior Advisor to the President
Canadian Executive Service Organization

Kristina Wittfooth

Director of Centre for Central and Eastern
Europe
Canadian Bureau of International Education

Teresa Dremetsikas

Intake and Settlement Coordinator
Canadian Centre for Victims of Torture

Des Garvey

Director
Nepean Outreach to the World

Fernande Meilleur

UNICEF Canada

Laurel Pearson

Senior Trauma Counsellor for CARE

Maria Beaulne

OSCE, Revenue Canada

Robert Busse

Field Coordinator
CARE / WUSC

Debby Côté

CUSO

Marianne Wightman
Deployment for UNMIK, CARE, WUSC
Ruth Walker
Christian Science Monitor

Debbie Bénard
CANADEM

Paul Larose-Edwards
Executive Director
CANADEM

Christine Vincent
CANADEM

Susan Brown
Chief of Peacebuilding Unit
CIDA

Mark Glauser
Senior Policy Officer
Deployment Coordination Unit
Regional Security and Peacekeeping
Division
DFAIT

Peter Oldham
Deputy Director
Regional Security and Peacekeeping
Division
DFAIT

Barry Parkinson
Consultant
DFAIT

Steven Lee (Chair)
Executive Director
Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy
Development (CCFPD)

Marketa Geisler
Rapporteur/Writer
Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy
Development (CCFPD)

Julie Rechel
Events Organiser
Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy
Development (CCFPD)