NUPI

[735] NUPIWorkingPaper

Moving Beyond the 4Ps – An Integrated Conflict Management System for the African Union

Cedric de Coning

No. 735 – 2008

Security in Practice no.12
[A Publication in the NUPI Series on Security in Practice]

Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Norsk Utenrikspolitisk Institutt

Utgiver: NUPI

ISSN: 82-7002-192-x
ISBN: 978-82-7002-192-5

Besøksadresse: C.J. Hambros plass 2d
Addresse: Postboks 8159 Dep.
0033 Oslo
Internett: www.nupi.no
E-post: pub@nupi.no
Fax: [+ 47] 22 36 21 82
Tel: [+ 47] 22 99 40 00

Moving Beyond the 4 Ps – An Integrated Conflict Management System for the African Union

Cedric de Coning[1]

[Abstract] The 1992 Agenda for Peace was a landmark development in the conflict management field, but it did also produce side-effects. The UN, AU, EU and others have developed conflict management capacities that have encouraged the bureaucratic compartmentalization of the 4Ps across different units and departments. This report introduces an integrated conflict management model that is, instead, focussed on the multi-dimensional (political, security, socio-economic, rule of law and human rights) nature of conflict systems, and the need to coherently combine the collective efforts of a wide range of internal and external actors to build momentum towards peace. The report argues that, in the AU context, such an integrated conflict management model would be more effective and efficient than the existing 4Ps model. The AU, being smaller, newer and more open to further development and capacity building than the UN and EU, has a better chance of breaking free from the inadequacies of the bureaucratic 4Ps model, and adopting an integrated conflict management model.

Key words: conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, conflict management, United Nations, African Union.

1 Cedric de Coning is a Research Fellow at ACCORD and NUPI, and a DPhil candidate with the Political Science Department of the University of Stellenbosch. This report has benefited from a number of comments by colleagues working in the UN, AU, ECOWAS and SADC, and their contributions are highly appreciated and acknowledged. All factual mistakes and other errors are, of course, attributable to the author alone.

Introduction

Managing conflict requires a multi-dimensional, comprehensive, system-wide or integrated approach[1]. One-dimensional or single-facet conflict management programming are superficial and counter-productive, in that it addresses only some aspects of a wider system, and this tends to distort, shift or re-direct tension in the system rather then address the root causes of the conflict in a coherent or comprensive manner[2].

Most international and regional organizations like the United Nations (UN) and the African Union (AU) have experienced that the need for clear organizational structures and reporting lines have resulted in the fragmentation of their capacity to manage conflict across various departments and units, most often broadly following the *1992 Agenda for Peace* categories of preventive diplomacy (conflict prevention), peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding[3]. The prominence given to peace and security issues in the post-Cold War era has further resulted in the establishment of specialised conflict management departments[4], which resulted in a growing institutional separation between those specializing in conflict management and other departments dealing with development, humanitarian assistance, human rights, rule of law, governance, etc.

Whilst this fragmentation may seem unavoidable from a bureaucratic perspective - organizational governance requires hierarchy and specialization – it contradicts the knowledge that has emerged in these institutions, as well as independently, that managing conflict requires an integrated approach. This report argues that the fragmentation of conflict management capabilities across highly specialised departments has more often that not resulted in incoherent policies, stove-piping of information, ri-

[1] See for instance the 2005, *In Larger Freedom: Towards Security, Development and Human Rights for All*, Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations (www.un.org/largerfreedom), and the 2006, *Delivering as One*, Report of the Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on System-wide Coherence, United Nations, New York (www.un.org/events/panel).

[2] Refer, for instance, to the OECD's *Policy Commitment and Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations*, adopted at the 2007 OECD DAC High Level Meeting. See www.oecd.org, accessed on 23 March 2008.

[3] Boutros Boutros Ghali , *Agenda for Peace,* United Nations, New York, 1992 and *Supplement to the Agenda for Peace*, 1999.

[4] The AU's Peace and Security Department with its Conflict Management and Peace Support Operations divisions, the EU's Conflict Prevention and Crisis Management Unit and the UN's Department of Peacekeeping Operations, are all examples of this trend.

valry for prestige and resources, loss of institutional memory, unnecessary gaps and time lags, and ultimately decreased efficiency, effectiveness and impact. The specialization and fragmentation has contributed to the inability of these organizations to generate sustainable conflict management systems. It is widely held that almost half of all peace agreements fail within five years[5].

The report considers the tension between the need for bureaucratic governance and the requirement for a multi-dimensional and integrated conflict management system in the context of the African Union, and generates findings and recommendations aimed at overcoming some of the negative affects caused by this tension in the past.

The report is presented in three parts. In the first it presents the generic *Agenda for Peace* bureaucratic conflict management model. In the second the report considers the implications of complex peace systems and in the third, it explores what an integrated conflict management system at the African Union could look like.

Part 1: The UN and AU Experience with the 4Ps Model

In the 1992 *Agenda for Peace* conflict prevention and peacebuilding is juxtaposed at the opposite ends of the conflict management spectrum, where 'preventive diplomacy' represents the first step or stage and 'peacebuilding' the last[6]. According to this model, the UN response to conflict, in is simplest form, is first to prevent conflict (preventive diplomacy); if that fails the next step is to make peace (peacemaking) by gathering all the parties around the negotiation table; if a cease-fire or an agreement is reached, the UN could deploy a peacekeeping mission to monitor the cease-fire and to otherwise assist with the implementation of the agreement; and lastly, the UN will assist to rebuild the country with a specific focus on addressing the root causes of the conflict so as to ensure that the conflict does not re-occur again (peacebuilding). This

[5] According to Collier, P. et al. (*Breaking the Conflict Trap: Civil War and Development Policy*, Oxford University Press and the World Bank, 2003, New York), approximately 50% of al peace agreements relapse into conflict within five years. However, Suhrke and Samset argues that a more correct interpretation of the Collier *et al.* study would bring the figure down to approximately 23%. See Suhrke, A. and Samset, I., 'What's in a Figure? Estimating Recurrence of Civil War', *International Peacekeeping*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 195–203, May 2007.
[6] Boutros Boutros Ghali, 1992, footnote 3.

paper will refer to prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding as the 4Ps.

The United Nations Experience

In order to manage these functions a bureaucratic division of tasks have developed over the years, where the Department of Political Affairs (DPA) is responsible for conflict prevention and peacemaking, whilst the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) is responsible for peacekeeping. The responsibility for peacebuilding is divided between the DPA and the new Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO). The PBSO serves as the secretariat for the new Peacebuilding Commission. Whilst this division of tasks may have brought about some of the desired specialization, it has also resulted in inter-departmental tension, lack of continuity and institutional consistency. The DPA is mandated to follow the political tension in specific country or region, and in some cases it may even have a country or regional presence. It undertakes fact-finding missions and it uses the good offices of the UN to try to prevent conflict and to negotiate cease-fires or peace agreements. It has also become the norm in the last few years to establish a peacebuilding office once a peacekeeping mission has withdrawn. DPA is thus the department with the primary responsibility for conflict management, but this responsibility is 'interrupted' when a peacekeeping mission is deployed, in that DPKO takes primary responsibility for the peacekeeping phase.

This seemingly rational bureaucratic division of tasks has had a number of side effects. Firstly, it distorts the conceptual differences, overlaps and similarities among the 4Ps. Officially DPKO is not mandated to do 'peacebuilding', whilst in-reality most contemporary complex UN peacekeeping operations are in fact post-conflict peacebuilding missions with responsibility for facilitating Disarmament, Demobilizing and Reintegration (DDR), Rule of Law and a host of other 'peacebuilding' related functions. The bureaucratic limitations to acknowledging this fact and maintaining the myth of the distinct 4Ps means that DPKO can't officially use the existing 'peacebuilding' concepts and tools that exist elsewhere in the UN system, which means that DPKO's conceptual and doctrinal understanding of its work, both at headquarters and in the field, is distorted. It has also resulted in DPKO being limited in its ability to de-

velop the appropriate human resources and institutional expertise to undertake the 'peacebuilding' tasks that has been included in its UN Security Council mandates. The creation of an office for Rule of Law and Security Institutions (OROLSI) within DPKO in 2008 is a welcome development in this regard. This development signifies that within the UN system, DPKO has been able to carve out space for security related peacebuilding tasks within the peacekeeping operations context. One hopes that this will ultimately result in more coherent UN peacebuilding efforts, instead of the security dimension of the peacebuilding system being pulled away from the other dimensions because of its assessed contribution funding.

This leads us into a discussion of another important side effect, namely the distortion that is brought about by the different financial structural arrangements that support and fund the UN's work along the lines of the 4Ps. Whilst it is widely acknowledged that prevention is better, and cheaper, than the cure (peacekeeping and peacebuilding) the assessed contribution system that underpins the UN's peacekeeping missions imply that there is more funding readily available for peacekeeping, than for prevention, peacemaking and peacebuilding. The latter has to be funded either through the general UN Secretariat budget or voluntary funding mechanisms. The result has been a significant distortion in favour of using peacekeeping as a tool. At the time of writing there was approximately 110,000 UN military, police and civilian peacekeepers deployed at a cost of approximately 7 billion USD, which represents a huge distortion compared to the number of UN staff and resources invested over the same period on prevention, peacemaking or peacebuilding initiatives[7].

Another side-effect has been cases where a serious loss of institutional memory, often accompanied by inter-departmental rivalry, has occurred when the responsibility for a specific situation, for instance East Timor in 1999, passed from DPA to DPKO[8]. New DPKO teams had to take over and plan peacekeeping interventions, without the benefit of the knowledge of those in DPA that have been following the particular situation for years. In some areas however, such as elections, the DPA remains the UN centre

[7] The United Nations Peacekeeping Operations statistics in this report was calculated from the DPKO Background Note of 31 March 2008, available on http://www.un.org/Depts/dpko/dpko/bnote.htm, last accessed on 7 May 2008.
[8] See Ian Martin, 2001, *Self-Determination in East Timor: The United Nations, the Ballot, and International Intervention*, Lynne Rienner Publishers, London.

of excellence, and DPKO relies on DPA to provide it with the expertise necessary to support or organise elections. Similarly, the Office for the High Commissioner of Human Rights (OHCHR) provides DPKO with the expertise necessary for it to manage the human rights dimension of UN peacekeeping missions.

Increasingly, other UN departments, agencies, programmes and funds, such as the the UN Development Group that overseas the Resident Coordinator system, the UN Development Programme (UNDP), the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the World Food Programme (WFP) and the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) have also had to develop capacities to manage or discount the effects of conflict in their specialised area of work. As a result, the UN's capacity to respond to a conflict situation in a given country or region is fragmented across a wide range of departments, agencies, funds and programmes. The norm in the UN system at country level is that the UNDP Resident Representative is the person who officially represents the UN. This person also acts at the Resident Coordinator (RC), and usually also as the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC). These are all specific functions that are recognised within the UN and the broader development and humanitarian communities. However, when a peacekeeping mission is deployed, or when a peacebuilding office is established, the new head of the mission or office becomes the most senior UN official in-country. The arrival of a peacekeeping mission often creates tension between the UN Country Team and the peacekeeping mission as new arrivals is typically perceived to be a huge bureaucracy that undervalues the local knowledge and networks developed by the Country Team over the years, whilst the peacekeepers often feel that the members of the Country Team are slow to adapt to the new conflict-context. More importantly, the violent conflict would have interrupted, or at least negatively impacted, on the agreed development framework, and the peace agreement that has brought about the need for a peacekeeping mission would probably require it to be re-negotiated or updated. The violent conflict probably also changed the focus of the work of the country team from development to humanitarian assistance. In the past, both the Country Team and the peacekeeping mission often failed to understand the inter-relationship between their development, humanitarian, political and security mandates and the two paradigms (peace & security and development) would co-exist side-by-side without any joint assessments, join planning, operational coordination or joint evaluations be-

yond the practicalities of providing security escorts and logistical support, where necessary.

Over the past decade and a half our understanding of the *Agenda for Peace's* 4Ps concept have been refined through practise and research, and they are now understood to be interdependent and interlinked aspects of the same process, rather than chronological steps or stages in the conflict management process. This shift in our collective wisdom have come about as a result of a vibrant debate in the UN system, the European Union (EU), the African Union (AU) and its predecessor the OAU, the OECD, the Group of Eight countries (G8) and many other international forums[9]. Whilst our understanding of the inter-relatedness and interdependencies of these concepts have undergone considerable refinement, and whilst there is now, at least at the strategic policy level, broad acceptance of the security-development nexus, the UN continues to pursue these various dimensions with a highly specialised and fragmented bureaucratic family that has implications for the way in which the overall effect remains fragmented and incoherent[10].

Whilst there are initiatives underway to reform, harmonize and integrate some of these agencies, programmes and funds, the central focus of the UN over the last half decade was on developing coordination mechanisms that would improve policy coherence and ensure closer operational coordination and cooperation among the different members of the UN family, especially at the country level[11]. These efforts have culminated in the *Integrated Missions* concept. UN *Integrated Missions* refers to a specific type of operational process and design, where the planning and coordination

[9] Some of the major milestones in this process were the 1992 *Agenda for Peace*, and the 1995 *Supplement to An Agenda for Peace*; the 2000 *Millennium Declaration* and the adoption of the 8 *Millennium Development Goals;* UN Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women, peace and security; the 2001 *Report of the Panel on Peace Operations*, the so-called Brahimi report; the 2003 *Rome Declaration on Harmonization;* the *2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness*; the 2005 *In Larger Freedom: Towards Security, Development and Human Rights for All*, report of the UN Secretary-General; the 2005 NEPAD *African Post-Conflict Reconstruction Policy Framework*, the 2006 *Delivering as One*, report of the UN Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on System-wide Coherence, and the 2006 African Union *Policy Framework for Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development*.

[10] See for instance, Cedric de Coning, *Coherence and Coordination in United Nations Peacebuilding and Integrated Missions: A Norwegian Perspective*, Security in Practise No.5, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs (www.NUPI.no), December 2007, Oslo.

[11] For example, the Integrated Mission Task Force (IMTF) concept for mission planning by DPKO, the Strategic Framework concept in Afghanistan and the Results Focused Transitional Framework (RFTF) in Sierra Leone.

processes of the different elements of the UN family is integrated into a single country-level UN System, when it undertakes complex peacebuilding missions[12].

The former UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan released a Note on *Integrated Missions* in 2006 that describes the concept as follows: "An integrated mission is based on a common strategic plan and a shared understanding of the priorities and types of programme interventions that need to be undertaken at various stages of the recovery process. Through this integrated process, the UN system seeks to maximize its contribution towards countries emerging from conflict by engaging its different capabilities in a coherent and mutually supportive manner."[13] The integrated missions concept thus refers to a type of mission where there are processes, mechanisms and structures in place that generate and sustain a common strategic objective, as well as a comprehensive operational approach, among the political, security, development, human rights, and where appropriate, humanitarian, UN actors at country level.

Within the UN context, therefore, the responsibility for different aspects of conflict management is fragmented across a wide range of departments, agencies, funds, programmes, etc. The peace and security aspects of conflict management are loosely organised around the 4Ps, whilst the rest of the UN response can be loosely grouped into a humanitarian cluster and a development group response. Whilst there are initiatives underway to harmonize some of the obvious overlaps, in general the focus in the UN is not on bringing these different units under one institutional umbrella, but rather to ensure that they deliver an integrated response. The focus is thus on ensuring that the fragmented units that make up the UN family actually start to operate as one System.

The African Union Experience

The African Union's conflict management system is loosely modelled on that of the United Nations and is also built around the *Agenda* for *Peace* model. The AU has de-

[12] United Nations, *Integrated Missions Planning Process (IMPP)*, Guidelines endorsed by the Secretary-General on 13 June 2006, page 3.
[13] United Nations, *Note of Guidance on Integrated Missions*, Issued by the Secretary-General on 9 December 2005, paragraph 4. See also the Revised *Note of Guidance on Integrated Missions*, dated 17 January 2006, and released under a Note from the Secretary-General on 9 February 2006, paragraph 4.

signed a conflict management system with specialised capacities in the areas of early warning, conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. Within the AU Commission these different capacities are spread across the Office of the Chairperson of the Commission, the Conflict Management and Peace Support Operations Divisions in the Peace and Security Department, and the Political Affairs Department.

Whilst there are other departments, and parts of the larger AU system, such as NEPAD, the African Development Bank and the African Commission for Peoples and Human Rights, that have a role to play in the larger conflict management context, the AU is not an operational humanitarian or development actor to the same extent as the UN. The AU's development related work is political, policy orientated and coherence seeking in nature, whilst most the AU's practical or operational field-related work has been in the peace and security realm.

The AU Peace and Security Protocol has established a Peace and Security Council at the centre of its peace and security architecture, with a number of satellite or supportive capacities, including: a *Continental Early Warning System* (CEWS), which is based within the Conflict Management Division of the Peace and Security Department; the *Panel of the Wise* which is an independent body made up of five prominent peacemakers with the authority to alert the Peace and Security Council of emerging conflicts, provide advice to the AU on conflict management initiatives, and who could undertake preventative or peacemaking initiatives of its own, and that will be supported by its own secretariat based in the Conflict Management Division of the Peace and Security Department; an *African Standby Force* (ASF)[14] aimed at further building the capacity of the continent to undertake peace support operations and which is managed out of the Peace Support Operation Division of the Peace and Security Department; and the AU's 2006 Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development (PCRD) policy, that is being supported by the Conflict Management Division of the Peace and Security Department.

[14] The AU embarked on the initiative to develop an African Standby Force in May 2003 when the first ASF Policy Framework was adopted by the 3rd meeting of the African Chiefs of Defence Staff, and endorsed by the Maputo Summit in July 2003. The concept has subsequently been further developed through a series of workshops in 2005 and 2006 that looked at doctrine, training and evaluation, logistics, standing operating procedures, and command, control and communications.

Although the AU's conflict management capacity is concentrated in the Peace & Security Department, many relevant functions are spread across other areas of the AU's Commission. These include the capacity to support and monitor elections in the Department of Political Affairs, units dealing with refugee affairs, gender and human rights, and the capacity to deploy and support special envoys and special representatives, residing in the Office of the Chairperson.

All of these instruments are currently being established and developed in parallel, without sufficient cross-fertilization and coordination. Although the AU Commission is relatively small compared to the UN and EU, and although its structure is less complicated and fragmented, compared to, for instance the UN or EU, it has developed a highly bureaucratic and hierarchal structure. It seems to lack and overall system dynamic, and in this vacuum powerful individuals, at the head of unit and departmental level, have forged ahead with their own programmes and initiatives, and this has generated a number of uncoordinated programmes with a considerable degree of overlap and duplication.

To date, the development of the AU's peace support operations capacity, in the context of the African Standby Force and the ongoing operations in Sudan (AMIS & UNAMID) and Somalia (AMISOM), has been the most resource intensive. However, more and more Member States, experts in the AU Commission itself, and partners are expressing concern about the imbalance that is developing between the AU's capacity to anticipate, prevent and mediate conflicts, on the one hand, and its capacity to undertake peace support operations, on the other. There is increasing recognition that much more attention should be paid to the development of the AU's conflict prevention and mediation capacity.

Although the OAU[15] has been undertaking conflict prevention, peacemaking and mediation interventions before the establishment of the AU, and although the AU has been undertaking and supporting such missions since its establishment in 2000, these missions were undertaken on the basis of ad hoc arrangements and no specific media-

[15] The Organization of African Unity (OAU) existed from 1963 to 1999 and was replaced in 2000 by the African Union (AU).

tion model has been developed to date, nor has the AU developed a dedicated capacity to manage and support such missions to date. The AU is not unique in this regard, as most international and regional organisations are only now starting to professionalize their respective mediation capacities[16]. This creates the opportunity for the AU to coordinate and cooperate with the UN's initiative to develop its mediation support capability, as well as similar initiatives underway in other regional organizations such at the EU and OSCE, and in the African context with the Regional Economic Communities (RECs) and African civil society organizations that have developed the capacity to undertake or support conflict prevention, peacemaking and mediation interventions.

The AU needs to systematically develop the strategic framework and practical mechanisms that would enable it to further develop its capacity to analyse conflict situations, undertake fact-finding and good offices initiatives, undertake mediation interventions, and support peace processes and post-conflict transitions. When doing so, it should consider how best to structure the departments and units within the AU Commission that has a role to play in conflict management, including those outside of the Peace and Security Department, and how to integrate these roles when the AU undertakes field missions of it own.

Part 2: An Integrated Conflict Management System

Although the 1992 *Agenda for Peace* continuum had a profound impact on the way the UN, AU and other regional organizations have tried to manage international conflict, there has also been a growing realization that the 4Ps do not necessarily follow chronologically on each other, nor do they have clear boundaries separating one from the other. In fact, in many cases, the 4Ps are in progress at the same time. Preventive diplomacy, for instance, does not only occur in the phase before violent conflict breaks out. In most cases tensions persist even after peace agreements have been entered into and there will be a need for a range of preventive measures far into the peace transition. In fact, the need for conflict prevention initiatives will remain until

[16] The UN's Mediation Support Unit, which is based within the Department of Political Affairs (DPA), was established in 2007.

the peace process has matured to the extent that conflict prevention has been institutionalised in the society through a range of processes designed to peacefully manage the natural tensions that exist in any society, including through participatory democracy, rule of law and respect for human rights.

Although many peace agreements have been imprinted in the public's minds through dramatic media-staged signing ceremonies, peacemaking is in reality much more complex than these images suggest. In reality, such processes typically involve periods of shuttle diplomacy between the parties that is indistinguishable from preventive diplomacy or conflict prevention. Negotiations over aspects of the peace process, and its implementation, are likely to continue long after the initial peace agreement has been signed[17]. Peacemaking is thus something that will take place from very early in the process, and it is likely to be a prominent feature throughout the peace process and the transitional period.

Many conflicts are not singular events. Instead they go though cyclical phases that see peace agreement after peace agreement relapse into conflict, and whilst the AU may be engaged with supporting the implementation of one peace agreement another conflict may break out[18]. Peacebuilding may thus be 'post-conflict' in theory, but in reality it is also 'preventative' in that it is aimed at trying to prevent the re-occurrence of the conflict by addressing the root caused of conflict[19]. In fact, as the root causes of conflict are typically linked to deep-seated and centuries-old patterns of exclusivity, inequality and privilege, addressing the root causes of conflict is bound to stir up further tensions and require pro-active conflict prevention, continued peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding. It may thus be more useful to see the 4Ps as facets of the conflict management process, rather than as stages or phases in conflict management, and to recognise that they are all complementary approaches throughout the conflict management process.

[17] The Inter-Congolese Dialogue that was initiated years after the initial Lusaka Peace Agreements is an example in point.
[18] The multiple UN and other peace operations to countries such as East Timor, Liberia, Haiti and Sierra Leone are all indicative of this trend.
[19] For this reason the UN distinguishes between preventative peacebuilding and post-conflict peacebuilding.

This does not imply, however, that there is no identifiable progression in peace processes. Any conflict management process is aimed at preventing or stopping violent conflict and managing a process aimed at arriving at a state of sustainable peace. The process thus inescapably deals with a progression from violent conflict to sustainable peace, and it has to be possible to identify some generic phases in this progression.

Each conflict system is formed by its unique history, the dynamics of the peace process, and the patterns of interaction among the specific configuration of internal and external actors. Although this makes every conflict situation unique, there are also some processes and dimensions that are common to most, if not all conflict management systems. This report will introduce an integrated conflict management system model that identifies a number of such loosely defined phases and dimensions, and argue that international conflict management response systems that are designed to manage conflict along these lines may be more effective that those using the 4Ps model.

For the purposes of this paper, an integrated conflict management system is understood as a complex system consisting of parallel, concurrent and interlinked short-, medium- and long-term activities that intend to prevent disputes from escalating, or avoid a relapse, into violent conflict, by addressing the immediate triggers, the consequences and the root causes of a conflict system, as part of a larger process aimed at facilitating a peace process.

An integrated conflict management system requires the collaboration of a wide range of internal and external actors, including governments, civil society, the private sector and international agencies, in a coherent and coordinated effort. Internal actors are understood to be part of the host conflict system, whilst external actors belong to regional or international systems that aim to assist or support the transition of the host system. These actors undertake a broad range of activities that span the political, security, socio-economic, rule of law and human rights dimensions. Collectively and cumulatively, these activities attempt to address both the causes and consequences of the conflict and lay the foundations for social justice and sustainable peace and development.

In order for positive momentum towards peace to come about in any society, every individual in that society must make thousands of micro-decisions about their own security, shelter, health, well being, employment, education and future prospects. The integrated conflict management system model recognize this multi-facetted nature of society and attempts to mirror each facet with matching programmes designed to have a system-wide impact on the peace process across the whole conflict spectrum. The following table orders the most common programme activities according to five broad dimensions: security, political, socio-economic, rule of law and human rights[20]. A sixth dimension, humanitarian action, is included but has a separate status from the rest in order to ensure and protect the independence, neutrality and impartiality of humanitarian action.

[20] This is the categorization that was used by the Joint *Utstein* Study on Peacebuilding (Smith 2003), but there are also several other models. See, for instance, the Report of the Commission on Human Security (p.40), that differentiates between: Public Safety, Humanitarian Relief, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction, Reconciliation and Coexistence and Governance and Empowerment. Another model has been developed by the Joint AUSA/CSIS *Post-Conflict Reconstruction Task Framework (2002)*, and is organized around four distinct 'issue-areas': Security, Justice and Reconciliation, Social and Economic Well-Being and Governance and Participation.

The Dimensions of an Integrated Conflict Management System

Security	Providing a Safe and Secure Environment
	Protection of Civilians
	Security Sector Reform
	Disarmament & Demobilization
Political	Support the Peace Process
	Political Participation, National Dialogue & Reconciliation
	Oversee the Political Transition
	Extend State Authority Throughout the Territory
	Conflict Management Capacity
Socio-economic	Physical Infrastructure: Roads, Ports, Airports; Electricity; Tele-communications
	Social Services: Health, Education, Social Welfare, Population Registration, Civil Society
	Stimulating and Facilitating Economic Growth
	Strengthen Civil Society
	Government/Civil Service Capacity Building
Rule of Law	Police, Corrections & the Judicial Reform
Human Rights	Human Rights Education, Advocacy and Monitoring
Humanitarian Assistance	Emergency and Early Recovery Services in the areas of Food, Water & Sanitation, Shelter, Health, Refugees/IDPs and Protection

It should be possible to identify a number of phases that most successful conflict management processes have to evolve through. This report suggests a loose progression that range from pre-violent conflict, violent conflict, stabilisation, transition, consolidation, post-conflict and ultimatey, to the development phase[21]. These phases should not be understood as fixed, time-bound, linear steps, nor should they be conceived of as having absolute boundaries or paradigms. We are using the concept of 'phases' as a way of describing the different periods in a peace process where one or another categorization of the emphasis and key characteristic of this period may be useful. One should anticipate considerable overlap in the transition between phases, and regression is possible, in which case a specific system may switch back-and-forth between phases. It is also possible that whilst the peace process in general may be making progress, a specific area could remain stuck in an earlier phase, or may regress back to earlier phases. The North Kivus in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Darfur in Sudan may be two contemporary examples. The Sudan also reminds us that there can be several peace processes underway in one country, and that each of these, whilst not isolated from the other, are progressing along its own pace as determined by its own dynamics.

The Pre-violent Phase

The pre-violent conflict phase represents the earliest period in which internal and external actors become aware of a deteriorating situation that may evolve into a violent conflict phase if early action is not taken. Early warning processes and mechanisms may be useful to alert regional and international conflict management systems to a worsening situation and may assist in triggering a response. International, regional, national and civil society actors may respond by undertaking fact-finding missions and otherwise improving their understanding of the unfolding situation. They are likely to respond with a large variety of activities, spanning the political, security, rule of law, human rights, humanitarian and development dimensions, aimed at preventing an escalation of the situation. If violent conflict nevertheless breaks out, the internal and external actors are likely to take further steps to try to stop the violence, to pre-

[21] There are various different interpretations of these phases, but most convey the same essential progression from violent conflict to normalisation, e.g. the Joint AUSA/CSIS *Post-Conflict Reconstruction Task Framework* (2002) model uses three stages, namely: the initial response, transformation and fostering sustainability.

vent any further escalation of violence and respond to the consequences of the violence that has occurred. There would typically be intense efforts aimed at negotiating a cease-fire or peace agreement between the parties engaged in the violence, often in the form of special envoys or special representatives dispatched to the conflict by Governments, regional and international organizations.

If a cease-fire or peace agreements is reached it may call on a specific international or regional actor to support the implementation of the peace agreement with the deployment of a peacekeeping mission. In some cases there may be no peace agreement in place, but the host Government or a regional or international authority may call on such a body to deploy an operation aimed at stabilization the situation with a focus on protecting civilians and facilitating humanitarian assistance. The stabilisation phase is the period that follows immediately after the official end of hostilities or the deployment of the intervention force and has a dual focus, namely establishing a safe and secure environment and managing the immediate consequences of the conflict through emergency humanitarian assistance programmes.

The Stabilisation Phase

The stabilisation phase will include actions aimed at minimising the opportunities for spoilers, criminals and others opportunists who thrive in these near chaotic environments[22]. The peace operation will, in most cases, take control over the territories formerly controlled by the parties to the conflict and ensure freedom of movement throughout the mission area for the civilian components of the mission and humanitarian agencies. Where necessary, this may include providing security to the civilian actors in the form of armed escorts or related activities. In the transitional and consolidation phases the emphasis gradually shifts to Rule of Law and Security Sector Reform aimed at the development of appropriate, credible and professional internal security, police, judicial, corrections and defence services.

[22] Stedman, Stephen J. "Spoiler Problems in Peace Processes", *International Security*, 22 (2), 1997, pp. 5-53; Edward Newman and Oliver Richmond (eds.), *Challenges to Peacebuilding: Managing Spoilers During Conflict Resolution*, United Nations University Press, 2006, Tokyo, and Gueli, R. Liebenberg, S. & van Huysteen, E., *Developmental Peace Missions Theory*, CSIR, Pretoria, 2005, p. 11.

The stabilisation phase will typically overlap with what the humanitarian community will refer to as the humanitarian emergency, and later the early recovery phase. During the mid to latter parts of the stabilisation phase, preparations will be underway for medium-term rehabilitation and longer-term reconstruction and development actions, and it is likely that various needs assessment processes will be undertaken, often culminating in an international donor conference.

During this phase the internal actors are typically pre-occupied with basic survival and the re-organisation of their social and political systems. As a result external actors often play a prominent role during the stabilisation phase but they should nevertheless seek every opportunity to involve and consult groups and individuals that represent internal actor interests, to ensure that their actions are need, not supply, driven.

The Transition Phase

The transition phase typically starts with the appointment of an interim government, followed by, in the shortest reasonable period, some form of election or legitimate traditional process to (s)elect a transitional government, constituent assembly or some other body responsible for writing a new constitution or otherwise laying the foundation for a future political dispensation. This process takes place according to the provisions of the new constitution, after which a new fully sovereign and legitimately elected government is in power. The transitional phase is focused on establishing a new legitimate and sustainable socio-political order, underpinned by a functioning bureaucracy, rule of law, credible security services and a sustainable socio-economic system. The humanitarian focus shifts from emergency relief to recovery, rehabilitation and reconstruction. The governance process includes reforming the civil service, strengthening public sector management; reviving local governance; facilitating enabling legislation and policy frameworks and broadening the participation of civil society in decision-making process. The relationship between the internal and external players should reflect a growing partnership and a gradual hand-over of ever-increasing responsibility to the local institutions.

The Consolidation Phase

The consolidation phase is aimed at supporting the newly elected government and the civil society with a broad range of programmes aimed at fostering reconciliation and nation-building, boosting socio-economic reconstruction, consolidating rule of law and security sector reform and supporting development programmes across the political, security, socio-economic and reconciliation dimensions of peacebuilding. If a peace operation was deployed, its military component is likely to draw down and hand over its security responsibilities to newly reformed local capacities in a phased process, that will eventually results in their total withdrawal. The timing of such a hand over and withdrawal process will be determined by the degree to which the local security services will be able to manage any potential risks during the consolidation phase. There will be a transition of responsibilities from the peace operation to an integrated peacebuilding office and in the UN context a transfer of functions to the UN Country Team and internal actors[23]. The consolidation phase is thus aimed at ensuring that the internal actors further develop the capacity to take full responsibility for their own planning and coordination, and that the role of the external actors is reduced to providing technical assistance and support.

The Post-conflict Reconstruction Phase

The post-conflict reconstruction phase follows after the withdrawal of the peace operation and is indicative of a period where the immediate risk of a return to violent conflict is unlikely, but where socio-economic and related development activities still need to be sensitive to the history of the violent conflict, and where the focus should still be on addressing the root causes of the conflict. The internal/external actor relationship will typically be guided by some form of integrated strategic planning framework that is focussed on investing capacity in those aspects most likely to deter a re-re-emergence of violent conflict[24].

---

[23] The drawing down of the UN peace operations in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) and East Timor (UNMISET), and the establishment of UN integrated peacebuilding offices in their place, are two contemporary examples.

[24] See *Building Effective Partnerships: Improving the Relationship between Internal and External Actors in Post-Conflict Countries*, Peacebuilding Forum Conference, 7 October 2004, New York.

The Development Phase

The development phase refers to a near-normal situation where a country or region has fully recovered from the violent conflict, and is firmly and sustainable on the path to peace, but where certain long-term development challenges remain. These development challenges are, however, now being addressed, as they would be in a country where there has been no violent conflict, i.e. the factors that caused the violent conflict are no longer of primary concern.

Assessment, Planning, Coordination, Resource Mobilisation, Monitoring and Evaluation

Assessment, planning, coordination, resource mobilisation, monitoring and evaluation are crosscutting functions that are critical for the successful implementation of all the dimensions and the coherence of the integrated conflict management system as a whole. All these dimensions are interlinked and interdependent. No single dimension can achieve the overall goal of the conflict management system – addressing the consequences and causes of the conflict and laying the foundation for social justice and sustainable peace – on its own. It is the collective and cumulative effect of the activities in all these dimensions that build positive momentum towards sustainable peace. The timing, prioritization and sequencing between the dimensions are thus important, and this is why coherence is a critical success factor for integrated conflict management systems.

Coherence

The need for, and benefits of, improved coherence is widely accepted today in the international multilateral governance context. There is now broad consensus that inconsistent policies and fragmented programmes entail a higher risk of duplication, inefficient spending, a lower quality of service, difficulty in meeting goals and, ultimately, of a reduced capacity for delivery[25]. There are, however, a considerable gap between

[25] See 'Policy Coherence: Vital for Global Development', *OECD Observer*, 2003, available on www.oecd.org accessed on 10 May 2007.

the degree to which the benefits of coherence are held to be self-evident and operational reality.

It is possible to distinguish between four elements of coherence[26] in the integrated conflict management context, namely: (1) agency coherence, i.e. consistency among the policies and actions of an individual agency, including the internal consistency of a specific policy or programme; (2) whole-of-government coherence, i.e. consistency among the policies and actions of the different government agencies of a country[27]; (3) external coherence, i.e. consistency among the policies pursued by the various external actors in a given country context (harmonization[28]); and (4) internal/external coherence, i.e. consistency between the policies of the internal and external actors in a given country context (alignment[29]). The degree to which a specific integrated conflict management system can be assessed to be more, or less, coherent will be a factor of all four elements of coherence.

In this report 'coherence' is understood as the effort to direct the wide range of activities undertaken in the political, development, human rights, humanitarian, rule of law and security dimensions of an integrated conflict management system towards common strategic objectives. It is important to recognise, however, that the dynamic and non-linear nature of complex systems means that coherence can never be fully attained[30]. It is possible, however to distinguish between systems where there is less, or more, coherence, and coherence is thus about degree, not end states. Coherence also need to be understood in the context of the natural tensions, and therefore trade-offs, between the four elements of coherence. In the real world, conflict management agents, more often than not, have to settle for 'second best' or 'partially coherent' solutions in order to establish a workable foundation for cooperation.

---

[26] See Robert Picciotto, *Fostering Development in a Global Economy: A Whole of Government Perspective, Introduction: Key Concepts, Central Issues*, OECD, Paris, 2005, pp 13–14, where he identifies: (1) internal coherence, (2) whole of government coherence, (3) donor coherence and (4) country-level coherence.

[27] Note for instance the Canadian approach aimed at combining Diplomacy, Defence & Development, the so-called '3D' approach.

[28] Note the 'Rome Declaration on Harmonization' of 25 February 2003.
See www.aidharmonization.org, accessed on 12 May 2007.

[29] Note in this context the 'Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness' of 2 March 2005.
See www.oecd.org, accessed on 12 May 2007.

[30] Cilliers, P. 2002, "Why We Cannot Know Complex Things Completely", *Emergence*, 4 (1/2), 77–84.

Coordination entails developing strategies, determining objectives, planning, sharing information, the division of roles and responsibilities, and mobilising resources[31]. Co-ordination is concerned with synchronising the mandates, roles and activities of the various stakeholders and actors in the conflict management system and achieves this through joint efforts aimed at prioritisation, sequencing and harmonisation of programmes to meet common objectives.

Part 3: Beyond the 4Ps Model – Towards an Integrated Conflict Management System for the African Union

The African Union is still a relatively new and small institution compared to the UN, although it has considerable bureaucratic baggage left over from its predecessor, the OAU. This continues to hamper its efficiency and effectiveness. The AU has, as outlined above, broadly followed the UN example and separated the peacekeeping function from the conflict prevention, peacemaking and peacebuilding functions. The aim of this section is to discuss the imperfections of the 4Ps model in the African Union context, and to explore, as an alternative, how an integrated conflict management system could be utilised within the African Union.

In addition to separating the 4Ps, the AU has further separated functions in the areas of elections, human rights, refugee affairs, humanitarian liaison, etc. across various other departments. The 4Ps distinction also represents a civil-military divide in the AU context, at least from some perspectives, in that the Peace Support Operations Division is viewed by some as the military arm of the African Union Commission. Such misperceptions are confirmed when the African Standby Force, which is meant to be a multi-dimensional standby system, that consist of civilian, police and military components, reports to the African Chiefs of Defence Staff (ACDS) and the Ministers of Defence and Security. Many politicians in Africa still see peacekeeping as a military affair, and as a result, the higher decision-making bodies of the AU and regional organisations tend to turn to their military experts for advice and decisions on peacekeeping issues.

[31] Minear, L. & Chellia U. 1992, *UN Coordination of the International Humanitarian Response to the Gulf Crisis 1990–1992*, Occasional Paper 13, Thomas J. Watson Institute for International Studies, Providence.

There is a further separation in that the capacity to deploy and support special envoys and special representatives are based in the Office of the Chairperson of the AU Commission, whilst the responsibility for early warning, conflict management, mediation support and post-conflict reconstruction lies within the Conflict Management Division.

As a result of these bureaucratic divisions the limited capacity of the AU is spread too thinly across to many departments and units, and there are considerable duplication in the capacity development context. For instance, there are at least three initiatives underway to train, roster and recruit similarly skilled civilian staff, namely for conflict prevention and mediation support, the civilian dimension of the African Standby Force and the roster of Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development experts[32].

In order to manage the kind of integrated conflict management system introduced in Part 2, the AU needs personnel that can combine and direct political, security, socio-economic development, human rights, humanitarian and rule of law knowledge and expertise, and apply these across all the different phases of the conflict management process. Regardless of the phase, the AU needs a multi-disciplinary capacity to monitor and analyse conflict systems, and the capacity to send missions to the field, including the ability to establish and maintain an office or to deploy a peacekeeping mission. If a significant portion of the human resources the AU Commission needs have the same core skills, regardless of whether they are working in early warning, mediation support, peace support or post-conflict sectors, it may be possible to use the limited resources at the AU's disposal more efficiently and effectively than is currently the case.

The AU requires essentially the same tool-set or capacity, regardless of whether it deploys a special envoy on a fact-finding mission, a special representative on a mediation mission, a peacekeeping mission or establishes a peacebuilding office. This is at the Commission-level, the ability to monitor and analyze a conflict system, design an

[32] Compare, for example, the *Draft Policy Framework for the Civilian Dimension of the African Standby Force*, African Union Peace Support Operations Division (PSOD), 1 September 2006, and the AU's *Post-Conflict Reconstruction and Development Policy* adopted at the 2007 AU Summit.

appropriate intervention strategy, hire staff and deploy them to field missions, a capacity to administer field missions, and a capacity to monitor, manage and channel reporting between the Commission and its field missions.

The integrated conflict management model emphasised: (a) the need to apply a multi-dimensional approach to conflict management, and (b) the ability to consistently support a conflict management system through its various stages. Instead of passing the responsibility for a conflict situation from unit to unit within the Commission, as the country in crisis progresses through the different conflict phases, the AU may consider rather creating multi-disciplinary teams that follows a specific conflict system throughout its life-cycle. This implies that the AU should consider organising the Peace and Security Department into an operations division that consist of between 3 to 5 multi-dimensional planning and managing teams, depending on the number of conflict systems it wishes to be able to manage at any one time. Each team should consist of a number of people that together represent a multi-disciplinary (political, security, development, economic, human rights, humanitarian, and rule of law) capacity to monitor and analyze a conflict system. Each team should have the capacity to design an appropriate intervention, provide direction and support to a field mission, and report on the conflict system to the Peace & Security Council.

In addition the Department needs the capacity to deploy field missions, peace support operations and establish offices. It will also need cross-cutting capacity for training, research in best practices and lessons learned, and recruitment and rostering. It could thus consider establishing a mission support division that is responsible for field recruitment and rostering, in close cooperation with the AU's human resources department, and a training and evaluation division, which will be responsible for researching lessons learned and best practises, and feeding these back into the system through training.

In addition to the staff in the Peace & Security Division, relevant staff in other departments and AU institutions should be integrated into the conflict management system through an integrated planning process that brings all the relevant skills and knowledge available within the AU, including satellite capacities such as in the African Development Bank, the Human Rights Commission and NEPAD, to bear on any

given conflict situation. The AU would also need to develop a systematic process for close cooperation, including integrated planning, with the Regional Economic Communities, Regional Mechanisms, the UN and other partners, such as the EU.

In many cases, the best forum for integrated planning and coordination would be at the country level, and the AU's integrated conflict management system should be a mission focussed system where the Commission-level capacity is aimed at generating, sustaining and supporting an AU field presence, with the emphasis being on operational activity and presence in the field as close to the conflict situation as possible. The AU's field presence, regardless of whether it may be a fact-finding mission, a mediation team, a peace support operation or a post-conflict office, should reflect the same multi-disciplinary team approach that is established at the level of the Commission, and it should reflect the same system-wide and multi-phased approach.

The AU's conflict management capacity should thus essentially be an operational capacity that is field heavy, while the Commission's capacity should be focussed on headquaters-level analysis, planning, deploying, supporting and evaluation its field missions.

Such an integrated conflict management system model differs from the bureaucratic model in that it uses an integrated capacity to manage conflict systems, regardless of whether it is perceived to be in a conflict prevention, peacekeeping or peacebuilding phase. Instead the emphasis is on two new variables, (a) the type of people needed: multi-disciplinary teams that combine expertise in political, security, human rights, developmental, economic, humanitarian and rule of law dimensions, and (b) the type of tasks they will perform: monitoring, analyzing, planning, coordination, evaluation, reporting for the substantial staff, and planning, managing and supporting field missions, including training, research, recruiting and rostering mission personnel.

Conclusion

Whilst the 1992 *Agenda for Peace* was a landmark development in the conflict management field, and has dominated our understanding of, and response to conflict for

over a decade, it has also resulted in the bureaucratization of conflict management across the 4Ps. The first part of the report highlighted the lessons learned from the approximately two dozen international conflict management missions undertaken over this period, namely that we should see the 4Ps not as steps or stages in a peace process, but rather as facets of the same process. The 4Ps are more often than not simultaneously relevant. Unfortunately, the UN, AU, EU and others have developed conflict management capacities that have encouraged the bureaucratic compartmentalization of the 4Ps across different units and departments, and this has contributed to the inability of these organizations to generate sustainable conflict management systems.

The second part of the report introduced an integrated conflict management system model that is instead, focussed on the multi-dimensional (political, security, socio-economic, rule of law and human rights) nature of conflict systems, and the need to coherently combine the collective efforts of a wide range of internal and external actors to build momentum towards peace. The model recognises that there has to be some form of recognizable progression from violent conflict to sustainable peace and proposes a number of loose phases through which most conflict systems should progress. The model then explored the interplay between dimensions and phases, and concluded that the role of coherence and coordination is critical in such integrated conflict management systems.

In the third part of the report the current AU model is juxtaposed against the integrated conflict management model and the report suggest that instead of passing the responsibility for a given conflict or peace process from pillar to post within the AU Commission, consideration could be given to the establishment of multi-disciplinary teams, that can plan, manage and evaluate the AU's response to a given conflict situation or peace process from a multi-dimensional perspective. It proposes that such teams can be used to manage the AU's response to a given situation throughout its life-cycle. Such multi-disciplinary teams should be supported by additional capacities such as mission support, research and training and recruitment and rostering.

The report argues that, in the AU context, such an integrated conflict management model would be more effective and efficient than the existing 4Ps model. The AU, being smaller, newer and more open to further development and capacity building

than the UN and EU, has a better chance of breaking free from the inadequacies of the bureaucratic 4Ps model, and adopting such an integrated conflict management model.