

Introduction:

- **Multilateral peacekeeping operations are at an all time high.** At present there are more UN peacekeeping troops deployed than ever before. Missions today are highly ambitious and are stretching far beyond traditional peacekeeping.
- **The UN has moved/shifted from an organization that is to an organization that does.** UN multidimensional peace operations thus a change process. We are witnessing a new pattern of complex peace operations.
- **A broader approach needed. This is recognized by both EU, NATO and the UN.** There is an ongoing process in developing a more comprehensive approach within all these institutions. Today there is a clear realization that military presence is a prerequisite but never the whole solution. Military presence is needed but not the solution in itself! Only effective and useful in so far as they are part of an overall strategy and backed by a clear and strong political process.
- **Parallel debates;** UN (Integrated Missions) EU (Security and Development) NATO (Comprehensive Approach)
 - Same theme discussed in the different forums but the debates are conducted separately. Important to improve dialogue between them.
- **An array of challenges.** There exists a plethora of difficult dilemmas and decisions that have to be made. Even though we have come far in the theoretical discussions, institutional reforms are far behind. Holistic approach already established, but how is this to be done? How can we achieve an improved strategic focus on the varied collaboration between the different elements operating within an integrated mission?

UN Integrated Missions:

- **UN at the forefront:** It is fair to say that the United Nations has come the furthest in their debate on the concept of integration compared to both NATO and the EU. The United Nations also has the most practice.
- **Largest peacekeeping actor on the scene;** 21 operations, with over 100 000 personnel. Global actor with high legitimacy world over.
- The United Nations has been good at **self-adjustment** and improvement since the mid-1990s.
- One of the UN PKO strong points is the **broad apparatus** it can “pull” on. (UNs programs, funds, organs etc)

- UN has demonstrated time and again that it is willing to do the necessary fundamental institutional changes - **but there is still a far way to go.**
- **Norwegian led project on Integrated Missions:** Follow-up of the **2005 ECHA report.**
- **Series of seminars around the world** (Beijing, Addis Abeba, Geneva, New York, Johannesburg, Brussels and Oslo.) to take stock of the current debate on multidimensional and integrated peace operations. The project will culminate in the release of a final report that will outline the trends and challenges and provide recommendations for the planning and implementation of ongoing and future integrated missions.
- **Some of the most central findings so far:**
- **Multi-hatted DSRSG**
 - Still an internal debate concerning this model, it still has challenges but so far it has proven to be a viable alternative. Though it is important to note that we should be very careful to limit the discussion of integration to an issue of structural set ups. The multi-hatted DSRSG a response to the need for pulling resources together to strengthen the overall sustainability and impact of the UNs presence/resources on the ground
- **Humanitarian space**, still discussed but the discussion has definitely matured and moved forward. HC should be respected within an agreed upon strategic integration (coordinated but necessarily integrated).
- It is also important to underline that integration is **not an aim, it's a tool**. If it doesn't work we should not necessarily go there.
- United Nations Integrated Missions is the **field level expression of a whole of government approach.**
- Integration meets a whole series of challenges. Example; some strong agencies are not willing to integrate, afraid of losing their central role and tasks.
- **Form should follow function;** The function of a peace operation ultimately should be determined by the desired impact. Mandate adapted to context
- **Peacekeeping-peacebuilding interface is not sequential**, however we too often adapt our efforts on the basis of this concept.
- **Realign mandates and resources.** UN mandates increasingly broad, but the traditional funding mechanisms are not following suit. Back to my point on the shift from an organization that is to an organization that does... the intergovernmental system has not changed accordingly. Decision making processes still too static.
- **Voluntary funding:** is often restricted by static definitions of the type of resources necessary for different phases of conflict.
- **Strong and clear leadership is needed in the field.** (Good structures does not replace good leadership) Giving them the possibilities to do their job.

- **Define a common mission**, Early planning phase is essential. Coordination in the field has little meaning if not joint planning from the outset.
- **Need to be better at reconfiguring along the way**. Adjusting. Measuring impact. Assessment. There has been little effort at measuring impact both desired and unintended consequences.
- **Local ownership**; Everyone is in favor, BUT in light of the various post-conflict situations and the capabilities and sometimes non-existent capabilities of the host country, how do we find the right balance between the efforts done by the international system vs. the local capabilities. There are many complex questions surrounding this dilemma.
- **Bring politics back in!!** We need to bring politics back in. We should not perceive ourselves as neutral. We should recognize our efforts as political. It is not an argument against, but one should not pretend to be neutral.
- **Protection of civilians**. How far can we go? Fundamental dilemmas, HUM space, local ownership, everyone struggles with these issues.
- **Civilian-Military** – Let me first clarify that IM is not the same as Civilian-Military Cooperation. In fact, the term has proven to be somewhat unhelpful and misleading vis a vis the challenges that we are faced with in the operational theatre. Remains important but not the same. One aspect of the larger IM debate. Those that are there with a political direction and those who are there for HUM invention. Civilians come in many facets. Political, development, humanitarian, International Organizations, Governments, NGOs etc. We have to be better at distinguishing between those who come with a political mandate and those who are “neutral”. (Building girl schools is not neutral, but it does not mean that we should not, on the contrary, but recognize that it is political.) In other words, impartiality needs to be defined in practice and operational terms. ICRC/MFS absolutely impartial.

NATO Comprehensive Approach

- **NATO**; Growing recognition that a purely military approach will not bring about the desired end. Therefore, within NATO there is also a much stronger focus on a comprehensive approach. NATO needs to be not only comprehensive within but also with others!
- **Challenges**:
 - A comprehensive approach for NATO implies to a large extent coordination and cooperation with non-NATO organizations.
 - **PRT model**; The PRT is often disconnected from broader development programs.
 - Different countries have different PRTs, with different results. This could also in the long run help to undermine the central government (too strong regional focus). Jury is still out!
- In Afghanistan there is an enormous amount of development money being spent with relative little effect, this is tragic. Strong need to strengthen the UN role, boost its

authority and coordinating capacities and responsibilities: political, development and humanitarian.

- NATO has an impressive strategic planning system/apparatus for traditional operations, however unfortunately there are no longer traditional operations to plan for. Therefore the development of the MNE 5/ ACT/CA are welcomed initiatives.

EU Security and Development

- EU; is in principle ideally placed and multifunctional. Large aid, trade policy development aid, diplomatic initiative etc. but struggling to be coherent.
- Challenge for the EU. Adding military to their soft approach. Old way or new? How to align/integrated the military into the equation.
- Internal structures of the EU work against coherence: Development and Humanitarian lies within the Commission. While Foreign Policy and Security issues lies within the realm of the Council.
- Can a new Constitution help?

Whole of Government approach

- Nationally one sees many of the same coherence problems that one finds on the international scene. Many different actors, different vested interests, different agendas, different cultures and different points of contact with the outside world.
- Also, problem of integration not only between the various departments but also within departments.
- Example; Diplomats working with NATO meet more often with NATO-people than their own colleagues working with UNs development programs. And the same goes for people working within the humanitarian sector will often be stronger influenced by the NGO perspective.
- There are however many examples of attempts made to establish a more coherent governmental approach: Canada DDD, UK PCRU, US Reconstruction and Stabilization Unit.
- Credo: In order to attain a more strategic governmental approach it has to be anchored at the political level and followed through with firm determination.

To sum up:

- **Barriers we have to overcome:**
- Different perspective of time between the various actors.
- Home grown “quick impact” vs long term development projects.
- Force protection vs. “real” development
- The need to further awareness of the essential divide between humanitarian work and development assistance.

- Good information distribution as one essential factor for the strengthening of local ownership.
- This debate is not beginning nor is it the end! Need to constantly and frequently revisit the issue.