

**INTER-AGENCY STANDING COMMITTEE WORKING GROUP
58th MEETING**

**22-23 September 2004
UNICEF New York**

**Terms of Reference
Expanded ECHA Core Group Joint Study
THE PEACEKEEPING-HUMANITARIAN/DEVELOPMENT INTERFACE**

Circulated: 10 September 2004

Background

- 1) In the mid to late 1990s, responding to the challenges thrown up at the end of the Cold War and galvanised by increasingly critical external performance assessments, the UN embarked on a search for greater coherence among its various departments and agencies. The objective, as put forward in the Secretary-General's reform agenda, was a more integrated crisis management system able to deal effectively with restoring peace, security and good governance in failed or failing states, building upon the skills and competencies of each part of the UN system. This led to the – now prevalent – concept of the 'integrated mission', whereby all UN resources are harnessed under common direction towards consolidating peace and supporting the re-establishment of stable and legitimate central government with viable institutions. In this view, integration has three critical advantages:
 - a) Facilitates a common strategic vision, harnessing collective system-wide action;
 - b) Ensures the capacity to rationalize resources and systems (e.g. procurement, services);
 - c) Allows for overall direct management of UN system resources.
- 2) Alongside these developments, there has been an ongoing and extensive debate on the ethical, security, access and protection costs arising from integration from the perspective of humanitarian and development operations and the adherence to humanitarian principles. Some actors see an inherent tension between the need for a clear command and control structure for all UN entities on the ground, and the requirement for some degree of insulation of humanitarian/development operations from the political and military elements of an integrated (multidimensional) mission. Others question whether and how best to manage potential trade-offs between humanitarian action and transitional processes and efforts to negotiate and/or implement peace agreements.
- 3) Experience in integration has been gained in a range of different missions, but there has been no clearly defined model for integration, and various missions have been integrated to a greater or lesser extent. Assessments as to the benefits of these experiences also vary between different parts of the UN system. There has been no consolidation of lessons, including on the the potential gains of integration for humanitarian or development activities, the minimum criteria for and best practice in integration, the overall costs versus the benefits of the various integration exercises thus far, and impact that the integration of UN activity has on the UN's effectiveness in supporting the overall peace process. In addition, much discussion remains to be had on the linkage between the work of the mission, and the longer term work of the UN system in the country, including the potential roles of the UN System agencies in the execution

of the mission's non-military or peace building objectives. The result has been the lack of a policy position on principles and practices that might enhance gains and minimize costs for both sides. Some elements of mission design have become more or less common, such as the double or triple "hatting" of a DSRSG with development and humanitarian responsibilities, and the integration of mission field offices. However, overall there remains a relatively ad-hoc approach to mission design, in which all the potential lessons have not been learnt. At the same time, missions are increasing in size and scale and in some cases, complexity in terms of their broader "less traditional" peace keeping mandates.

- 4) There have been some studies on integrated missions (such as those produced by King's College and the Centre for Humanitarian Dialogue and various evaluation reports on Afghanistan) but these have not addressed these issues as their primary concern. Furthermore none of these studies has focused primarily on defining practical steps that may be taken to maximise gains and minimise costs from integration.
- 5) To remedy this situation, and in view of recent new mission deployments, a joint lesson learning review is proposed, with the aim of defining the over-arching issues of concern to the respective humanitarian, development and peacekeeping constituencies regarding the question of integration of humanitarian and development coordination and operational responsibilities into multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations, including issues of security and protection, and achieving agreement on measures to address them. The study will also consider the implications for humanitarian and development action of working alongside non-UN peacekeeping or multinational forces, in light of emerging hybrid missions.

Purpose and Scope of the Study

- 6) This study is a joint initiative by the members of the Expanded ECHA Core Group: Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), the Department of Political Affairs (DPA) and the ECHA Core Group (OCHA, UNICEF, UNDP, UNHCR, WFP). The primary purpose of the review is to draw lessons from the interface between peacekeeping and humanitarian and development work in the context of integrated missions, including during the planning and design phases, and the consequent effects on the relationships between UN and non-UN humanitarian/development actors. These lessons will translate into practical policy and operational input on the humanitarian/development-peacekeeping interface for the design and implementation of current and future multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations. It is hoped that the review will permit the United Nations to identify circumstances and criteria for the integration of either humanitarian or development coordination and the mechanisms for making it efficient and successful in different situations, both at headquarters and in the field.
- 7) The review will focus on the period between 2000 and mid-2004 and will address policy, operational, security, management/reporting and information sharing issues, drawing on practitioners' insights at headquarters and in the field. Key integrated missions to be studied include: UNAMSIL, UNMIL, ONUCI, UNOB, UNAMA and MINUSTAH . The current OCHA-DPKO joint lessons learned exercise on MONUC will be incorporated into this broader study because of the humanitarian element to the mandate and the humanitarian component to the mission (although it is not a traditional integrated mission). A case study approach will be taken for UNAMSIL, UNMIL, ONUCI, MONUC and UNOB, while the remainder will be covered by interviews and a desk review. A brief desk review of lessons from UNMIK and UNTAET will also be undertaken.

- 8) The main scope of the study is the overall effectiveness of the integration of the UN system in fulfilling the range of mandates given to it, especially the integration of humanitarian, development and peacekeeping/building mandates, coordination structures and management responsibilities in the context of multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations and the interpretation and application of such mandates and responsibilities by the various actors involved (at headquarters and in the field), the interface between the peacekeeping and humanitarian/development actors, and the resulting outcomes in terms of coherence of UN policy, programming and operations.

Key Issues to be covered

- 9) The study is tasked with assessing the efficiency, effectiveness and value-added of integration, what form it should take under which circumstances, and the overall peacekeeping-humanitarian/development interface in situations of integration, with a view to ensuring the goals of the whole United Nations system in country are effectively met within the context of the Secretary-General's reform agenda. A number of key issues and questions will be raised (the list of key issues will be refined by the consultants and the steering committee following the desk review):

- Is there clarity on the respective roles and responsibilities, both within the mission and with external actors? How can efficiency be improved and duplication avoided? What role have structures and staffing, and reporting lines played in the efficiency and effectiveness of the various integrated missions? What are the perceived benefits and costs in terms of administration, logistics, common services, funding etc?
- Based on these lessons and the analysis of opportunities and costs, what is the added value of integrated missions and what are the pitfalls to be avoided, including in structural, operational and security terms? When is integration most applicable?
- What are the criteria needed for deciding on the extent of integration of humanitarian or development approaches in peacekeeping operations in different types of situations? What should integration entail from the perspective of furthering the UN's overall agenda and fulfilling its various mandates? Or from a humanitarian perspective? Or from a development perspective in the transition from relief to nation building? What should integration entail from a peacekeeping perspective? How can the space necessary for humanitarian operations be maintained within a mission framework? How can joint processes be properly established? How can cross-cutting issues be addressed and by whom?
(Note: The review should not propose strict templates for integration, but rather criteria and a menu of options for differing degrees of integration depending on the situation on the ground, as well as appropriate structures and policies to make these work.)
- In all the above areas, the study will establish what has worked well in integrated missions and for whom, what has not, and why? What can be learned from this, both in terms of the mission design process, structure, who should be involved in the process and at what stage?

Management of the Study

- 10) The Study will be jointly organized and managed by OCHA's Policy Development and Studies Branch and DPKO's Peacekeeping Best Practices Unit, in full consultation with DPA, UNDGO and the ECHA Core Group. Two consultants will be chosen to carry out the review, who between them should have familiarity with multi-dimensional peacekeeping, humanitarian principles and practice, and countries in transition and development more broadly.
- 11) The consultants will be expected to provide two interim reports to the Expanded ECHA Core Group: after the headquarters interviews; and after the field trips.
- 12) A Steering Committee at the decision-making level will be created to monitor the exercise throughout the process. It will be composed of representatives designated by the members of Expanded ECHA Core Group and UNDGO. The steering committee will meet at least four times: Screening and selection of consultants; Overall briefing for the consultants upon selection; Commenting on the consultants' proposal for the field portion of the review; Debriefing on the field work, prior to drafting process.
- 13) The draft report will be submitted to the Steering Committee for comment, and the final draft will go to the Expanded ECHA Core Group for a ten day comment period prior to finalisation.

Proposed method

- 14) Below is an indicative method for the review. The final method is to be designed by the consultants and will be reviewed and agreed to by the Steering Committee after the completion of Phase I.

Phase I: (New York): Initial Desk Review and briefing (7 days)

The consultants will undertake a comprehensive desk review of background information related to the peacekeeping-humanitarian/development interface. Following the Desk Review, they will submit a short paper outlining the key issues and questions to be addressed in the field trips. The Steering Committee will provide comments and inputs.

Phase II: (New York, Geneva, Rome): Structured interviews with key informants, New York, Geneva and Rome (10 days)

The consultants will interview a range of key informants, including DPKO, DPA and OCHA management and Desk Officers, UNICEF, UNDP, UNHCR, WFP management, UNSECOORD, other UN and non-UN entities, including Troop and Police Contributing Countries, Military and Police Advisers, donors, ICRC and key NGO counterparts. Interviews may be conducted one-on-one or in groups, where appropriate. In addition to interviewing those involved in working with UNAMSIL, UNMIL, UNOCI, MONUC, UNOB, UNAMA and MINUSTAH, the consultants will also interview those involved in planning for Sudan to assess criteria and lessons learned. A desk review of the peacekeeping-humanitarian/development interface in UNTAET and UNMIK should also be undertaken (although there is no longer a significant humanitarian programme, unlike in the earlier missions cited). In addition, telephone interviews will be held with those key informants who are not based in NY, Geneva or Rome.

Phase III: (Consultant Home Base): Follow-up Desk review of relevant materials and design of the field work (10 days)

The consultants will review additional materials collected during the interview phase and prepare a short interim report, outlining key issues emerging from the interviews as well as a design for the field work. As part of the field methodology, the team should consider a standard questionnaire based on the key issues to ensure comparability between the case studies.

Phase IV: Case Studies: Field trips to Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC and Burundi (40 days total, including travel time)

The consultants will travel to Sierra Leone, Liberia, Cote d'Ivoire, DRC and Burundi to collect information on the peacekeeping-humanitarian/development interface in these countries and the lessons learned from integration experience. Focus groups with key informants, including the UNCT, will be organized on the spot. The consultants should also visit at least one sub-office in each location. Following each field trip the team will provide a short case study country report on key issues back to the Steering Committee.

Phase V: Report writing (10 days), presentation (2 days), and report finalization (2 days)

After completion of the field trips, the consultants will debrief the Steering Committee and a select panel of experts. The team will then prepare a draft report which will be submitted to the Expanded ECHA Core Group for comments. The draft report will then be reviewed during a session of the Expanded ECHA Core Group – it is expected that one of the consultants will travel to New York to present the report. Following discussions and comments made by the Expanded ECHA Core Group, the consultants will finalize the draft report.

It is expected that the review will be carried out over a period of at least four months.

Composition of the Team

- 15) Three senior, independent and external experts with thorough understanding of UN peacekeeping, humanitarian and development issues will be recruited to undertake this assignment. At least one of the consultants should have a solid knowledge and expertise on multi-dimensional peacekeeping operations. In addition, one researcher will be tasked with supporting the consultants for 2-3 of the case studies. The researcher should possess detailed knowledge of the case study countries and be familiar with peacekeeping, humanitarian and development issues. To the extent possible the team should be diverse in terms of gender and nationalities.
- 16) The team will be supported by two professional staff members from OCHA and DPKO in New York. These two staff members are responsible the provision of relevant background information, the organization of key meetings and the field visits. The team will be accompanied by either an OCHA or DPKO staff member on each field visit.

Report

- 17) The consultants will submit a succinct and fully edited report in English with no more than 20,000 words, in conformity with the DPKO publications guidelines for External Studies. The report will include an executive summary (up to 3,500 words) and will address all of the key issues indicated above. Country case studies will be annexed and referred to in the main text where indicated. The report should be structured to provide succinct conclusions for each issue as well as specific, targeted and action-oriented key recommendations. The annex will include a description of the method used, a bibliography, list of persons interviewed, the country case studies and the terms of reference.

Use of the Lesson Learning Review

18) Once received by the Expanded ECHA Core Group, a joint implementation plan will be drawn up by the Steering Committee, based on the review's recommendations. This plan will be presented to the Expanded ECHA Core Group who is expected to review and endorse it and present it to the USGs for DPKO and OCHA (on behalf of ECHA) and UNDP (on behalf of UNDG) for action.