Appendix 3A. Multilateral peace missions in 2005

SHARON WIHARTA*

I. The evolution in peace operations

The notion and practice of peacekeeping have undergone significant change over the past 40 years. During the cold war, peace operations were mandated to perform such discrete functions as the monitoring of ceasefires, interpositioning between the parties to conflicts and maintaining buffer zones. These are often referred to as 'traditional' peacekeeping missions or 'Chapter VI operations'.[1] Peacekeeping has evolved and expanded since the first deployment of a United Nations (UN) mission, to monitor the armistice between Egypt, Israel, Lebanon and Syria in 1948. Besides the sheer number of operations deployed today—only 40 peace operations in all were deployed between 1948 and 1989—the present landscape is marked by increasingly costly and complex operations, with various functions and conducted by a multitude of actors. The mandates of peace operations have expanded beyond traditional peacekeeping tasks to peace-building, including the holding of elections, the provision of humanitarian support and reform of the security sector. At the other end of the spectrum, they have in some cases been strengthened with Chapter VII powers, thereby enabling them to legitimately 'take all necessary measures to fulfil their mandates' or to carry out what is more commonly termed as 'peace enforcement'.[2] The size of peace missions has also been expanded correspondingly—missions launched after the end of the cold war typically have at least several thousand personnel.

II. Global and regional trends in 2005

A total of 58 multilateral peace missions were conducted in 2005, deploying 289 500 military[3] and 17 500 civilian personnel. Eight new multilateral peace missions were launched in 2005, six of which were civilian missions deployed by the

---

[1] Diehl, P. F., *International Peacekeeping: With a New Epilogue on Somalia, Bosnia, and Cambodia* (Johns Hopkins University Press: Baltimore, Md., 1995). Chapter VI of the UN Charter vest authority in the Security Council for the settlement of disputes in a peaceful manner.

[2] See, e.g., Goulding, M., *Peacemonger* (John Murray Publishers: London, 2002); Findlay, T., SIPRI, *The Use of Force in UN Peace Operations* (Oxford University Press: Oxford, 2002); Nassrine, A. and Chang, L. (eds), *United Nations as Peacekeeper and Nation-builder: Continuity and Change—What Lies Ahead?*, Report of the 2005 Hiroshima Conference organized by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) and the Institute of Policy Studies of Singapore (IPS) (Martinus Nijhoff: Leiden/Boston, 2005). Chapter VII of the UN Charter authorizes the Security Council to use enforcement powers, including the use of force, to maintain or restore international peace and security in situations where the Security Council has determined the existence of a threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of transgression.

[3] Of this number, 183 000 soldiers (or 63%) were deployed to the Multinational Force in Iraq.

European Union (EU) while the remaining two are the UN Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) and the UN Office in Timor-Leste (UNOTIL). Five missions were closed in 2005—the UN Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), the UN Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISET), the UN Advance Mission in Sudan (UNAMIS), the EU Police Mission in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (EUPOL PROXIMA) and the EU Rule of Law Mission in Georgia (EUJUST THEMIS). UNAMSIL, UNMISET and EUPOL PROXIMA were each succeeded by smaller, follow-on missions to further institution- and capacity-building efforts and to maintain a residual presence in the countries involved. These missions testify to the international community's recognition that continued engagement is required to ensure the sustainability of peace processes.

Since 1998, owing to a surge in the global demand for peacekeeping and notwithstanding the primacy of the UN in conflict management and resolution, the engagement of regional organizations and UN-sanctioned non-standing coalitions of states has consistently been more pronounced than that of the UN. This recent trend continued in 2005. A total of 37 such missions were conducted during the year, equalling the peak reached in 1999. Table 3A.1 shows opposite trends in the roles of regional organizations and ad hoc coalitions. The number of peace missions carried out by standing regional organizations has steadily risen since 2002 and in 2005 reached the highest level since the end of the cold war. Moreover, beginning with the takeover in 2003 by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan, there has been a growing willingness on the part of regional organizations to launch out-of-area operations. However, the number of ad hoc coalition operations stayed constant over the four-year period 1999–2002 and has been on the decline since 2003. Given the current international political context, and the enormity of the resource and financial burdens on the lead nations, it is unlikely that sizeable peace missions will be launched by coalitions of the willing in the foreseeable future.

The year 2005 was a significant one for civilian missions under the EU's European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP). The number of peace missions burgeoned—the EU carried out 11 peace missions, twice as many in the previous year. The total of six new missions deployed by the EU in 2005—three times as many as the number initiated in 2004—was the highest number of new missions initiated in a single year by any regional organization. The EU launched, in succession, the EU Police Mission in Kinshasa in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (EUPOL Kinshasa); the EU Integrated Rule of Law Mission for Iraq (EUJUST LEX), the first EU mission in the Middle East; the EU Advisory and Assistance Mission for DRC Security Reform (EUSEC DR Congo); the Aceh Monitoring Mission (AMM), the first EU mission in Asia; the EU Police Advisory Team in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (EUPAT); and the EU Border Assistance Mission for the Rafah Crossing Point (EU BAM Rafah) in the Palestinian Territories on the Israeli–Egyptian border.

The most notable development in the EU's peacekeeping efforts is that a majority of the new missions are out-of-area operations: the EU is engaged in four non-European regions. The intensity and the geographic diversity of the missions represent a new stage in Europe's involvement in peace missions and are testimonies

Table 3A.1. Number of peace missions conducted by the United Nations, regional organizations and non-standing coalitions worldwide, 1996–2005

	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
UN peace missions (DPKO- and DPA-administered)	24	23	21	24	22	18	20	18	21	21
Peace missions conducted or led by regional organizations or alliances	18	22	26	30	25	26	21	26	29	31
Peace missions led by non-standing coalitions	4	7	8	7	7	7	7	8	7	6
Total	**46**	**52**	**55**	**61**	**54**	**51**	**48**	**52**	**57**	**58**

DPKO = UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations; DPA = UN Department of Political Affairs.

Source: SIPRI Peacekeeping Missions Database.

to the EU's deepening commitment to be a global security actor.[4] The AMM also represents the first joint operation between two regional organizations—the EU and the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN). It is still early days to draw any conclusions about the EU BAM Rafah mission, but the apparent success of the AMM, at least in the disarmament and demobilization process, has led to calls for the mission to be extended beyond March 2006 and for its mandate to be expanded.[5]

The various EU civilian missions initiated in 2005 illustrate that the EU is the most forward-looking institution with respect to building its civilian crisis management capacity and has achieved some success on this front. However, it remains to be seen if the General Secretariat of the Council of the EU will cope with planning and running multiple peace missions. The biggest challenge faced by both the UN and regional actors in peacekeeping in 2005 was that of resource constraints. This was cogently demonstrated in Africa where missions for a multitude of reasons had difficulties in reaching the authorized (and necessary) staffing level needed to carry out their duties effectively. NATO's extensive commitment in Kosovo and its growing role in Afghanistan will probably prevent it from increasing its presence elsewhere.[6] The challenge of fielding well-trained and -equipped soldiers and civilians with appropriate expertise will remain a central concern in 2006.

Table 3A.2 shows the breakdown of missions that were conducted in 2005 by type of mission and by the world region in which they were conducted.

---

[4] This has been articulated in policy documents of the EU. Council of the European Union, 'A secure Europe in a better world: European Security Strategy', Brussels, 12 Dec. 2003, URL <http://ue.eu.int/cms3_fo/showPage.ASP?id=266>.

[5] 'AMM hails plan to deploy TNI to help rebuild Aceh', *Jakarta Post*, 12 Dec. 2005.

[6] The troop strength of ISAF is expected to increase in 2006.

Table 3A.2. Number of peace missions conducted by the United Nations, regional organizations and non-standing coalitions, by region, 2005

	Africa	Americas	Asia	Europe	Middle East	**World total**
UN peace missions (DPKO- and DPA-administered)	9	1	4	3	4	**21**
Peace missions conducted or led by regional organizations or alliances	4	2	4	18	3	**31**
Peace missions led by non-standing coalitions	1	–	2	–	3	**6**
Total	**14**	**3**	**10**	**21**	**10**	**58**

DPKO = UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations; DPA = UN Department of Political Affairs.

Source: SIPRI Peacekeeping Missions Database.

III. Table of multilateral peace missions

Table 3A.3 contains more data than were included in the tables of multilateral peace missions that appeared in previous editions of the SIPRI Yearbook. First, the table lists the troop-contributing countries by type of personnel (troop, military observer, civilian police or civilian staff). Second, data on mission strength also include approved numbers in order to show whether a mission is deployed at full strength. Finally, the data on fatalities for the reporting year are broken down in the table by cause of death.

   Table 3A.3 presents extensive data on the 58 multilateral peace missions that were ongoing or terminated in 2005. The table lists only those operations that were conducted under the authority of the UN and operations conducted by regional organizations or by ad hoc coalitions of states that were sanctioned by the UN or authorized by a UN Security Council resolution, with the stated intention to: (*a*) serve as an instrument to facilitate the implementation of peace agreements already in place, (*b*) support a peace process, or (*c*) assist conflict prevention and/or peace-building efforts.

   SIPRI uses the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) description of peacekeeping as a mechanism to assist conflict-ridden countries to create conditions for sustainable peace—this may include monitoring and observing ceasefire agreements; serving as confidence-building measures; protecting the delivery of humanitarian assistance; assisting with the demobilization and reintegration process; strengthening institutional capacities in the areas of judiciary and the rule of law (including penal institutions), policing, and human rights; electoral support; and economic and social development. The table thus covers a broad range of peace missions to reflect the growing complexity of mandates of peace operations and the potential for operations to change over the course of their mandate. The table does not include good offices, fact-finding or electoral assistance missions, nor does it include peace

missions comprising non-resident individuals or teams of negotiators or operations not sanctioned by the UN.[7]

The missions are grouped by organization and listed chronologically within these groups. The first group, covering UN operations, is divided into two sections: 17 operations run by the UN DPKO; and 4 operations that are defined as special political missions and peace-building missions. The next eight groups cover operations conducted or led by regional organizations or alliances: 1 by the African Union; 1 by the Economic and Monetary Community of Central African States (CEMAC, Communauté Economique et Monétaire d'Afrique Centrale), 3 by the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), including 1 mission carried out by Russia under bilateral arrangements; 11 by the EU; 3 by NATO; 2 by the Organization of American States (OAS); and 10 by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE). The final group lists 6 operations led by ad hoc coalitions of states that were sanctioned by the UN.

Missions which were initiated in 2005 and new states joining an existing mission appear in bold text; operations and individual state participation which ended in 2005 are shown in italics; and designated lead states (those that either have operational control or contribute the most personnel) are underlined.

Legal instruments underlying the establishment of an operation—UN Security Council resolutions or formal decisions by regional organizations—and the start dates for the operations (by which SIPRI refers to dates of first deployments) are cited in the first column.

Approved personnel numbers, particularly for UN operations, refer to the most recently authorized staffing level. National breakdowns of personnel numbers and the number of local support staff are not included in the figures presented in the table but, where available, are given in the notes below the table.

Mission fatalities are recorded as a total from the beginning of the mission until the last reported date for 2005 and as a total for 2005. Fatality numbers for the reporting year are broken down by cause of death: accidental, hostile acts and illness.

Unless otherwise stated, all figures are as of 31 December 2005 or as of the date on which the mission closed.

Budget figures are given in millions of US dollars. Starting this year, conversions from budgets set in other currencies are based on the aggregated market exchange rates for 2005 of the International Monetary Fund (IMF).[8] Budget figures presented for UN operations refer to core operational costs, which among other things include the cost of deploying personnel, per diems for deployed personnel and direct non-field support costs (e.g., requirements for the support account for peacekeeping operations and the UN logistics base in Brindisi). The cost of UN peacekeeping missions is shared by all UN member states through a specially derived scale of assessed contributions that takes no account of their participation in the peacekeeping operations. Political and peace-building missions are funded through regular budget assessments. UN peacekeeping budgets do not cover programmatic costs, such as

---

[7] E.g., in its capacity as a mediator in the conflict in the Philippines, Malaysia has led a team of observers to monitor the ceasefire between the Philippine Government and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front.

[8] This follows the methodology employed by the SIPRI Military Expenditure Project in its data analysis. In previous years, figures as of 31 Dec. were used in the peace missions table. The change to using the IMF's aggregated market exchange rates limits the inconsistency of the budget data owing to fluctuating currency exchange rates.

those for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, which are financed by voluntary contributions.

In contrast, budget figures for operations conducted by regional organizations such as the EU and NATO refer only to common costs. This includes mainly the running costs of EU and NATO headquarters (the costs of civilian personnel and operations and maintenance) and investments in the infrastructure necessary to support the operation. The costs of deploying personnel are borne by the states which send personnel and do not appear in the budget figures given here. Most EU missions are financed in one of two ways, depending on whether they are civilian or military missions. Civilian missions are funded through the Community Budget, while military missions or missions with military components are funded through the Athena mechanism, to which only the participating member states contribute.[9] In missions by other organizations, such as the OAS Mission in Haiti and in general the ad hoc missions, budget figures for missions may include programme implementation. For these reasons, budget figures presented in this table are best viewed as estimates and the budgets for different missions should not be compared.

Data on multilateral peace missions are obtained from the following categories of open source: (*a*) official information provided by the secretariat of the organization; (*b*) information from the mission on the ground, either in official publications or in responses to annual SIPRI questionnaires; and (*c*) information from national governments contributing to the mission in question. These primary sources are supplemented with a wide selection of publicly available secondary sources consisting of specialist journals; research reports; news agencies; and international, regional and local newspapers. The sources are given in the notes.

[9] The Athena mechanism is a financial and administrative instrument that provides for the administration of costs that are defined as common costs. European Union, Council Joint Action 2004/197/CFSP, 23 Feb. 2004, establishing a mechanism to administer the financing of the common costs of European Union operations having military or defence implications.