

## Tip Sheet

### Key questions to explore UN integration arrangements and engagement with peacekeeping operations on the protection of civilians

September 18, 2015

This tip sheet includes a series of questions to support information collection by InterAction members on (i) the implications of United Nations integration arrangements for humanitarian operations and (ii) the interpretation and implementation of UN peacekeeping operations' (PKOs) protection of civilians mandates. The questions are designed to assist members, for example, when engaging on matters related to protection of civilians mandates or undertaking field visits to contexts where UN integration policy applies.<sup>1</sup> Members can utilize their observations to inform joint analyses and actions, for example, through InterAction working groups, other collaborative efforts of InterAction members, or the work of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC). Along with the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) and the Steering Committee for Humanitarian Response (SCHR), InterAction represents the views and concerns of NGOs to the IASC, including on UN integration matters.

This is an informal and evolving document. If you have any input to improve this tip sheet or questions on UN integration arrangements or matters related to the protection of civilians, please contact InterAction's Director of Protection, Jenny McAvoy, at [jmcavoy@interaction.org](mailto:jmcavoy@interaction.org).

#### UN integration

1. Are the staff of your organization familiar with and making use of integration guidance, including the UN Integrated Assessment and Planning (IAP) Policy, the UN IAP Handbook (particularly the sections detailing procedures for Strategic Assessments and risk analysis), and the IASC Principals' guidance on UN integration?
2. Are there particular implications of UN integration arrangements that are of concern to your team in-country? Do they feel these issues are recognized and are being addressed in a constructive and collaborative manner by the Humanitarian Coordinator (HC), Humanitarian Country Team (HCT), and broader humanitarian community?
3. Has the HCT or UN initiated a thorough risk assessment to determine the implications that UN integration arrangements could have for humanitarian operations, as well as to help inform decision-making on UN integration structures and practices? A risk assessment should be undertaken in order to ensure that the integration arrangements "take full account of humanitarian principles", "facilitate effective humanitarian coordination with all humanitarian actors", and "protect humanitarian space".<sup>2</sup>
4. Does the HCT regularly review risks regarding humanitarian activities in integrated settings? If so, is appropriate information shared with its respective PKO or special political mission (SPM)? Do actors examine the PKO's or SPM's internal decision-making processes, as well as those within

---

<sup>1</sup> Currently, the UN has integrated presences in Afghanistan, Burundi, the Central African Republic, Cote d'Ivoire (Ivory Coast), the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Darfur, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Iraq, Israel/occupied Palestinian territory, Kosovo, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Sierra Leone, Somalia, and South Sudan.

<sup>2</sup> *Integrated Assessment and Planning Handbook*, United Nations, December 2013, p. 34, <http://www.undg.org/docs/13379/2014-IAP-HandBook.pdf>.

the UN Country Team and the HCT, to see if these are affecting principled humanitarian action?<sup>3</sup> Are the HC, the HCT, and broader humanitarian community continually engaging with the PKO or SPM to update the risk analysis for UN integration arrangements?

5. Are humanitarian actors seen as aligned with one side in the conflict, or as promoting certain political interests, due to an association with the PKO or SPM and its mandated tasks (for example, security sector reform, elections, or military actions that are intended to neutralize armed groups)? Are there pro-active efforts on the part of the humanitarian community and/or the PKO or SPM to maintain a distinct and independent humanitarian identity so as to avoid negative effects arising from such an association?<sup>4</sup>
6. What arrangements exist between the PKO or SPM and humanitarian actors on the following matters:
  - a. Joint analysis;
  - b. Humanitarian advocacy (including public communication);
  - c. Protection (of civilians, IDPs, refugees, etc.);
  - d. Humanitarian access (e.g., civil-military coordination and logistical support);
  - e. Humanitarian negotiations;
  - f. Contact with non-state armed actors; and
  - g. Security management?<sup>5</sup>
7. Has the PKO or SPM undertaken adjustments or corrective action when there have been negative effects due to integration or significant changes in the context or the PKO's/SPM's mandate?<sup>6</sup>
8. Has your NGO taken any steps (informed InterAction, ICVA, or SCHR, as your representatives to the IASC; submitted formal letters of concern; disengaged from UN-led coordination, etc.) if UN integration arrangements have impacted your NGO's ability to conduct humanitarian activities?

#### Humanitarian engagement on the protection of civilians with a UN PKO

1. Is there a shared understanding of the PKO's protection of civilians mandate and priority tasks?<sup>7</sup>
2. Is there a shared analysis of the risks faced by the civilian population and, of these, where and how the PKO is well-positioned to have a positive impact?<sup>8</sup>
3. Has the PKO consulted all relevant actors, including the affected population, the HC, HCT, and Protection Cluster or Working Group, to develop its protection of civilians strategy? Have there been efforts to ensure complementarity with the strategies of humanitarian actors?<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> See "UN Integration and humanitarian space: building a framework for flexibility", IASC Principals, July 2013, p. 9, <http://www.humanitarianinfo.org/iasc/downloaddoc.aspx?docID=6885&type=pdf>, for the recommendation regarding such a mechanism.

<sup>4</sup> See *ibid*, p. 6, for discussion of the need to maintain principled humanitarian action and a distinct identity in the case of harmful associations with UN peacekeeping or political missions.

<sup>5</sup> As of yet, there are no broad-reaching best practices on integration arrangements for the noted matters. The IASC review of the impact of UN integration on humanitarian action (expected to be finalized in September 2015) will help establish a body of practice observations and recommendations regarding these matters.

<sup>6</sup> See the *Integrated Assessment and Planning Handbook*, p. 16, for the guidance to carry out a new Strategic Assessment following these changes. The assessment can be triggered by the UN at headquarters or the field.

<sup>7</sup> See *Framework for Drafting Comprehensive Protection of Civilians (POC) Strategies in UN Peacekeeping Operations*, UN, May 2011, p. 10, <http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/523998464.pdf>

<sup>8</sup> Multiple references touch upon this expectation. See, for instance, *ibid*, p. 8, and "Diagnostic Tool and Guidance on the InterAction between field Protection Clusters and UN missions", Global Protection Cluster, July 2013, p. 12-13, [http://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/assets/files/tools\\_and\\_guidance/GPC\\_Diagnostic\\_Tool\\_Interaction\\_UN\\_Missions\\_2013\\_EN.pdf](http://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/assets/files/tools_and_guidance/GPC_Diagnostic_Tool_Interaction_UN_Missions_2013_EN.pdf).

4. Are there agreed mechanisms and/or standard operating procedures for information-sharing, including for early-warning? Are there explicit agreements to safeguard confidentiality? Are they adequate and are they being adhered to by all concerned parties?<sup>10</sup>
5. Have NGOs engaged with the PKO through the Protection Cluster or Working Group or HC on the protection roles and responsibilities that OCHA or UNHCR and humanitarians are expected to fulfill as stipulated in the 'roles and responsibilities' section and the implementation matrix of the PKO's protection of civilians strategy?<sup>11</sup>
6. Is the PKO's protection of civilians strategy followed in practice or have there been deviations? Has the PKO informed the HCT and Protection Cluster or Working Group of what it can and cannot do to contribute to the protection of civilians in light of its resource limitations?<sup>12</sup>
7. Is the UN peacekeeping mission's protection strategy kept up to date, including following significant changes in context, in consultation with the HC, HCT, and Protection Cluster or Working Group?<sup>13</sup>
8. Are NGOs engaging on a continual basis with the PKO through OCHA or the Protection Cluster or Working Group to establish a common picture and prioritization of risks based upon their likelihood and significance?<sup>14</sup>
9. Has the Protection Cluster or Working Group collaborated with the PKO to develop contingency plans that account for the threats, vulnerabilities, and the capacities of the vulnerable population?<sup>15</sup>
10. Are there agreed decision-making and coordination structures between the PKO and the HC and HCT for response to critical and urgent threats to the civilian population?<sup>16</sup>
11. Do the HCT, Protection Cluster or Working Group, and broader humanitarian community participate in lessons learned exercises and after action reviews in the aftermath of critical operations undertaken by PKOs?<sup>17</sup>
12. Is the PKO implementing the Human Rights Due Diligence Policy (HRDDP)? If so, is the peacekeeping mission holding consultations with the UN Country Team and/or the HCT on the HRDDP implementation framework?<sup>18</sup> Have any issues arisen regarding matters covered by the policy and, if so, were they addressed in a satisfactory manner?

---

<sup>9</sup> See *Framework for Drafting*, p. 3-5.

<sup>10</sup> For guidance on information sharing, see and "Diagnostic Tool and Guidance on the InterAction between field Protection Clusters and UN missions", Global Protection Cluster, July 2013, p. 10, [http://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/assets/files/tools\\_and\\_guidance/GPC\\_Diagnostic\\_Tool\\_Interaction\\_UN\\_Missions\\_2013\\_EN.pdf](http://www.globalprotectioncluster.org/assets/files/tools_and_guidance/GPC_Diagnostic_Tool_Interaction_UN_Missions_2013_EN.pdf).

<sup>11</sup> See *ibid*, p. 12, for discussion of the need to have clear roles, responsibilities, and activities noted in a UN peacekeeping mission's protection of civilians strategy regarding the role of humanitarians in contributing to the protection of civilians.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid* requires that the protection of civilians strategy includes a comprehensive, pragmatic discussion of what a UN peacekeeping mission can undertake and that any gaps or inadequacies are noted.

<sup>13</sup> See *ibid*, p. 8, for requirements on when a protection of civilians strategy should be updated.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>15</sup> For this standard, see *Security Council resolution 1894 (2009)* [on the protection of civilians in armed conflict], UN, 11 November 2009, p. 6, <http://www.refworld.org/docid/4b0550d42.html>; "Diagnostic Tool and", p. 14; and *Framework for Drafting*, p. 4.

<sup>16</sup> See *Framework for Drafting*, p. 9.

<sup>17</sup> See *ibid*, p. 16.

<sup>18</sup> For the need to consult with the UN Country Team on the HRDDP, see *Document A/67/775*, UN, 5 March 2013, p. 7, [http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=S/2013/110&referer=http://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/letters/2013.shtml&Lang=E](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/2013/110&referer=http://www.un.org/en/sc/documents/letters/2013.shtml&Lang=E).

## Critical references

### UN integration

1. [Decision No. 2008/24 – Integration](#), UN, June 2008.
2. [Integrated Assessment and Planning Handbook](#), UN, December 2013.
3. [Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning](#), UN, April 2013.
4. [“UN Integration and Humanitarian Space: An Independent Study Commissioned by the UN Integration Steering Group”](#), Humanitarian Policy Group and Stimson Center, December 2011.
5. [“UN Integration and humanitarian space: building a framework for flexibility”](#), IASC Principals, July 2013.

### Protection of civilians

1. [“Diagnostic Tool and Guidance on the InterAction between field Protection Clusters and UN missions”](#), Global Protection Cluster, July 2013.
2. [Evaluation of the implementation and results of protection of civilians mandates in United Nations peacekeeping operations: Report of the Office of Internal Oversight Services \(OIOS\)](#), UN, March 2014.
3. [Framework for Drafting Comprehensive Protection of Civilians \(POC\) Strategies in UN Peacekeeping Operations](#), UN, May 2011.
4. [United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Principles and Guidelines](#), UN, 2008.
5. [Uniting Our Strengths for Peace – Politics, Partnership and People, Report of the High-Level Independent Panel on United Nations Peace Operations](#), UN, June 2015.