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## Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AfDB</td>
<td>African Development Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGA</td>
<td>African Governance Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFISMA</td>
<td>African-led International Support Mission in Mali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICRC</td>
<td>African Immediate Crisis Response Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMISOM</td>
<td>African Mission in Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APF</td>
<td>(EU) Africa Peace Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APP</td>
<td>(Danish) Africa Programme for Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APRM</td>
<td>African Peer Review Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSA</td>
<td>African Peace and Security Architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASF</td>
<td>Africa Stand-by Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU</td>
<td>African Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>African Union Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AULO</td>
<td>AU Liaison Office/Field Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUPG</td>
<td>African Union Partner Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEN-SAD</td>
<td>Community of Sahel-Saharan States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEWS</td>
<td>(AU) Continental Early Warning System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMESA</td>
<td>Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>(OECD) Development Assistance Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DKK</td>
<td>Danish Kroner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>East Africa Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECCAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of Central African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EASFCOM</td>
<td>East Africa Standby Force Coordination Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOWAS</td>
<td>Economic Community of West African States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IGAD</td>
<td>Inter-Governmental Authority for Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JFA</td>
<td>Joint Funding Arrangement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAIPTC</td>
<td>Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MITF</td>
<td>Mali Integrated Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU</td>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation for Economic Co-operation &amp; Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POW</td>
<td>Panel of the Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRC</td>
<td>(AU) Permanent Representatives Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC</td>
<td>(AU) Peace &amp; Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSD</td>
<td>(AU) Peace &amp; Security Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDC</td>
<td>Rapid Deployment Capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>Regional Economic Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI-LRA</td>
<td>Regional Cooperation Initiative – Lord’s Resistance Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SADC</td>
<td>Southern African Development Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAMID</td>
<td>United Nations Africa Mission in Darfur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNECA</td>
<td>United Nations Economic Commission for Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSCR</td>
<td>United Nations Security Council Resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANEP</td>
<td>West Africa Network for Peacebuilding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Executive Summary

At the May 2013 African Union Summit, Africa’s leaders again reinforced their support for the development and full operationalization of comprehensive approaches for responding to conflict on the continent. They noted that the African Peace and Security Architecture – or APSA - forms the basis for this through its mix of operational and structural mechanisms stretching across the continent and the spectrum of conflict responses.

APSA within the African peace and security environment

APSA is the collective term for a number of capability areas highlighted in Article 2 of the Protocol establishing the African Union’s Peace and Security Council (PSC). These are: decision-making structures - the PSC itself; an early warning mechanism - the Continental Early Warning System; an integrated response capacity comprising military, police and civilian elements - the African Stand-by Force; a capacity for preventative diplomacy and advice – the Panel of the Wise; and a mechanism for making available adequate financing for peace initiatives - the AU Peace Fund. As a whole, the APSA can be thought of as a framework for enabling a coherent and effective African contribution to peace and security on the continent and, as an element in one of the AU’s core documents, has a statutory basis. It fits also together with the AU’s emphasis on the promotion of democratic governance and human rights. The APSA requires the AU to work closely with its sub-regional partners (the African Regional Economic Communities and Regional Mechanisms) on the same agenda and for both sets of organisations to have the support of their member states.

In general, progress on operationalizing the main APSA capability areas has increased in tempo over the past few years and is being matched by an increasing assertiveness by the AU and certain of the sub-regional organisations in response to African crisis and post conflict situations. This has most recently been illustrated by the response to the crisis in Mali in 2012/2013, but other examples include Darfur, Somalia, Northern Uganda, eastern DRC, Guinea-Bissau, and South Sudan. There is also an increasing connectivity to the global peace and security architecture, as epitomised by the United Nations, and a number of joint initiatives are emerging. As a consequence of its willingness to take a greater share of the responsibility for resolving African crises, the AU is demanding more representation in decision-making on them and access to financing and other resources.

While political decision-making, early warning, preventative diplomacy, a speedy and flexible response capability, and adequate and predictable funding are specified in the PSC Protocol and are absolutely central to the APSA, the AU is increasingly taking the view that a wider range of capabilities is needed to respond effectively to Africa’s peace and security challenges in a manner that is also preventative. These include security sector reform, counter terrorism, post conflict reconstruction and development, maritime security, small arms and light weapons proliferation, and disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration. By and large, the operationalization of these other capabilities is less developed than the core APSA areas and there is substantial further policy and technical work required. APSA as a whole continues to require significant external support and partnership for its development.

Key issues here concern; firstly, the role that the AU and the sub-regional organisations should play in relation to each other and to member states and, secondly, the role taken compared to other, often more specialised and better resourced, agencies. Resolving this requires determining where the comparative advantages of the different actors lie. As this report shows,
the degree to which the different organisations are able to contribute varies and the way forward must be based on a coherent partnership.

It is relevant that the AU and the sub-regional organisations are faced with the challenge of responding to crises on the continent at the same time as they are developing the capacity to do so. Not surprisingly, therefore, the overall picture is uneven and, by and large, the sub-regional organisations are less advanced on operationalizing APSA capabilities than the AU. The state of preparedness of the regional brigades contributing to the African Standby Force varies, for example. With some minor exceptions, the standby force framework has not yet contributed to African peace operations and the operations that have been launched have been on an ad-hoc basis. Also, as recent assessments indicate, there is a need to improve the coherency of the system as a whole, including its linkages to regional and global initiatives, capacities and the assistance available from partners. It can be argued that specialised agencies (UN agencies, for example) should be prepared to give “space” to the African organisations, through involving them in decision-making and facilitation where relevant. There are some examples of this approach emerging.

The report explains that, as the work on operationalizing APSA capabilities progresses, there will be a need to focus on four main areas: (a) within the APSA itself, by strengthening the breadth and depth of the main APSA areas and the other capabilities; (b) improving the balance between the AU and the sub-regional organisations, all of whom are markedly weaker, so that the latter can act as robust partners; (c) enhancing the partnership between the African organisations and their global counterparts so that African commitments are recognised (for example, through more predictable financing), and (d) strengthening the engagement between the African organisations and their member states.

**APSA within the global peace and security architecture**

Ensuring the full operationalization of the APSA capabilities lies at the core of the African peace and security organisations’ ability to play a meaningful role on the continent. Promisingly, the connectivity here is developing and the AU, in particular, is now more involved that at any time previously. It is significant, for example, that the AU Peace and Security Council and the UN Security Council hold annual political consultations, alternating between Addis Ababa and New York. The most recent meeting was on 8 October 2013. Since the rather chaotic reaction to Libya, the cooperation has become progressively more substance based and focused on how best to respond to concrete crises. It has been accompanied by a more technical dialogue at senior official level; a Joint Task Force on Peace and Security was established in 2010 and meets twice a year. Ad hoc groups have also been established to follow particular issues, such as the Support and Follow-up Group on Mali. There are also the beginnings of a desk-to-desk cooperation. Since 2010, an important facilitating element in this relationship has been the UN Office to the AU (UNOAU) in Addis Ababa, which is now headed by an official of Under-Secretary General rank.

But, while the relationship is on a positive trajectory and is becoming more valuable, it is not without tensions. With the UN, a key (as yet unresolved) issue concerns status; the UN’s Charter mandates the Security Council as having the primary responsibility for international peace and security and there is a reluctance to defer to the AU on African peace and security issues. The PSC, on the other hand, argues that it has greater interests and understanding of African issues and that (especially UN mandated but African-led missions) should be eligible for UN financial support. In short, the AU wants a relationship that is underpinned by a shared strategic vision involving a flexible and innovative interpretation of the UN Charter’s key Chapter VIII on regional cooperation (the hybrid mission in Darfur is seen as an example of this), enhanced consultations between the PSC and the Security Council (including more adequate
follow up on decisions), further collaborative missions and practical cooperation, and a solution to the issue of how to ensure predictable, sustainable and flexible funding for African-led peace support missions.

**APSA and Danish assistance to regional peace and security processes**

Over the last decade, Denmark has been an active and valued supporter of the enhanced African engagement on peace and security. With an increasing commitment to contributing to the resolution of African peace and security issues – in particular through the strengthening of the capacities of leading African institutions – the developments relating to APSA have implications for Danish security assistance and the way it is organised. This report sees that the overall coherency of the Danish support could be strengthened through extending to other peace and security related programmes the arrangements already in place for stabilisation support. An obvious candidate for this is the Africa Programme for Peace (APP), which is currently the main channel for Danish support to APSA. This would enable greater concentration of effort, sharing of knowledge and exploitation of synergies that are available.

**Key messages**

In reviewing the development of APSA, its linkages to global actors and initiatives, and to Danish policy and programmes in the area, the following key messages are apparent:

- **APSA** is the collective term for a series of key enabling capabilities within the areas of political decision-making, early warning, preventative diplomacy, and response. Its focus is broadening to include a range of supporting capabilities as well as linkages to areas such as governance, broadly defined.

- The **African Union** is consolidating its position as the paramount African peace and security organisation. This is not least thanks to the intensive capacity building and support that it has received over the last decade. Further institution building needs to be matched by a demonstration of seriousness and competence from the AU and a willingness to engage it and give it space from global agencies in response. This needs to extend beyond political dialogue and involve operational partnerships.

- There is regular dialogue between the **AU and the African sub-regional organisations** but the functional level contacts between desks require extension and should become a natural part of business. However, the sub-regional organisations’ capacities in terms of political decision-making, staff capacity and financial resourcing are highly variable and generally much weaker than those of the AU. Limitations here have a negative impact on their ability to deliver concrete results on APSA capabilities. As a consequence, there is an asymmetry between the capacity of the AU and the sub-regional organisations that restricts the degree of subsidiarity possible.

- There is a significantly greater degree of political dialogue between the **UN and African organisations** emerging, although it needs to develop further. The AU PSC feels a continuing need to underline the importance of adequate consultation in relation to the organisations’ peace and security mandates.

- Lessons learnt from the **Mali crisis in 2012-2013** are leading to (a) renewed thinking on early response, (esp. rapid deployment) and (b) sharpening up of APSA generally with increased focus on prevention. On the one hand, the AU is becoming more assertive and more engaged with global processes as a result. On the other, the experience demonstrates that the capabilities required are not yet in place to allow the AU to fully meet its political and operational expectations. The sub-regional organisations lag further behind.
• Operational interaction between the AU and the UN is deepening and broadening as African-led peace operations expand. But major policy issues remain, esp. on PSO financing. A renewed effort is required to find an acceptable model. Practical cooperation is also taking place in other areas (for example, peace building) where joint missions have taken place. The UN Office to the African Union in Addis Ababa has helped energise these links.

• The EU is the other significant partner. The EU’s Africa Peace Facility is financing both African-led PSO and APSA operationalization. An evaluation of the Facility is expected to report in late 2013.

• The linkages to the new aid architecture (New Deal etc.) are unclear. The AU should be pulling greater weight here through advocacy and engagement.

• There is also a clear potential for APSA to support cross-cutting issues (including gender and human rights) but they are not yet being fully exploited. The core APSA capabilities all have major roles to play in relation to protecting human rights but the response is overly ad-hoc.

• The work to provide an effective African-led peace support operations capability (the African Standby Force) needs to be reviewed to ensure that recent lessons from the response to Mali are assimilated. Inter alia, the AU Chairperson’s African Immediate Crisis Response Capacity initiative and the ASF’s Rapid Deployment Capability need to be harmonised.

• The AU Peace Fund continues to be inadequate as a source of funding for the AU’s peace and security programmes. It requires rethinking. The poor response of member states to finding a solution to its persistent underfunding indicates a lack of political will. Yet, the current situation where external partners fund over 95% of operational peace and security activities is clearly not sustainable. A similar predicament faces most other African regional organisations.

• The coming review by the AU of the APSA and the development of a new APSA Road Map must critically assess the degree to which APSA capabilities are in place at the AU and amongst the sub-regional organisations and ensure that key enabling capacities are in place. This will provide a sounder basis for early response as well as prevention.

• Denmark is a modest but valued partner. It has this position courtesy of its active engagement rather than the size of its contribution. Nonetheless, Denmark’s niche role can be exploited to target key areas of APSA that need strengthening. It can do this through its dialogue and the selective use of technical assistance. The APSA Road Map provides a basis for alignment.

• The increasing number of Danish peace and security interventions suggests the need to ensure overall coherency, knowledge sharing and possibilities for synergies between programmes. For example, a way could be found to involve the Africa Programme for Peace (APP) in the Whole of Government Steering Group (Samtænkingsstyregruppen) and strengthen the coherency and monitoring of the two funding mechanisms.

• It is highly relevant for the third phase of Danida’s Africa Programme for Peace (APP III) to focus on the APSA priorities through alignment with the new APSA Road Map. There is a need to promote further operational linkages between the AU and RECs on the one hand and between them and the UN, World Bank, AfDB etc. on the other.
The African Peace and Security Architecture and global and regional initiatives

1 Introduction

This paper provides a mapping and assessment of the state of play on the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA) and its relationship to other global, regional and Danish initiatives within the field of peace and security. The fundamental role of the APSA and related platforms in operationalizing an operational and structural response to conflict on the continent was most recently reiterated by African leaders at the May 2013 AU Summit.

APSA is the collective term for a number of specific capability areas intended to strengthen Africa’s ability to respond to the peace and security challenges facing the continent. The APSA capabilities are specifically mentioned in Article 2 of the 2002 Protocol establishing the African Union’s Peace and Security Council (PSC) and thus form important building blocks for the organisation. These comprise the PSC itself, the Continental Early Warning System (CEWS), the African Stand-by Force (ASF), a Panel of the Wise (PoW), and the AU Peace Fund (APF).

The APSA also stands upon a number of pillars, including the AU Commission and the sub-regional organisations (known as Regional Economic Communities and Regional Mechanisms – RECs/RMs). It can thus be thought of as a framework for enabling a more coherent and effective African contribution to peace and security on the continent. APSA is firmly anchored within the AU's new Strategic Plan that was approved in May 2013 and, to varying degrees, is reflected in the strategic plans of the sub-regional organisations.

Diagram 1: Main components and interrelationships of the APSA
After a decade of development, the main capabilities comprising the APSA have achieved a certain level of operationality and this has fed into the more active engagement from the AU and the sub-regional organisations and member states in crisis situations on the continent. Examples include Burundi, Côte d’Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Darfur, Somalia, South Sudan, Guinea-Bissau, and most recently the Central African Republic and Mali. However, the AU and the sub-regional organisations are faced with the dual challenge of responding to crises on the continent at the same time as they are developing the capacity to do so. Not surprisingly, therefore, the overall picture is uneven and some areas have developed much more than others. In addition, there is a need to improve the coherency of the system as a whole, including its linkages to regional and global initiatives, capacities and the assistance available from partners.

Denmark has been supporting the African Union, some of the key sub-regional organisations and other African stakeholders relating to APSA capabilities since 2004 through its Africa Programme for Peace (APP). In addition, a number of other Danish programmes within the same or adjacent areas have been established, including stabilisation programmes in the Horn of Africa and the Sahel. Other Danish support has contributed to APSA through the activities of NGOs and applied research institutes.

1.1 Purpose of the study

The objective of this study is to assess the progress made in operationalizing the APSA capabilities seen in the perspective of their place within the broader global peace and security architecture based on the current state of conflict on the African continent. In addition, the study examines areas of Danish engagement of relevance to the APSA, including the different programme and policy areas supported by Denmark.

The Terms of Reference for the study highlight a number of issues within three main areas: (a) the thinking and rationale behind the APSA and its main pillars, the main achievements, challenges and possible setbacks; (b) the APSA capabilities within the broader and global peace and security architecture (including the UN, EU and capabilities supported by them) and ways to strengthen this relationship for mutual benefit; and (c) the complementarity, synergies, coherence and consistency of Danish assistance to regional peace and security processes on the African continent and how this can be strengthened. In addition, the ToR ask that the study consider cross-cutting issues, including the new aid effectiveness agenda (the New Deal etc.) and initiatives relating to women and children living in contexts of conflict and fragility, such as UN Security Council Resolutions 1325 and 1882.

1.2 Methodology

The study combines desk-based research drawing from documentation openly available or made available by stakeholders and field-work in Addis Ababa, where officials from the AU, IGAD and major international partners were consulted. This has been supplemented through telephone interviews with other stakeholders and experts. Danish officials in the MFA, Danish Defence Command and the Danish Embassy in Addis Ababa have also been consulted.

---

1 The main organisations supported have been the African Union (AU), the Inter-Governmental Authority on Development (IGAD), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the East Africa
2 ToR, APSA Study. Danish Embassy in Addis Ababa, April 2013
3 APSA Study: Synopsis of Preliminary Findings, Tana. 20 May 2013
1.3 Structure of the report

The report is divided into three main sections. In the first section, a mapping and analysis of the state of play on the APSA is provided. The APSA is set in the context of a generally more assertive AU, characterised by its policy of “non-indifference” which has meant that the APSA capabilities have come to be seen as the principal vehicles for enabling structural and operational responses to conflict. The section ends with a number of key conclusions regarding APSA and the priorities for the immediate future. The second section describes the way in which African peace and security issues and the APSA are being integrated into the global security architecture, epitomised by the UN, and also the aid effectiveness agenda. The third section provides an overview of Danish experiences in relation to APSA capabilities, noting that Denmark has a number of different programmes and modalities available. Some observations as to how these can be used cohesively are also provided. The report closes with a set of conclusions linking the three analytical sections.
2 APSA within the African peace and security environment

This section provides an outline of the main results being achieved on the capabilities within the framework of the APSA and the lessons being learnt. Important aspects are the interaction between the AU and the African sub-regional organisations responsible for peace and security and their capacities in terms of political decision-making, staff capacity and financial sourcing. Limitations here have an impact on the ability to deliver concrete results on APSA capabilities but also present opportunities for dialogue and institutional strengthening. The AU recognises that it cannot move forward without a partnership with the sub-regional organisations, member states, the UN and other international actors, including bilateral partners.

2.1 Context

The APSA is located within a peace and security terrain in Africa that continues to evolve. There continues to be violent conflict on the continent and there are a number of countries that remain decidedly fragile. Many more still need to consolidate their democratic institutions and other governance arrangements. Elections pose serious risks for incumbents and are often manipulated as a result. Since 2008, coups have taken place in Mauritania (August 2008), Guinea (December 2008), Madagascar (March 2009), Niger (February 2010), Mali (March 2012), Guinea-Bissau (April 2012) and Central African Republic (2013). The Arab Spring also resulted in a series of regime changes across North Africa from 2011, to which the AU and the sub-regional organisations concerned have often struggled to find a coherent response. The UN has more peace missions (eight) in Africa than in any other part of the world.4 2013 alone demonstrates the relevance of timely and effective responses to political and security crises on the continent, most notably the need to respond adequately to situations arising in eastern DRC, South Sudan, Sudan, Somalia, CAR and Mali.

Despite the at times chaotic response to the Arab Spring and its effects, there is a trend in African conflict prevention and peace building that is increasingly positive. It is helped by the more assertive and interventionist stance being taken by key African peace and security actors, particularly at the continental and sub-regional level. Compared to the situation a decade ago, there is now a marked African engagement in conflict management and peace support being spearheaded by the African Union, certain of the sub-regional organisations and some member states. This is demonstrated by the range of peace and security initiatives that are beginning to match actions to the normative frameworks that have been established, including preventative diplomacy, mediation and peace support operations in Burundi, Comoros, Côte d’Ivoire, Darfur, CAR, DRC, Guinea-Bissau, Mali, Somalia, and South Sudan.

The threats to national, regional and international security require coherent and targeted responses and it is increasingly recognised that the African organisations, led by the AU, have a distinct role to play given their mandate and legitimacy. Many of the initiatives are direct outcomes of the work progressing under the framework of the APSA.

That said, the effort involved in developing the arrangements to respond to crisis while at the same time actually taking concrete action presents challenges. The AU was effectively sidelined over Libya and had difficulty maintaining a coherent international voice. Compared to this, it is

---

4 UN Missions in DRC, Côte d’Ivoire, Liberia, South Sudan, Sudan, and Western Sahara (peace missions) and Burundi, Central Africa, CAR, Guinea-Bissau, Libya, Sierra Leone, Somalia, and West Africa (political and peace building missions). Source, DPKO
much more engaged on Mali even though there remains a heavy reliance upon UN, EU and other partner financial and planning support. Moreover, although African countries have supplied the personnel to African-led peace missions, this has not yet been within the framework of the African Standby Force, which has raised questions about the relevance of the structures being built. The difficulties of putting in place robust and timely responses to crises have also revealed marked shortcomings in vertical coordination between the AU and the sub-regional organisations.

Over the past decade, the AU’s Peace and Security Council (PSC) has sometimes had difficulty in reconciling its policies with the national interests and actual practice of certain of its member states. In only rare cases are countries with serious governance and rights deficits barred from membership of the Council and it is unclear how the Council would respond to stability challenges in one of the major member states (such as Ethiopia or Nigeria). Meanwhile, the continued reliance upon non-African partners for financial and other support also undermines its credibility. The delays in getting AFISMA in Mali off the ground coupled with the French intervention at the last minute have caused the AU to rethink its approach to rapid deployment capabilities. During the January 2013 AU Summit and subsequently, there has been an unusually direct acknowledgement from the AU Commission that the response to Mali was not good enough.

What Mali and other instances show is that the relationship between the AU, the sub-regional organisations and the UN remains complicated and further steps need to be taken to improve alignment, capacity and burden sharing. A key issue concerns the availability of funding from UN assessed contributions for African-led peace missions.

A further factor is the inter-connectedness of national systems; in other words, people, commodities, ideas - opportunities as well as threats - and their tendency to cross borders. The current insecurity in the Sahel region, Darfur, Somalia, eastern DRC, CAR and Southern Sudan are clear demonstrations of the threats arising from porous borders, underdevelopment, militancy, lack of government presence and poor governance, and the proliferation of weapons. Other transnational threats include terrorism, organised crime (including drugs and human trafficking), piracy, migration and climate change. These issues are now on the agenda in a way that they were not a decade ago. They have led to a renewed emphasis on regional (as well as national) approaches to development, peace and security.

This in turn has led to a stronger recognition of the diversity of peace and security actors - including international organisations, national governments, organised and semi-organised civil society and other non-state actors – and the relevance of putting in place joined up and holistic approaches. Again, the vast terrain covered by peace and security issues in Africa requires actors to make conscious choices regarding their comparative advantages, where they can contribute, who they are prepared and able to work with, when, how and with what. There is a widespread view that blue-printed off-the-shelf solutions will not work because of contextual differences – so interventions must be context-specific. Even so, there is an obvious value in ensuring that core capabilities are available and modalities for cooperation are in place. This is the niche that APSA is intended to fill.

The extent to which the capabilities of the AU and the sub-regional organisations are well targeted, meet established and emerging needs and are utilised, efficient, effective and

---

5 Although Africa’s peace and security regime is promising, serious challenges remain. ISS Today, 3 May 2013.
6 Statement by Ambassador Ramtane Lamamra, 370 PSC meeting, 24 April 2013
accountable are key aspects of which the leadership in each organisation is aware. It is relevant and a positive development that the AU is demonstrating a more active continental leadership. However, this role is being played on a scene that is far from completed and where the AU and its regional counterparts are either still struggling to exert themselves or have leadership problems. So, while the logic for greater subsidiarity is clear, the practical expression of it is constrained by the capacity of the sub-regional organisations to effectively deliver. At best, this capacity is uneven.

Most of the sub-regional organisations (of which the key ones in relation to Africa peace and security are the ECOWAS, SADC, COMESA, ECCAS, EAC, IGAD, CEN-SAD) have relatively broad mandates that reflect the wide range of political, economic and social issues affecting the continent and its international role, while a few (EASFCOM) are almost wholly focused on development of the African Stand-by Force (ASF). Within their mandates, considerable attention is given to peace and security: for example, in ECOWAS’ Revised Treaty (1993) and its Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management, Resolution, Peacekeeping and Security (1999); in the Agreement Establishing IGAD (1996); and in the MOU establishing EASBRIG (2005). All of the sub-regional organisations prioritise active engagement, which in practice means that they expend considerable energy developing their normative frameworks, management systems and intellectual capacity while simultaneously engaging in concrete peace and security related initiatives. This is most obvious in the case of the ECOWAS, SADC and EASFCOM, all of which have deployed peacekeeping forces. ECOWAS, SADC and IGAD have also engaged in various preventative diplomacy and mediation efforts.

As mentioned, it is relevant that all the African organisations are still in the process of defining themselves. The multiple tasking places considerable pressure on the sub-regional organisations’ ability to meet their commitments and there is a widespread view, including within the sub-regional organisations themselves, that their systems and human resources are not yet optimised. The AU, which is shortly to embark on its third comprehensive strategic plan, is the organisation making the most obvious progress here, but even this is relatively recent. Despite its restructuring in 2008 as a Commission, ECOWAS struggles with the multiple tasking inherent to its political, security, economic and social agenda and the diversity of its member states, a number of which are either in conflict or recovering from it. The slow progress on ECOWAS’ ground-breaking conflict prevention framework (a fore-runner of the AU’s APSA Road Map) since 2009 is an indicator. IGAD and SADC have somewhat similar hurdles in operationalizing their peace and security mandates due to heavily centralised political decision-making structures and generally weak secretariats with limited freedom of action.

In this context, the AU is further solidifying its role as the paramount African organisation and the main interlocutor for the UN, EU and other international partners. It is the beneficiary of the majority of international support. Comparatively speaking, transparency is better, visibility is better, and coordination is better.

Equally, there is a tendency for the functions and membership of many of the sub-regional organisations to overlap, which counter-acts the efficiency and effectiveness of the system as a whole. Efforts are in hand to define their inter-relationships, taking into account the principles of subsidiarity, complementarity and comparative advantage. However, the experience shows that there continues to be work required to optimise this. The AU is generally focusing on eight sub-regional organisations. But even here, there is overlap. For example, EASFCOM, which is
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7 Up to 95% of the member states of a given REC also belong to another regional grouping.
CAMEII/Consol. Report (1), March 2006

8 MOU between the AU and RECs
The coordinating mechanism for the African Standby Force in East Africa, has a membership that straddles a number of RECs (IGAD, COMESA and EAC), all which have peace and security mandates. In the discussion on subsidiarity, which should involve delegated responsibilities to the lowest feasible level, observers comment that the AU appears more interested in sub-ordination.\(^9\)

### 2.2 Overview of the status of APSA’s components

As mentioned, the PSC Protocol outlines the central components of an African Peace and Security Architecture comprising the AU’s Peace and Security Council, the Continental Early Warning System, the African Stand-by Force, the Panel of the Wise, and an AU Peace Fund.\(^10\)

Most sources also now acknowledge the need to include other capability areas, particularly relating to conflict prevention and post conflict reconstruction. The current status on these varies, with some being relatively more developed than others, including in relation to their connectivity to the regional organisations and member states.\(^11\)

**Table 1: Status of main APSA components**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main APSA elements mentioned in PSC Protocol 2002</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace &amp; Security Council (PSC)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Meets regularly (400 meetings since 2002). Annual meetings with UNSC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Early Warning System (CEWS)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Increasing capacity &amp; feeds into PSC and PoW. Open source, AU based, also some capability amongst RECS but insufficient linkage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Standby Force (ASF)</td>
<td>Initial Operating Capability</td>
<td>Has initial operating capability. Road Map III leading to full operating capability in 2015 (but unlikely to be met). RECs at different levels of capacity. Needs review in light of AFISMA/AMISOM lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel of the Wise (POW)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Increasing engagement. Mediation Support Unit and PoW Secretariat established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU Peace Fund</td>
<td>Operational but inadequate</td>
<td>Approx. 8% of AU regular budget (target 12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An assessment of progress on operationalizing the APSA was undertaken in 2010 involving the AU, the sub-regional organisations and the EU.\(^12\) The resulting report largely reflected the picture shown above; certain components were relatively more advanced than the others and there were encouraging signs of vertical coordination in these two areas between the AU and RECs/RMs. This was partly explained by the fact that both had road maps for their operationalization and that these helped provide guidance and momentum. In terms of

\(^9\) Interviews in Addis Ababa.

\(^10\) PSC Protocol (2003) Article 2. Subsequent Articles describe the core features of the various APSA components.

\(^11\) The current status of implementation on core and wider APSA capabilities is summarised at annex A.

horizontal coordination, it was found that the APSA components had a tendency to operate in silos, without sufficient interaction between them and within the various institutions. The PSC, for example, was not sufficiently benefiting from the early warning systems developing under CEWS (although this has since improved). Similarly, there was insufficient connectivity between the sub-regional organisations.

The 2010 Assessment noted also a concern that APSA was not reflecting adequately the range of capabilities required to address Africa’s peace and security needs. In addition, it was found that the dependence upon partner funds for operationalizing the APSA raised questions about the sustainability, predictability and flexibility of the systems being put in place. Moreover, there was a lack of clarity surrounding the application of the concept of subsidiarity as it applies to the role of the AU vis à vis the sub-regional organisations. The basic thrust of the assessment’s findings was thus that **greater attention needed to be paid to the coordination and coherence of the APSA as well as the technical capacity and sustainability of the systems being established.** While there has clearly been substantial progress in a number of areas, these overall observations remain valid for others and thus represent strategic issues that need to be further addressed.

The 2010 Assessment Study fed into the development of the 2011-2013 APSA Road Map, which is an AU-EU product. The Road Map is due to be reviewed in the second half of 2013 (AU-lead) and can be expected to feed into an updated road map for 2014 onwards. It will be highly relevant that both the review and the road map take into account the evaluation of the EU’s Africa Peace Facility (APF), that is expected to report in late 2013.

### 2.2.1 Peace and Security Council

The PSC, which is essentially modelled on the UN Security Council (albeit with some important differences), was inaugurated at the first AU Summit in Durban in July 2002 as the AU’s principal decision-making body for the prevention, management and resolution of conflicts. Since then the Council has met over 390 times since 2002, now regularly meeting five or more times a month (compared to the two meetings a month originally envisaged).

The PSC’s fifteen members are elected on the basis of equal rights (i.e. no veto and no permanent membership); ten are elected for a two year period while the remaining five are elected for three years on the basis of equal representation of the five regions (being North, West, Central, East and Southern Africa). The Council functions at Head of State and Government, Ministerial and permanent representative level, the latter within a Permanent Representatives Council (PRC) that meets at least twice a month but in practice more frequently than this. In addition to the PRC, a Military Staff Committee has been established to provide military advice on security issues. The PSC and its sub-organs are chaired by the AU Commission’s Chairperson and supported by a small Secretariat.

In its initial years, the work of the PSC was hampered by a lack of adequate secretariat support – a point that was recognised in the 2010 APSA Assessment Study and the following APSA Road Map that has successfully prioritised enhancements to the PSC Secretariat, translation services, and consultative mechanisms with counterparts at regional level. In practice, the PSC is relatively unique in have regular meetings drawing upon permanent representatives located in Addis Ababa. While ECOWAS’ Mediation and Security Council (MSC) has similarly extensive decision-making powers, it needs to draw more heavily than the PSC on member states’
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representatives based in capitals. Both IGAD and SADC rely upon ministerial and heads of state meetings that are more cumbersome arrangements for policy making.

The PSC’s increasing workload places burdens on the member states as well as the AU’s own support mechanisms that feed into PSC decision-making on specific conflict and post conflict situations. With the expansion of the AU’s engagement in peace missions, the technical demands of this role have also increased. The Commission has responded to this by enhancing the technical staff capacity within the PSC Secretariat and greater attention has been paid to the Council’s working methods (a number of PSC Retreats have specifically focused on this aspect in 2012/13). The Secretariat has taken an increasing role in preparing for PSC discussions and follow-up, although servicing the large number of PSC meetings remains a challenge.

2.2.2 Continental Early Warning System

The Continental Early Warning System (CEWS) is an Addis-based data collection and analysis capability able to provide up-to-date information on potential, actual and post conflict situations to the AU decision-making organs and operational arms, such as the Panel of the Wise and Special Envoys. The system collects data from a variety of open and privileged sources, including independent media, the AU’s Liaison Offices and Field Missions located in crisis countries, and, to an increasing degree, from the sub-regional organisations.

CEWS is one of the areas contributing APSA that has advanced most in the past couple of years, which is not least thanks to the acquisition of further staff in Addis and data processing software. The system is now regularly feeding analysis to the AU’s Peace and Security Department and PSC Secretariat and this helping to inform decision-making. News monitoring outputs are gathered in the Africa News Brief and Daily News Highlights, as well as on the AU’s homepage (www.peaceau.org). The system is partially automated, using live monitoring software, roll out of real time data links (which are being extended to all AULOs and the RECs), as well as early warning monitoring tools (the Africa Media Monitor and the Africa Reporter), are contributing to efficiency and effectiveness. The EU has been a major supporter of CEWS in terms of assistance with software and procedures.

Certain of the RECs have also established early warning systems, most notably IGAD (CEWARN) and ECOWAS (ECOWARN). IGAD’s system is now extending beyond its original focus on pastoral conflicts to cover a wider range of threats across the IGAD region, information on which is gathered by local observers and collated by national early warning units (which thus perform a dual national and regional early warning function). ECOWAS’ system on the other hand is based on a small number of regional “nodes” (each covering a number of countries), which gather open source data and forward it to analysts located at the ECOWAS Commission in Abuja. Work is underway to enhance ECOWARN through more extensive civil society based monitoring at country level using indicators tailored to the specific contexts. A decision is needed regarding the continued utility of the regional nodes versus a more centralised system (more akin to CEWS in the AU).

The 2008 MOU between the AU and the RECs/RMs underpins the arrangements for data exchange between the AU and the sub-regional early warning systems. One concrete outcome is that quarterly technical meetings are now held to promote an operational partnership and help
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harmonise the data collection systems. These meetings appear to be useful and appreciated and serve as an example of the sort of operational cooperation envisaged by the APSA.\(^{16}\)

Despite these undoubted steps forward, the functionality of the system as a whole is constrained by human resource shortcomings (numbers as well as skills, including amongst agencies providing raw data) and constraints with data management and transmission (lack of real time connectivity, although this is being addressed).\(^{17}\) A recent review of the AU Liaison Offices, which are an important source of data for CEWS, indicated that some offices were not delivering reports of sufficient quality and timeliness. In such cases, analysts need to apply extra resources to collect and analyse data so that decision-makers are adequately informed.\(^{18}\) Also, the fact that not all RECs with early warning systems are connected with CEWS through real time data links, or routinely use the facilities available, is a limitation. A further constraint is the lack of standardisation between CEWS and the sub-regional systems, although efforts are being made to address this through sharing of licensing agreements for software. SADC is perhaps the most challenging due to its use of information drawn from intelligence sources.

### 2.2.3 African Standby Force

Like CEWS, the African Standby Force (ASF) has benefited from having a road map for its operationalization (currently Road Map III intended to bring the ASF to full operating capability by end 2015).\(^{19}\) The ASF’s basic concept rests on five regional standby capabilities (under RECs/RMs in Southern East, Central, West and North Africa) that will be able to deliver peace keeping forces at pre-set levels of readiness and capability according to a set of six envisaged scenarios following a decision by the UN or the AU. These are expected to include integrated missions drawing upon military, police and civil resources. Important elements of the ASF design have been largely defined in Road Map I (core concepts, doctrine, standards and command structures) and were reinforced in Road Map II (leading to the AMANI AFRICA command post exercise in October 2010).

Actual progress on the ground is variable and some regions are more advanced than others. The ASF is being criticised for not yet being able to deliver relevant capabilities to African peace missions, which continue to be managed on an ad-hoc basis. An exception to this are the capabilities developed through the East Africa Standby Force (including headquarters personnel and formed police units) that are being used in Somalia with AMISOM.

It is generally regarded that the regions progressing best are West Africa, East Africa and Southern Africa, although the modalities differ and there is a reliance on a few countries in each region. In Southern Africa, the SADC Brigade is largely dependent upon South Africa to act as lead nation. The situation in East Africa is more evenly balanced. Although Ethiopia is often seen as the regional hegemon, Uganda, Kenya, and Rwanda are all active members of
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Box 1: ASF deployment scenarios
The six ASF deployment scenarios are (1) attachment of an AU/regional military advisor to a political mission; (2) an AU/regional observer mission deployed within a UN mission; (3) a stand-alone AU regional observer mission; (4) deployment of a regional peacekeeping force under the auspices of a Chapter VI mandate within a timeframe of 30 days or less; (5) a multidimensional AU peacekeeping force deployed within 90 days with the military component within 30 days; and (6) a robust AU intervention force in response to “grave circumstances”, such as genocide, and deployment within 14 days.
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EASF. In West Africa, Nigeria plays a determining role. But the difficulties in getting AFISMA off the ground in 2012 suggest that the ECOWAS ASF contribution may not be as advanced as previously thought. In general, training and evaluation, logistics and command and control are areas that are lagging behind. The police and civilian components are also developing more slowly. Observers point to the gaps in policy and disparities between the various regional arrangements as having implications for mobilisation, deployment and interoperability of the ASF. They may also be perpetuating the existing ad hoc approach to interventions that are largely outside the ASF’s structures and heavily supported by external partners.20

The ASF design relies upon the ability of the AU and its regional counterparts to agree on the appropriate response to any given situation and to provide the leadership, military (and police and civilian) forces, logistics support, and funding required. A key component of this is a rapid deployment capability (RDC) able to respond quickly and be self-supporting for an initial period. Both the need for such a capability and the challenges of operationalizing it have been amply demonstrated recently by the response to the crisis in Mali, where the AU and ECOWAS had difficulty in putting an effective force on the ground in time.

Mali, as with previous crises in Côte d’Ivoire and Libya, also demonstrated the need for robust and timely decision-making to underpin a targeted response capability involving a mix of military, police and civilian capacities. For Mali, this necessitated alignment between the UN, AU and ECOWAS and key AFISMA contributing states on the provision, transport and logistic support of troops, where a major consideration for contributing states was also the provision of an adequately financed support package. Ultimately, events on the ground gained a pace that the three organisations were unable to match and led to the French Operation Serval in early 2013.

Drawing from this experience, the AU Summit in May 2013 agreed to develop arrangements for an African Immediate Crisis Response Capacity (AICRC) offering the possibility to draw from lead nation capabilities to place military forces on the ground rapidly. A report from the AU Chairperson in April 2013 notes the delays in logistical preparation and force generation of AFISMA units and reflects on the need for an operational military capability at continental level (i.e. one that is able to integrate perspectives from more than one region). It proposes “a transitional formula” to provide a “military capacity with high reactivity to respond swiftly to emergency situations”. It foresees that the planning, mobilisation and coordination of such a capacity would need to be undertaken at the strategic level by the AU and at the operational level by a deployable Force Headquarters.21 The actual arrangements for this are currently sketchy, as are its implications for the RDC concept that has hitherto been intended as the principal ASF capacity for rapid reaction. And although the proposal was initially treated by African defence chiefs with some scepticism, it has since gained the support of a number of key AU member states, including South Africa, Nigeria and Ethiopia.22
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20 A stitch in time would have saved nine: Operationalizing the African Standby Force. Festus Aboagye, ISS Policy Brief, September 2012
21 Report of the Chairperson on the operationalisation of the Rapid Deployment Capability of the African Standby Force and the establishment of an African Capacity for Immediate Response to Crisis. April 2013. At the time of writing this study, the Chairperson’s report was relatively fresh and it was unclear how comprehensively it had been staffed within the AU Commission.
22 During their meeting on 30 April, African defence ministers had proposed to defer the AICRC discussion and requested that a comprehensive assessment be conducted to identify challenges in operationalising the ASF (and the RDCs).
At the same time, the AU has been gaining experience with other (non-ASF) deployment models, especially the large-scale ad-hoc arrangements used for AMISOM in Somalia and the hybrid UNAMID in Darfur and the smaller ad-hoc missions against the Lord’s Resistance Army (RCI-LRA). Also SADC’s intervention force for the eastern DRC (comprising 3000 troops from Malawi, South Africa and Tanzania) is an ad-hoc arrangement under UN-auspicies, with South Africa as lead-nation.

According to the AU, all these options can be expected to be on the table for the next 5-10 years as the ASF system develops and matures. Other observers continue to point to the challenges of providing command and control, logistic support and the strategic lift, on which quick reaction will depend. As African defence ministers have proposed, what appears necessary is to comprehensively review the progress that has been made on the ASF in the light of these structural developments and the lessons emerging from Mali, Somalia, Darfur and elsewhere. Underpinning this should be a realistic assessment of the nature and range of crisis response likely to be required; for instance taking into account that future operations can be expected to be multinational (thus requiring interoperability), require flexible, tailored, and deployable force components (including military, civilian and police elements to varying degrees) with appropriate logistics and command and control arrangements, and be linked to political processes (using UN/AU/REC capacities). As part of this review, critical attention will need to be paid to force generation and command and control (with the possibility that the validity of parts of the original ASF concept will be seriously questioned).

2.2.4 Preventative diplomacy and the Panel of the Wise

The AU’s Panel of the Wise consists of five African personalities whose role is to advise the PSC and the Chairperson on peace and security issues, including acting independently when deemed necessary. Its mandate clearly states that it does not have a mediation role but it can assist and advise mediation teams engaged in formal negotiations. That said, the Panel’s work is supportive of the AU’s wider preventative diplomacy role and its small secretariat in the Commission is double hatted and serves also as the AU’s Mediation Support Unit. This offers advantages in terms of linking the Panel’s work with that of special representatives and other AU mediators. The unit draws from CEWS data to help identify local actors and entry points for the Panel and special envoys/mediators. It has made progress in a short space of time to help document and disseminate lessons learned and best practice and is in the process of identifying a roster of mediation experts.

Similar consultative structures have also been established in certain RECs, most notably the Council of the Wise in ECOWAS which has been active in various West African crises, while others have, or are in the process of developing, mediation capacities (for example, IGAD, SADC) or a mixture of the two (for example COMESA, CEN-SAD, EAC). The regional councils have slightly different mandates and structures; the 15-member ECOWAS Council of the Wise, for example, is appointed by national governments, which could be seen as
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23 Analysis: AU prepares its shock troops, IRIN, 3 June 2013.
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26 For example, in relation to AU initiatives in Burundi and Comoros and to management of election disputes.
27 The AU Panel of the Wise was created in 2002 and became operational in 2008; ECOWAS’ Council of the Wise was created in 1999; COMESA’s Committee of Elders was put in place in 2008; SADC’s Mediation Reference Group and Panel of Elders was established in August 2010; and IGAD is in the process of putting in place a Mediation Contact Group, whose responsibilities will be similar to those of the AU Panel of the Wise.
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constraining its impartiality. Nor does it have a dedicated support facility along the lines of the AU Panel,28 IGAD, which otherwise has had success in the past in relation to its ad-hoc mediation processes in Sudan and to a lesser extent Somalia, has yet to establish an institutionalised structure, although decisions have been taken to do so. Similarly, SADC has engaged in mediation (for example in Madagascar and Zimbabwe) on an ad-hoc basis through special envoys supported by their sending states, although there are indications that this may also become more institutionalised.29

The existence of the various sub-regional structures presents an obvious need for coordination given the overlapping mandates of the AU and a number of the RECs. The AU is aware of this and takes steps to ensure coherency, including through joint activities where these are appropriate. For example, the Panel’s consultative activities in preparation for the Kenyan elections were held jointly with COMESA.30

In April 2013, the AU’s Panel of the Wise and its counterparts met to consider the scope for establishing a continental network that would be able to harness the capacities of the AU and RECs modalities more cohesively. Agreement was reached to form a so-called Pan-African Network of the Wise (PanWise) that would operate as an umbrella network bringing together the various mechanisms, the AU High-Level Representatives and Special Envoys, the Friends of the Panel, and individual mediators and institutions engaged in mediation activities at various levels – with the aim of enabling them to work on joint activities and strengthen the impact of the AU and RECs preventative diplomacy.

In other respects, there is also a need to reflect that the relative value of AU-led and local mediation (i.e. led by the sub-regional body concerned) is going to vary from case to case and there will be advantages and disadvantages that need to be carefully weighed. It seems politically unrealistic to expect a sub-regional body (ECOWAS, for example, in the recent examples of Côte d’Ivoire, Guinea-Bissau and Mali) to ignore its potential role, which would damage its credibility. At the same time, the selection of special representative or lead mediator appears critical from the perspective of the individual’s personal qualities as much as the background and interests that he/she represents. The choice of Blaise Compaoré as ECOWAS mediator in the Mali crisis is a case in point. Solving this is not going to be easy but it does suggest the relevance of flexibility and AU involvement.

2.2.5 AU Peace Fund

The Peace Fund is intended to provide financial resources for peace support missions and other operational activities related to the AU’s peace and security mandate.31 However, the Fund remains grossly underfunded and utterly inadequate to provide the degree of support (and ownership) to peace activities that is needed. In the 2007 AU Audit, it was noted that the Fund received on average only 6% of the regular budget. At the AU Summit in Tripoli in 2009, it was agreed to gradually raise this to 12% by 2012, although this target does not appear to have been reached to date. The current level is around 8%, clearly insufficient and a negative indicator of member states’ commitment to strengthening the APSA and the AU’s peace and security role.

Of the other organisations, ECOWAS has applied a form of community levy on regional trade that has provided it with rather better access to internal funds, provided member states forward

28 2010 APSA Assessment Study.
29 SIPO II, 2012
30 Interview with PoW Secretariat, AUC, Addis Ababa
31 PSC Protocol, Article 21.
the due receipts. There appears to be some reluctance to do so in this is all cases. In March 2013, it was agreed to replace this (and a further levy charged within UEMOA – the Francophone West Africa grouping) with a common external tariff.

In the absence of adequate funding from member states, the APSA capabilities (especially peace missions) are overwhelmingly dependent upon partner resources, most notably from the EU APF. As the AU leadership has commented, this reliance is unacceptable and damages the AU’s credibility as well as its ability to act independently.

Despite these strong words, there has not been progress on either radically improving member states’ contributions or finding alternative models (a tax on intra-Africa air flights has been suggested). At a minimum, there is a need to separate APSA related Peace Fund demands (for example in relation to PCRD) from operational peace support, where there is a reasonable argument for eligibility for UN assessed contributions and/or access to ad hoc trust funds with realistic disbursement conditions.

2.3 Other capability areas contributing to the APSA

As already noted, there is a general understanding that a number of other capabilities and initiatives are linked to it. These include Post Conflict Reconstruction and Development (PCRD); Security Sector Reform; Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration (DDR); Small Arms & Light Weapons (SALW); counter terrorism; African borders; and maritime security, amongst others. Being relatively specialised areas, a common question emerges concerning the exact nature of the AU/RECs involvement that is appropriate? Answering this involves taking into account the organisations’ mandates and legitimacy on the one hand and their technical and financial capacity on the other relative to that offered by more specialised agencies, including UN agencies and INGOs. Possibly because of these issues, overall progress has until recently been relatively modest. The following sections explore two examples that demonstrate the challenge faced.

2.3.1 Post Conflict Reconstruction and Development (PCRD)

The AU’s PCRD Policy was adopted at its Banjul session in June 2006 but since then has made little headway other than establishing a small PCRD office in AU headquarters charged with considering how to implement the policy. The practical roll-out has struggled partly because of this institutional constraint, but more fundamentally because of the difficulty in determining what the practical expression of the PCRD policy could be compared to that of other security, development and humanitarian actors and taking account of the limited funds and technical capacity available.

The AU has also dispatched multidisciplinary teams to DRC, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, CAR, Burundi, Mali, South Sudan and Sierra Leone to assess post-conflict reconstruction and development needs and propose concrete recommendations on the assistance that could be rendered by the AU, its Member States and International Partners. Some of these missions have been conducted together with the UN and sub-regional organisations. In the revised mandates and structures being proposed for the Liaison Offices, PCRD is likewise prioritised as a distinct intervention area.

Yet despite these steps forward, the overall nature and scope of the possible AU role in PCRD remains unclear. In this vacuum, there is a tendency to promote quick ad hoc solutions; funds have been disbursed, for example, to small-scale projects in post conflict countries such as South Sudan. In the absence of a clearly defined role, the tendency for PCRD to revolve around
Quick Impact Projects (QIPs) implemented by field missions is assessed as unlikely to have significant impact in development terms due to their small scale and isolated implementation. These limitations suggest the need for further exploration of where the comparative advantages between the various organisations lie and how best the AU and the RECs can draw upon their legitimacy and mandates. One option being tested is to enter into partnerships with specialised agencies (such as UNDP, UNICEF and INGOs) that bring the benefits of their technical skills (and funding) with the African organisations’ political legitimacy. The African Solidarity Initiative (ASI) seeks to contribute to operationalizing PCRD through the use of African and other resources, including in-kind contributions and capacity building. A concrete example of this is the IGAD Civil Service Support Officers (CSSO) that have been deployed through UNDP with United Nations Volunteers in South Sudan in order to augment and strengthen the South Sudanese civil service. Lessons learnt here include the need to ensure local ownership, the co-location of suitable counterparts, and avoiding perceptions that regional experts are taking local jobs.

2.3.2 The AU’s system of Liaison Offices (AULOs)

The Liaison Offices are a product of a decision of the PSC and reflect the increasing involvement of the AU in the prevention and management of conflicts where the need for an effective physical presence on the ground is evident. Most, if not all, of the peace agreements signed over the past years in Africa provide for the establishment of follow up mechanisms, in which the AU should take an active part along with other actors. The AU has also accepted a role in post conflict reconstruction and development, which is also facilitated through having an appropriate presence on the ground. Finally, the AU sees a need to increase its visibility and demonstrate solidarity to countries in/or emerging from crisis.

Since 2011, the Liaison Offices have been supported through a Joint Financing Agreement between the AU Commission and a number of development partners, including Denmark. In the 2012 external review of this arrangement, it was found that significant progress had been made by the AUC to strengthen its management of the offices and their linkage to the AU headquarters in Addis Ababa and decision-making organs. It was found that further embedding of the offices within the AU structures would be beneficial, for example to optimise the role that the offices play in supporting CEWS and AU-led peace initiatives.

2.4 Relationship between the AU and the sub-regional organisations

The APSA Road Map underlines the point that the APSA cannot be implemented without the involvement of the sub-regional organisations with a peace and security mandate but, while there are indications that the interaction is strengthening, there is a risk that the lesser capacities of the RECs/RMs compared to the AU will have consequences for how the interaction will progress. The gap has widened since the 2010 APSA Assessment highlighted this as an issue.

The inter-relationship between the AU and the RECs was placed on a firm legal footing in January 2008 when the Protocol on Relations between the African Union (AU) and the Regional
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Economic Communities was signed between the AU and eight regional communities.\textsuperscript{36} This was partly a recognition that the overlapping membership of the RECs was causing challenges for coordination on the overall regional integration agenda (an issue that the AU and the RECs has been grappling with since 2003). Inter alia, the Protocol requires RECs to "align their programmes, policies and strategies with those of the AU" and that the AU opens a liaison office at each REC. It also provides the AU with powers of sanction against RECs not living up to their obligations relating to the Abuja Treaty establishing the African Economic Community.

Further to this, in June 2008, a separate MOU was agreed relating to cooperation with RECs and regional coordinating mechanisms in the area of peace and security.\textsuperscript{37} While Article 6 of the MOU specifically refers to the shared effort to ensure "the full operationalization and effective functioning of the APSA" (in terms of the PSC Protocol), its other provisions reflect a much wider set of capabilities.\textsuperscript{38} The MOU also underlines that the organisations should exchange information, hold regular consultations, have an institutional presence, and enter into operational cooperation. Since then, the chief executives of the organisations have met regularly to review their cooperation. These normally include an agenda item on APSA, as well as specific security situations. At their most recent meeting in March 2013 in South Africa, they discussed the further operationalization of the APSA, the mainstreaming of their strategic plans and the possibilities to regularise pre-Summit meetings.

Several of the RECs/RMs have now established their own liaison offices at the AU in Addis and the AU is in the process of doing likewise in return. At the time of writing, the AU Liaison Officer to ECOWAS was still outstanding. The 2010 APSA Assessment pointed to the improved opportunities for coordination provided by these liaison personnel, while noting that there was a need to harmonise their profiles and mandates. The point here is that the Liaison Officers provide (in theory at least) capacity to greatly extend the connectivity between the AU and RECs in decision-making if they are appropriately briefed and operating under instructions. Three years on, however, this appears to remain an issue.

The 2010 Assessment also noted that there appeared to be limited functional coordination between the AU and RECs/RMs and that the AU should play a strategic leadership role, reflecting the principal of subsidiarity and the comparative advantages of other agencies. Currently, the strongest functional cooperation appears in the core APSA capabilities of early warning, preventative diplomacy and the African Standby Force. Ideally, CEWS should capture data and analysis provided at regional level so that there is a common basis for decision-making. To promote this, the AU CEWS team conducts regular trainings and holds quarterly technical level meetings. According to sources consulted, these are useful. In the area of preventative diplomacy, the Panel of the Wise (and its secretariat) makes an effort to consult and cooperate (joint missions) with its regional counterparts. An indicator of this is that the recent election consultations in Kenya were conducted with COMESA. There also appears to be improving connectivity at the political level that is being driven by crisis management. Notably, arrangements established to help manage the response to Mali have included a number of AU-ECOWAS-UN linkages, of which the Mali Integrated Task Force and the Support and Follow up

\textsuperscript{36} The eight recognised RECs are ECOWAS, COMESA, ECCAS, IGAD, UMA, SADC, CEN-SAD, and the EAC.

\textsuperscript{37} Memorandum of Understanding on cooperation in the area of peace and security between the African Union, the Regional Economic Communities and the Coordinating Mechanisms of the Regional Standby Brigades. June 2008.

\textsuperscript{38} These include promoting democracy, good governance, the rule of law, human rights, humanitarian assistance and disaster management, post conflict reconstruction and development, arms control and disarmament, counter terrorism and organised crime, and border management.
The African Peace and Security Architecture and global and regional initiatives

Group are examples. It is also noteworthy that PSC communiqués on Mali have consistently underlined that actions in relation to Mali must be in collaboration with ECOWAS. Regarding the ASF, the basic concept has built upon an assumption of a strategic and operational cooperation between the AU and the five RECs/RMs providing standby brigades. As a result, the basic design work has involved regular consultation processes involving the key players and other partners.

With some exceptions, it is not obvious that the RECs are currently able to match the progress being made by the AU on APSA capabilities. For example, none of the PSO deployments so far have used the ASF framework to any significant extent.\textsuperscript{39} ECOWAS has made very limited progress on its conflict prevention framework since it was adopted in 2008 and the steps that IGAD has taken are also minimal beyond the area of early warning. Both organisations tend to get bogged down in process activities and have difficulty in producing concrete outcomes, despite the fact that their strategies focus on relevant issues and capabilities. The reasons for this lassitude vary but are broadly due to organisational and political capacity constraints leading to a gap between political decision-making and action with the consequence that their responses either have the character of fire-fighting when crises arise or lack adequate bite. A similar picture emerges concerning the implementation of SADC’s peace and security agenda, beyond the areas of preventative diplomacy and election support, because certain member states remain reluctant to allow the Secretariat sufficient capacity and authority to act on their behalf.\textsuperscript{40} In Central Africa, ECCAS is held back by limited consensus amongst its members on the organisation’s peace and security role, despite possessing some of the essential structures for this.\textsuperscript{41}

Member states are ultimately responsible for the effectiveness of the regional organisations of which they are members. But the their capacity to respond to the APSA Road Map at national level is variable at best and only a few countries appear to take an active and cohesive approach (the obvious example being South Africa). This affects both the extent to which APSA capabilities can reach down to ground level and the political dialogue and decision-making at the top. The links between permanent representatives and capitals is an area that deserves attention. A similar shortcoming has been observed in relation to the Africa Group at the UN.\textsuperscript{42}

2.5 Capacity development facilities

Supporting the ASF and African peace and security capacity in general are a number of training institutions, applied research institutes and specialised NGOs. Many of these are internationally recognised and are regularly highly placed in international league tables (examples include ACCORD, the Centre for Conflict Resolution (CCR), the Institute for Security Studies (ISS), the South African Institute for International Affairs (SAIIA), and the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC)).\textsuperscript{43}

There are positive linkages between APSA and the work of these training and research establishments and the latter contribute commissioned and non-commissioned inputs, notably in relation to conceptual design work. In 2012, ISS was asked by the AU to help extract lessons learned for the ASF from recent AU-led peace missions. The West African Network of Peace Builders (WANEP) has been supporting ECOWAS with expansion of its early warning network. The African Security Sector Network (ASSN) has been assisting the AU with the development

\textsuperscript{39} EASFCOM has deployed staff officers to AMISOM.

\textsuperscript{40} Implementing peace and security architecture II: Southern Africa. ICG. October 2012.

\textsuperscript{41} Implementing peace and security architecture I: Central Africa. ICG. November 2011.

\textsuperscript{42} Africa, South Africa, and the United Nation’s Security Architecture, CCR, June 2013

\textsuperscript{43} University of Pennsylvania’s Global Think Tank Assessment – see www.gotothinktank.com.
of the AU’s Security Sector Reform policy framework. The Elections Institute of South Africa (EISA) has been training SADC election observers. Likewise, several institutions are providing PSO-training (notably the Kofi Annan Centre in Accra, ACCORD, ISS, and the International Peace Support Training Centre (IPSTC) in Nairobi).

The range and depth of contacts between these service providers and the regional organisations demonstrates the relevance of looking beyond the AU and the RECs for APSA-relevant capabilities. The Kofi Annan Centre’s new strategic plan, for instance, specifically refers to its role in the operationalization of the APSA (and the African Standby Force) at both continental and sub-regional level. However, the plethora of actors also presents a challenge with regard to the overall coherency of approach.

The Africa Peace Support Trainers’ Association (APSTA) provides an example of how this could be achieved by gathering the continent’s peace and security training institutes and other stakeholders together via an umbrella organization. APSTA’s key role and its comparative advantage is to provide a coordinated approach to PSO training in order to improve the speed and effectiveness of response. This includes standardization of training curricula, exchange of best practice and lessons learned, monitoring and evaluation, support to rosters, and (potentially) certification of training. Whether APSTA can deliver on this will depend upon its ability to increase its capacity (the small secretariat requires additional resources), engage its many constituents, particularly the AU, PSO training institutions, and the UN, and deliver results. To really contribute to coherency, APSTA will also need to reach out to the African sub-regional organisations (chiefly the five organisations with ASF responsibilities) in view of their responsibilities regarding force development/deployment and their member states, which are the force contributors. A review of APSTA undertaken in mid-2013 reflected that the Association was not achieving its goals, lacked visibility, and suffered critically from an overall lack of leadership, staff capacity and predictable funding. Developments since the arrival of a new Executive Secretary in June 2013, including the launching of a training needs assessment, a new strategy and the good attendance at the association’s Annual General Meeting in September 2013, demonstrate a new sense of commitment that is promising. It will be relevant to follow this process closely.

2.6 APSA and the African Governance Architecture

The so-called African Governance Architecture (AGA) is emerging as a counterpart to the APSA, although it is less defined and thus far without a road map to support its implementation.

The linkage between peace and security and governance is clearly made in the PSC Protocol, Article 3(f) of which states that the PSC shall “promote and encourage democratic practices, good governance and the rule of law……as part of efforts for preventing conflicts”. The AU refers to the “overall political and institutional framework for the promotion of good governance in Africa by enhancing interaction and synergies between African Union organs/institutions with a formal mandate in governance and strengthen and their capacity to produce “shared” agendas of governance.” A key foundation is provided by the normative standards established in, for example the African Charter on Democracy, Elections and Governance that came into force in February 2012. Reflecting this, the AGA operates on the basis of four clusters, namely: democracy, elections and governance; human rights, people’s rights and transitional justice;

44 KAIPTC Strategic Plan, 15 September 2013
46 The five regional RECs/RMs providing ASF standby brigades are: ECOWAS (West), EASFCOM (East), SADC (South), NARC (North), and ECCAS (Central).
public service, administration, anti-corruption, decentralisation and local governance; and humanitarian affairs. It therefore fits in to the space also occupied by the New Economic Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD), which has otherwise lost some of its initial promise, including the Africa Peer Review Mechanism (APRM).

Proposals for institutionalising the AGA (as with APSA) were discussed at an inter-departmental AU Retreat in 2012 and are also reflected in the decisions reached at the May 2013 AU Summit. A general observation here is that APSA and AGA need to be institutionally and structurally mutually supporting - there are a number of APSA capabilities that feed directly into AGA (such as the PSC itself, CEWS, the Panel of the Wise/mediation, and PCRD) while progress on governance issues in line with the African Charter is necessary to underpin sustainable peace and security.

2.7 **Summary of main findings relating to APSA in Africa**

The contextual premises underlying the APSA remain valid; there is a need for a coherent, timely, and effective response to African peace and security challenges and the core elements of the APSA highlighted in the PSC Protocol are essential to provide this.

However, the nature of the response to the crisis in Mali in 2012/13 has prompted renewed thinking within the AUC on the ability of the APSA to respond in a timely fashion and with appropriate capacities. There is a need to sharpen up political decision-making with African sub-regional organisations and ensure the availability of the right range of instruments for action. A key question being asked is whether the African Standby Force (ASF) can/will be able to deliver? It is also obvious that an enhanced focus on structural conflict prevention will need to draw also upon other parts of the organisations’ mandates, including governance.

The five core capabilities mentioned in the PSC Protocol remain central to the AU and sub-regional responses to conflict but not sufficient in themselves to produce the operational approach to conflict prevention and conflict management being sought by the AU. In terms of crisis response, early warning, political instruments (the PSC), mediation instruments (including the Panel of the Wise and special envoys), and the African Standby Force are all relevant. These capabilities are generally developing well, although some require further expansion and others may require adjustment to take account of lessons being learned. In particular, questions are raised regarding the conceptual relevance of the African Standby Force in its current form. Also, the huge cost of peace support and peace building indicates that other financing modalities will continue to be required. On the one hand, the AU Peace Fund requires augmenting so that it can contribute more significantly to conflict prevention (pre and post conflict). On the other, there is a need to reach a viable way forward on access to UN assessed contributions for African-led but UN mandated peace missions.

However, the AU and most of the sub-regional organisations recognise that to respond effectively to structural causes of conflict, it will be necessary to include other capability areas within the APSA umbrella. In general, these areas are less developed and in some cases face conceptual and/or institutional challenges that need to be thought through. A focus on structural issues also calls for firmer linkages between the APSA and governance. While decisions on roles need to take into account the comparative advantages of the African organisations vis à vis specialised UN and other agencies. Partnering is seen as one way forward here. The implications of this are discussed in the next chapter.

---
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3 APSA within the global peace and security architecture

This section locates the initiatives being taken by the AU and sub-regional organisations relating to APSA within a global context, taking account of the relationships with the UN and EU, as well as developments within the aid effectiveness agenda (the New Deal etc.). There has been a tendency to see this in terms of political dialogue and capacity building. Although still a dominant element, there is now an increasing trend towards a more substance-based cooperation that also involves joint operations and missions, albeit one that still has certain caveats.

3.1 Political dialogue

Political dialogue between the AU, UN and EU has developed substantially over the last five years. Even in the light of major international crises in Afghanistan and Iraq, there can be no doubt that African peace and security issues feature highly on the global security agenda. In 2012, 61% of the Security Council’s country or regional meetings concerned Africa, which shows the relevance of ensuring an effective African input. Recent non-permanent African members of the Security Council (notably South Africa, Nigeria and most recently Rwanda) have helped ensure continued focus on African operational and structural conflict issues.

It is significant that the AU Peace and Security Council and the UN Security Council hold annual political consultations, alternating between Addis Ababa and New York. Since 2011, the level of discussion in these has become progressively more substance based and focused on concrete crises. It has been accompanied by a more technical dialogue at senior official level; a Joint Task Force on Peace and Security was established in 2010 and meets twice a year. Ad hoc groups have also been established to follow particular issues, such as the Tripartite Coordination Mechanism on UNAMID and the Support and Follow-up Group on Mali.

But, while the relationship is on a positive trajectory and is more meaningful than it was even a few years ago, it is not without tensions. With the UN, a key (as yet unresolved) issue concerns status; the UN’s Charter mandates the Security Council as having the primary responsibility for international peace and security. Chapter VIII recognises the role of regional organisations but underlines the UN’s supremacy and the five permanent members (P5) are reported as being concerned about diluting this mandate by appearing to defer to the AU on African peace and security issues. The PSC, on the other hand, argues that it has greater interests and understanding of African issues and that (especially UN mandated African-led missions) should be eligible for UN financial support. It is significant that recent PSC communiqués demonstrate a degree of frustration that progress on some AU priorities raised in the dialogue has not been made.

In January 2012, South Africa initiated an open debate on the relationship during its Security Council presidency. The resulting resolution (UNSCR 2033) expressed the importance of establishing a more effective and balanced relationship, reflecting the AU’s responsibilities on the Continent within the context of Chapter VIII of the UN Charter (concerning the role of regional organisations). This has since become a core theme of the AU’s policy towards the UN;

as recently restated by the AU Chairperson, the AU wants a relationship that is underpinned by a shared strategic vision involving a flexible and innovative interpretation of Chapter VIII (the hybrid mission in Darfur is seen as an example of this), enhanced consultations between the PSC and the Security Council (including more adequate follow up on decisions), further collaborative missions and practical cooperation, and a solution to the issue of how to ensure predictable, sustainable and flexible funding for African-led peace support missions.52

However, as the difficulty of responding to Mali demonstrates, there would be merit in the AU taking a strong role in support of the three African UNSC members and the UN Africa Group in general. As some have observed, this would require strengthening of the mandate and capacity of the AU Liaison Office at the UN.53

3.2 Coherence between African and global peace and security arrangements

The increased dialogue has been paralleled by an increase in the substance based cooperation between the UN and the African regional organisations, particularly the AU, that has been primarily driven by the African-led peace missions in first Darfur, then Somalia and most recently Mali. The Secretary General’s 2009 report on UN support to AU peacekeeping operations underlined the importance of a shared agenda and understanding of issues underpinning decisions being made by the two organisations.54 Since 2010, the UN Office to the AU (UNOAU) has provided a substantial embodiment of UN support and is now firmly embedded in the AU Commission (also filling a number of staff functions). The UNOAU symbolises a greater degree of technical interaction between New York and Addis, for instance regarding early warning and conflict mediation (as foreseen in the UNSG report on relations with regional organisations from 2008 and the UN-AU Ten Year Capacity Building Programme – see also below). UNAOU also serves as a conduit for greater political interaction; for example through joint field missions (the joint ECOWAS, AU, EU and UN assessment mission to Guinea-Bissau in December 2012 is an example). This is also able to build upon the AU-UN Joint Task Force.

As noted above, the AU continues to see that more could be done to make the relationship to the UNSC more effective and increase the weight given to the AU input. This relates to extending to other areas the existing capacity of the African organisations to take the lead in preventative diplomacy and mediation (where they demonstrate some comparative advantage). Two areas in particular are peace support operations and post conflict reconstruction and development.

Within peace support, the underlying logic is that the AU needs the support of the UN as it lacks the capacity for sustained operations. The planning for the crisis-driven African-led mission in Mali (AFISMA) underlined again the complexity of mounting missions of the type the African Standby Force should be expected to lift once it has full operating capability (post 2015). At the same time, the PSC sees that the UN should treat it as a real partner given the AU’s willingness to undertake peace enforcement (as opposed to peace keeping) as well as its legitimacy and mandate which it sees as necessary for local ownership and long term results.55 However, this also requires that the AU is able to provide solid and meaningful input to the World body.

52 Report of the AU Chairperson. 23 September 2013
53 CCR, June 2013
54 UNSG Report on AU peacekeeping operations authorised by the UN. 18 September 2009.
55 Review of AULOs, January 2013. Tana.
Operationalising the APSA through effective continental and regional elements as is intended will definitely contribute to achieving this.

A key issue for the African organisations has been the wish to secure predictable, sustainable and flexible funding for African-led peace missions. In 2008, the joint UN-AU Prodi Panel emphasised the importance of partnership between the UN and regional organisations and stressed the need for equitable burden-sharing between the UN and AU. The Panel recommended UN-assessed funding to support specific AU-led peace operations mandated by the UNSC on a case by case basis, for a limited period and where the missions would transit to UN integrated missions. It also recommended the creation of a trust fund to enable capacity building for conflict prevention, resolution and institution building. Meanwhile, the AU should also augment its own AU Peace Fund. Messages emanating from the UN, however, continue to demonstrate caution, guarding against overly standardised approaches and indicate the relevance of flexibility in any arrangements so that they can reflect the particular needs of the situation and the interests of host countries and member states.\(^{56}\) UNSCR 2033 (2012) reiterated that “common and coordinated efforts…….should be based on their respective authorities, competencies and capacities” while the regional organisations have the “responsibility to secure human, financial, logistical and other resources for their organisations, including through contributions by their members and support from partners”. With virtually all their programme and operational funding coming from external sources, the AU and the sub-regional organisations clearly remain challenged to meet this, hence the continuing logic for the PSC’s demands for adequate financial and logistical support packages for UN mandated African-led missions.\(^{57}\)

In relation to their post conflict role, a somewhat similar position is faced where the AU and the sub-regional organisations remain poorer and younger cousins, despite their mandate. Key issues here are financing and human capacity – both of which are generally lacking – and the willingness of specialised agencies to see the AU and RECs as relevant actors, either in their own right or as partners. There has been some progress in relation to the latter; examples include the cooperation between the AU, UN and some specialised agencies in relation to the AU’s Security Sector Reform agenda and the IGAD Civil Service Support Officers programme in South Sudan in conjunction with UNDP and UN Volunteers. A number of joint post conflict assessment missions have also taken place, including with the UN Peace Building Commission.

But as humanitarian and development actors, the argument for a strong AU/REC role on the ground is more uncertain. In the 2012 External Review of the AU Liaison Offices, it was noted that the AULOs were visible amongst their host governments and other African missions but were less visible as contributors alongside international partners and are not fully engaged. Despite now having some staffing capacity (a number of AULOs have PCRD officers), they are otherwise under-resourced and consequently the results and sustainability of the relatively small-scale project based inputs being made is questionable.\(^{58}\)

### 3.3 UN and EU Capacity building

A substantial part of the explanation for the improved performance of the AU relating to APSA lies in the substantial capacity building supported by the UN, EU and international partners over the past decade.

---

\(^{56}\) Remarks by Dmitry Titov, ASG DPKO at Geneva Centre for Security Policy, 9 May 2012.

\(^{57}\) The PSC’s 358th meeting in March 2013 set out a number of parameters in this regard.

\(^{58}\) External Review of AULOs, Tana, 2012.
Since 2006, UN assistance to the AU has operated under the umbrella of a Ten-Year Capacity-Building Programme, which is organized around a number of thematic clusters led by UN DPA (with inputs also from DPKO and other departments) in the area of peace and security. The programme has been supported by UNOAU and UNECA on the ground in Addis Ababa. A review undertaken in 2011 reported that it had promoted significant advances in collaboration between the two institutions, with some positive spin-offs also for sub-regional organisations. In particular, the system of regular UN-AU Joint Task Force and desk-to-desk meetings has been beneficial. The programme has had a specific focus on support to the main APSA capabilities, including in the management of peacekeeping operations; the development of early warning systems and indicators; conflict-prevention initiatives; the build-up of mediation capacity; and the strengthening and deepening of democratic systems, especially through the conduct of free, fair and transparent elections in African countries. The capacity building inputs have generally been supplied through attachment programmes, workshops and seminars, direct technical assistance, and material and financial support. The review found that capacity had been developed but that the results would have been stronger through a better defined work programme, taking account of absorption capacities and the AU's human and financial constraints.\(^{59}\)

Likewise, the EU has been a major and influential supporter of the AU and the sub-regional organisations in relation to APSA. The support falls within the Joint Africa-EU Strategy (JAES), which covers a range of thematic areas in addition to peace and security, and is managed through biannual meetings of an Africa-EU Task Force.\(^{60}\) Following a joint AU, EU, REC meeting in Akosombo, Ghana in December 2009, the EU helped fund the 2010 APSA Assessment Study and develop the 2011-2013 APSA Road Map – two strategically critical steps in operationalizing APSA.

Within the policy framework provided by the JAES, the EU’s Africa Peace Facility has since developed into a major means of providing more predictable funding for African-led peace operations (where UN support from assessed contributions is not possible), early response (through an Early Response Mechanism for funding urgent operational requirements) and APSA capacity building (including ASF development, training for police, civilian and military personnel, support to CEWS, the AU Border Programme, PCRD, gender (women, peace and security), small arms, security sector reform, counter-terrorism, maritime security and safety etc.).\(^{61}\) This support is decentralised, involving also support to a number of RECs/RMs in addition to the AU and encouraging political dialogue between them. The EU has indicated that it will support the 2013 APSA Review and is joining the joint support to the AU Liaison Offices.

### 3.4 APSA within the new aid architecture

On the new aid architecture (New Deal etc.) there are few signs that the AU or the sub-regional organisations are yet playing a role and there appears to be little substantive discussion of the possibilities that exist.

Despite the fact that the overwhelming majority of G7+ members are African countries and the AU’s participation in the initial International Dialogue meeting in Accra, there do not appear to

\(^{59}\) Review of the 10 year capacity building programme for the African Union, UNSG, February 2011

\(^{60}\) The JAES focus areas are: Peace and security; Democratic Governance and Human Rights; Regional integration, Trade and infrastructure; MDGs; Energy; Climate change and Environment; Migration, Mobility and Employment; Science, Information Society and Space. Cross-cutting issues are: enhanced political dialogue and coordination; institutional architecture and working arrangements; financing; a people-centred partnership.

\(^{61}\) JAES Action Plan 2011-2013
be any institutional pan-African or regional mechanisms to follow up on the implementation of the New Deal commitments to support the transition from conflict towards recovery and development. On the one hand, this is surprising given the close alignment between the New Deal’s principles and the AU’s wish to strengthen aid effectiveness and the growing interest for a substantive role within Post Conflict Reconstruction and Development (PCRD). It could appear as a missed opportunity given that other development actors are participating in the International Dialogue (including UN agencies and the World Bank). However, the current absence of the AU as a serious actor here is probably more reflective of the lack of capacity within the Commission and in the field (i.e. the AULOs) than a lack of interest. The International Dialogue is also largely revolving around the G7+ and INCAF partners (of which the AU is not a member).

It can, however, be argued that the AU should be playing a more strategic role and coordinating African positions on the new aid architecture, for example through its contacts with the UN Secretariat and through the Africa Group at the UN (which is after all the largest regional grouping). Although the latter is sometimes characterised as lacking in drive and a clearly defined purpose and cohesiveness, the three African members of the Security Council could be further encouraged in this direction. South Africa’s membership during 2007-2008 and 2011-2012 resulted in some movement on AU and APSA related issues (for example UNSCR 2033 that reiterated the commitment to more effective collaboration with the AU).

3.5 Global cross cutting issues

APSA has potential to play a significant role in promoting cross-cutting issues, such as gender and human rights, in view of its objective to operationalize peace and security responses, including operational and structural conflict prevention. The issues are not, however, currently sufficiently mainstreamed, despite declarations proclaiming the opposite. The AU and the sub-regional organisations need to put more action and capacity behind their rhetoric.

3.5.1 Responsibility to Protect (R2P)

Responsibility to Protect (R2P) relates to the imperative of timely and decisive responses to situations where people are at risk of serious human rights abuse and crimes against humanity. It is reflected directly in the focus of the AU’s Constitutive Act and PSC Protocol on timely and efficient responses (including intervention) in cases of “war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity”. And as a result, it is supported by a number of APSA capabilities, particularly the PSC, CEWS and the ASF. The 2013 initiative of the AU Chairperson in relation to the African Immediate Crisis Response Capability (AICRC) would provide the AU with a swift and flexible military mechanism to intervene within an R2P context – although it should perhaps be restated that the requirement is not new and the same issues feature in the current ASF scenarios underpinning the logic for the ASF’s Rapid Deployment Capability (RDC).

3.5.2 Women, peace and security

Operationalization of the APSA provides extensive opportunities to take forward UNSCR 1325 and other gender commitments. These include through the inclusion of women in preventative diplomacy (the Panel of the Wise and mediation missions are obvious examples), the African Standby Force (through inclusion of women and through training on human rights, women and children rights etc.), through the collection of gender disaggregated data via the Continental Early Warning System and its regional counterparts, to name a few. The PSC offers the

---

62 The African G7+ countries are: CAR, Chad, DRC, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan
opportunity to keep women, peace and security issues on the decision-making agenda. Nonetheless, while there is some movement (the PSC has devoted meetings to the issue, for example) the overall level of progress is slow.

UNSCR 1325 and its follow up resolutions (1820, 1888 and 1889) require member states to increase women’s representation at all decision-making levels for the prevention, management, and resolution of conflict. The Secretary-General was also urged to appoint more women as his special representatives and envoys and to expand women’s role and contribution in UN field-based operations. In resolution 1889, the Security Council called for the development of global indicators to track the implementation of resolution 1325 and greater attention to the gender dimensions of post-conflict planning and financing. In 2010, the Secretary General’s report on the implementation of these resolutions noted the fairly dismal progress being made, for example on women’s role in peace negotiations, and called for further effort centred on an action plan with seven commitments addressing the key features of the resolutions. That said, steps forward have been possible where the greater presence of women at different levels during peace negotiations has strengthened the gender-sensitivity of the final texts. Examples include peace agreements for Burundi, Darfur, and Northern Uganda. The point has been made that even if the gender-related provisions of peace agreements are not implemented, they do provide a legal basis for civil society to draw from in its advocacy.

In the AU, the operationalization of the Security Council resolutions is a policy priority reflected in the six pillars now defining the AU’s gender framework; comprising the Constitutive Act, the Protocol to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights on the Rights of Women in Africa, the Solemn Declaration on Gender Equality in Africa (SDGEA) the African Union Gender Policy, the launch of the Fund for African Women, and the Assembly decision which declared 2010 – 2020 as the African Women’s Decade. The 2009 Gender Policy and Gender Action Plan commit the AU to promote the effective participation of women in peace operations and within its organs, the RECs, and member states. The operationalization of these commitments is the main purpose of the AUC’s Women and Gender Development Directorate (WGDD) that reports directly to the Chairperson.

Within peace and security, the APSA Road Map includes a range of specific actions on women, peace and security, including AU staff training, annual open PSC sessions, gender mainstreaming guidelines for thematic areas (including mediation), interaction with RECs, appointment of women as special envoys, and PSO training. However, reports indicate that the actual progress achieved on UNSCR 1325 and other aspects of the gender framework has been limited. Despite the AU’s commitment to involve women in conflict resolution and peace building, this is still not adequately reflected in their participation during peace negotiations. Women’s involvement remains peripheral and women are mostly relegated to participation in civil society processes or as observers during formal negotiations. That said, there have been some steps forward in relation to the ASF (procedures are in place for gender training of military, police, and civilian personnel deployed as part of an AU or AU/UN hybrid mission) and the recently launched Security Sector Reform policy framework highlights the requirement for women-specific activities, gender awareness and responsive programming. In addition, a

---

64 UNSG Report 466(2010). Between 1992-2010, only 8% of UN negotiating teams were women and less than 3% of peace agreement signatories were women. Only 16% of 585 peace agreements studied contained specific references to women. Meanwhile a study of post conflict MDTFs indicated that less than 6% of funds were allocated directly to activities advancing gender equality.
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Special Representative on Women, Peace, and Security has also been appointed, who will act as a point of contact for AU-UN partnership on women, peace and security issues. The current AU Chairperson has made gender one of the priorities for her term of office.

The situation within the sub-regional organisations is similar. While the RECs have gender units, and have adopted policy commitments in line with UNSCR 1325 and the AU’s Gender Policy, they have also lacked the resources and political drive to make substantial progress in either mainstreaming gender in their own work or promoting gender action plans and follow up mechanisms amongst their member states. With some exceptions (for example, SADC) women remain grossly under-represented in senior decision-making positions. This picture is mirrored amongst member states where there is a tendency for gender to be pursued by gender machineries rather than as a responsibility decentralised through all government structures. With some exceptions (for example, SADC) women remain grossly under-represented in senior decision-making positions. This picture is mirrored amongst member states where there is a tendency for gender to be pursued by gender machineries rather than as a responsibility decentralised through all government structures.68 Member states have yet to fully ratify key elements of the gender framework and reporting is patchy.69

69 Report of the Chairperson on the implementation of the SDGEA, July 2012
4 Danish assistance to regional peace and security processes in Africa

This section of the report discusses existing Danish interaction with the AU and the RECs/RMs in relation to APSA capabilities and their operationalization and the prospects for strengthening this through further focusing and coherency.

4.1 Overview of Danish engagement

Denmark has an increasing level of engagement on peace and security issues in Africa, both bilaterally and through its multilateral support. Compared to a few years ago, there is an increasing use of programmes combining ODA and non-ODA funds and drawing from stabilisation policy and programming (via the Whole of Government Steering Group – Samtænkingsstyregruppen). Examples include the Horn of Africa Regional Stabilisation Programme and the Regional Sahel Stabilisation and Peace Programme.

In September 2013, Danida’s policy paper on stabilisation reiterated the Danish Government’s intention to continue its engagement in fragile states and situations with a particular weight being placed on joint programming (where the country concerned has a central role) and support to inclusive political processes that address the origins of the conflict in question. In addition to this, the paper also notes that priority will be given to long-term capacity and institution building at regional and country levels.70

In addition, there are a number of smaller programmes and support packages with peace and security dimensions, including the support to South Sudan, Mali, Niger, and Somalia and the continuing engagement with a number of think-tanks and other organisations. Ad-hoc grants have also been provided to support specific needs and opportunities, for example in relation to PSO (most recently AFISMA) and other initiatives (for example, counter radicalisation/violent extremism in West Africa/Sahel). Some of these programmes are administered by Danish Embassies, while others have a strong link to different departments in the MFA.

4.1.1 Africa Programme for Peace (APP)

Since 2004, the main direct support to the APSA has been through the two phases of the Africa Programme for Peace (APP); Phase 1 (2004-2009) for DKK 248 million and Phase 2 (2010-2014) for DKK 250 Million. A third phase of the APP will cover the period 2014-2017.

The APP has provided technical and financial support to the peace and security activities of the AU, ECOWAS, IGAD, EASFCOM, KAIPTC, as well as the activities of certain think tanks and

---

70 Danmark’s samtænkt stabiliseringsindsatser i verdens brændpunkter, Danida, September 2013.
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civil society organisations.71 A component intended to support SADC was included in the first phase but was subsequently dropped due to difficulties in engaging with the organisation and the subsequent lack of uptake. The overall aim of the APP has been on making conflict prevention and responses more operational through strengthening the implementation of APSA.72 It has, inter alia, supported the operationalization of the core APSA capabilities (examples include cementing the role of the PSC, enhancing the capacity of the Panel of the Wise Secretariat, promoting interaction between CEWS and the RECs early warning systems). The AU support has also been directed to the AU Liaison Offices (where Denmark has been the driving force behind joint financing support) and to gender.

In IGAD, the APP has supported the development and role out of the IGAD Peace and Security Strategy, in particular concerning early warning, preventative diplomacy, gender and in relation to IGAD’s peace initiatives in Somalia. APP support to ECOWAS was earmarked to the operationalization of the ECOWAS Conflict Prevention Framework (ECPF), which had been designed with Danish support in APP I. However, as mentioned, the actual uptake has been severely constrained due to internal constraints within the organisation resulting from management change. Core support has been provided to the KAIPTC in relation to its PSO training activities and support has also been provided to the West African Network of Peacebuilders (WANEP), which is a key enabler of early warning in the region (thus supporting ECOWAS’ contribution to the continental system, CEWS). In APP II, funding was also channelled to the East Africa Standby Force (EASF) to enable the development of its civilian and police components. Some limited support was also provided in APP II to UNECA’s capacity building cooperation with the AU.

The third phase of the APP will have more or less the same focus as its predecessor, albeit with some streamlining and a slightly lower level of finding (DKK 210 million). The overall purpose will again be the operationalization of APSA with regard to making the responses to crisis and conflict more structural and operational. The programme will be significantly aligned to the partner organisations’ own strategies and plans, which is a key difference from the first phase of the programme and reflects the fact that the AU and RECs concerned now have strategic and increasingly results based management processes in place that focus on APSA capabilities as the main framework for peace and security interventions.

4.1.2 Danish stabilisation programmes in Africa

Meanwhile, the support provided by Denmark through the two stabilisation programmes in the Horn of Africa (2011) and Sahel (2013) use a mix of ODA and non-ODA funds to target operational needs as well as capacity building at regional level (EASF, ECOWAS) and for certain member states. An overview of these two programmes is shown in the table below.

Table 2: Focus of Danish stabilisation programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Horn of Africa Stabilisation Programme73</th>
<th>Sahel Stabilisation Programme74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened Regional Stabilisation and peace Keeping Capacity:</td>
<td>Improved security activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Analysis of security sectors in Mali, Niger,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

71 In the absence of direct cooperation with the SADC Secretariat, the SADC component of the programme has concentrated on supporting the work of non-governmental organisations.
72 The SADC component was managed from the Embassy in Pretoria.
73 Overview as per Programme Document. Actual interventions have been subject to change.
74 Sahel Programme Document.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity building of the Eastern African Standby Force (EASF)</th>
<th>Burkina Faso jointly donor funded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project support to the establishment of a Rwandan Rapid Deployment Capability in connection with the EASF (now shelved)</td>
<td>Strengthened democratic control of armed forces by building capacity of Parliaments, civil society and Ministries of Defence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Un-earmarked support to the AMISOM Trust Fund</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improved regional stability by supporting international cooperation on counter-piracy, regional cooperation on maritime security and rule of law:</th>
<th>Enhanced mediation and conflict resolution:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improved International and regional cooperation concerning counter-piracy and maritime-security</td>
<td>Community-based border management in the border region between the three countries, with border authorities and local communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to maintain the Kenyan Navy’s capability</td>
<td>Stabilisation in Northern Niger and in time in Northern Mali implemented by NGOs, local authorities and communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support to UN rule of law programme in Somalia with emphasis on Puntland</td>
<td>Peace conference, implemented by Ministries of Foreign Affairs in Niger and Denmark</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>International and Regional Anti Money-Laundering and Counter Terrorism/Anti-Radicalisation efforts are Increased:</th>
<th>Extremism and radicalisation countered:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-money laundering support activities (Ethiopia)</td>
<td>Improved regional cooperation on combatting organised crime, jointly funded with other development partners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter radicalisation activities (Kenya)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.1.3 Danish support to African research institutes

Denmark has also been a long-standing supporter of certain leading think-tanks working on peace and security issues, the majority based in South Africa. These include the Institute for Security Studies (ISS), the Centre for Conflict Resolution, the Institute for Justice and Reconciliation (IJR), and the South African Institute for International Affairs (SAIIA). Outside of South Africa, the support to WANEP and KAIPTC is also relevant. As mentioned earlier, these organisations have been (and remain) important practical and intellectual contributors to the APSA, particularly ISS but also more recently CCR (both of which have provided source material for this study). Some of the African think tanks have been used actively by the AU/RECs to assist their policy development. At the same time, they face a difficult balance between their roles as “trusted advisors” and as critics/watch dogs and, at times, the relationship has been turbulent. Nonetheless, overall, they represent a significant asset that Denmark can encourage in relation to APSA’s further development.

### 4.2 Danish support to multilateral institutions

In addition to its bilateral programmes, Denmark supports multilateral approaches relating to peace and security through the UN, EU, World Bank and other institutions. Some of this support is operationalized through specialised agencies that are active on the ground, for example UNDP, UNICEF, UNHCR, as well as the UN Peace Building Commission (UNPBC). The major

---

75 Supported outside of the APP, through allocations from the Danish Embassy in Pretoria. Support has also been provided to the Electoral Institute of South Africa (EISA) and the Institute for Democracy in Africa (IDASA) – both of which worked in the democratic governance area. The U.S.-based Centre for Global Counterterrorism Cooperation (CGCC) has also been actively supported.
role played by certain of these actors in areas adjacent to the APSA should not be underestimated and, as described above, there are signs in some areas of an increasing complementarity and coherency while in others there are asymmetries.

Likewise, Denmark provides considerable support to humanitarian NGOs whose activities are not directly related to APSA but should be considered complementary to certain APSA capability areas (for example, post conflict reconstruction).

4.3 Lessons learned from Denmark’s APSA and stabilisation support

The experience from the last decade of support to the APSA through the AU and selected REC’s supports the understanding that also underpins the New Deal, in particular the principles designed to build mutual TRUST by providing aid and managing resources more effectively and aligning these resources for results. In other words, prioritising transparency, risk-sharing, use and strengthening of (beneficiary) systems, strengthening of capacities, and timely and predictable aid.

The main collection of lessons learned relate to the APP, which has benefited from a number of formulation assessments, appraisals, reviews as well as a commissioned lessons learned exercise (2011). 76

The findings are that the programme has been valid and relevant but overall progress has been uneven, largely due to capacity constraints among the recipients. In the first phase (APP I), there was generally good progress in the AU and ECOWAS and a number of significant results. However, it was much slower with IGAD and the envisaged support to SADC failed to take off due to difficulties in engaging with the SADC Secretariat (a problem that was not unique to Denmark). With the exception of SADC, Denmark was able to assist the organisations at a critical time and won much respect for its ability to play a catalytic role, influencing in particular the development of APSA and the overall donor engagement in a positive way. In the second phase (APP II), the situation changed markedly as described in this report; most notably, the AU has taken major strides forward and ECOWAS has fallen behind, due partly to internal management problems and partly to a succession of regional crises that it has struggled to match.

The APP was also ambitious: the partner organisations were all going through transition at the same time as being expected to deliver against their extensive mandates. They have faced significant capacity shortcomings in terms of human resources and systems. And, while there have been a relatively large number of donors interested in interacting with them, the support being offered was initially largely bilateral and un-harmonised. Later, Denmark was at the forefront of efforts to promote alignment and harmonisation, particularly through joint financing and through common dialogue for a (especially AU and IGAD). The programme was therefore received positively by the organisations and by other donors. It was seen as providing an excellent opportunity to support the emerging African peace and security architecture, support the efforts of the organisations to deliver and engage in dialogue with them. A further observation is that, while the programme has raised Denmark’s profile on African peace and security issues, this success and opportunity also prompts the question of how best to maintain this position? 77

---


77 Start up Mission report (2005), Danish MFA
Since the launch of the APP in 2004, the stabilisation programmes in the Horn of Africa (2011) and the Sahel (2013) have been prepared. As mentioned above, these programmes differ from the APP in that they respond directly to the concrete operational demands (e.g. AMISOM financing, anti-piracy, counter radicalisation, security sector reform) connected to the current instability in the two regions. The formulation of these programmes provides a different level of insight to the capabilities being promoted under APSA – on the one hand clearly demonstrating their overall relevance and, on the other, the capacity shortcomings and asymmetries at ground level that currently limit APSA’s effectiveness in terms of outcomes.

A further lesson from these programmes is that they can be expected to be vulnerable to a different set of risks than the APP. Whereas one of the key problems with the APP has been the dependency upon counterpart leadership, fund management, and ownership, the stabilisation programmes (so far the Horn of Africa) have encountered significant political risk. Experience suggests that the main risks associated with APSA-related inputs will be political, institutional and financial. The value of taking an active approach to these has been demonstrated by the political difficulties encountered in relation to the support to be provided to the Rwandan RDC and, in another case, by the institutional difficulties (low absorption) encountered by the APP II grant to ECOWAS. In both instances, the risks were articulated in the programme support documentation, which is required by Danida’s aid management guidelines. Furthermore, in the case of the Rwanda RDC, the proposed support was also subject to a detailed pre-cursor study – which would be a good practice for such major investments. The APP experience shows that risks are also connected further down-stream with beneficiary implementation. Relating to APSA, where policy documentation generally does exist, risks are likely to centre on lethargic implementation practices leading to sub-optimal project implementation.

As noted earlier, the most marked progress within APSA has been where clear, results based action plans or road maps are available and coupled with sufficiently strong internal management and monitoring. This is demonstrated by the joint support to the AU Liaison Offices where demonstrable progress only really became possible through a combination of (a) solid AU ownership (the identification of some financial mismanagement and the need to respond visibly to this was an important factor in generating visible and active management), (b) the introduction of internal delegated management arrangements within the Commission, coupled with a clearly defined and monitorable institutional strengthening plan, and (c) active engagement with international partners (via a joint financing arrangement). This is a model that would be useful for other APSA capability areas.

4.4 Promoting coherency in Danish support

The lessons highlighted above point to the relevance of ensuring overall coherency in programming and policy dialogue so that Denmark sends a consistent message and draws from the experience available. The importance of this becomes acute when different programmes utilise the same partners and/or operate within the same or adjacent space. In concrete terms, the proximity of the APP to the stabilisation programmes in East and West Africa raises the issue of alignment between the programmes’ objectives and the optimum allocation of resources and management in view of the funding sources and stakeholders involved.

To some extent, a division of labour between the two programme types has already evolved: for example, the support to EASFCOM was moved from the APP to the Horn of Africa Stabilisation Programme - with the consequence that the APP is now no longer supporting the ASF, despite it being one of the main APSA capability areas. The stabilisation programmes are also much
more targeted on immediate stabilisation/security needs than the APP, which has its focus on the overall architecture. This broad division of labour is shown in the table below.

Table 3: Division of labour between Danish programme types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme type</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>Alignment priorities</th>
<th>Funding source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APP</td>
<td>Longer term engagement. Capacity building &amp; operationalization of APSA at continental level. Focus on core APSA capabilities (except ASF) but adopt a flexible approach to other thematic areas. Requires local anchoring and clear commitment. Alignment with APSA road maps (also in RECs). Joint financing prioritised.</td>
<td>AU/RECs strategic plans APSA Road Map</td>
<td>ODA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabilisation</td>
<td>Responds to operational needs, flexibility over funding sources, shorter term inputs, including contributions to multilateral agencies (trust funds etc.), potential for non-DAC-able inputs. Higher degree of risk acceptable. Joint financing prioritised. Responds to DK political priorities.</td>
<td>Operational requirements AU/REC/RM policy docs National policies</td>
<td>ODA &amp; non-ODA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The inter-relating programmes and Danish stakeholders involved, raises the question of how best to ensure the overall coherency of the Danish contribution during design and implementation? The current practice relies upon intense efforts during programme design during which a wide variety of (mainly in-house MFA departments and embassies) are consulted (with MoD joining in the case of stabilisation programmes) coupled with well-established appraisal and approval procedures.

In the case of the stabilisation programmes, a useful higher level policy group also exists in the Whole of Government Steering Group (WGSS or Samtækningsstyregruppen). This currently omits the APP, but it could be considered how the mandate and membership of the group could be developed so that additional APP-related (and potentially other, for example Danish military) stakeholders can be involved, thus strengthening linkages between the two programme types.

Related to this is also the issue of how best to maintain currency and knowledge within the narrow (WGSS, Danish MFA) group and other stakeholders and experts (including other government agencies, researchers, NGOs, consultants etc.). While some informal resource groups exist on an ad-hoc basis (for example in relation to strategy development), these may be too large and discussion too generalised for an operational interaction. On the other hand, the more focused programme formulation (and implementation) processes amongst a core, select programming group results in a rapid in-flow of knowledge that may be lost once the programming exercise is complete. This suggests that consideration be given to knowledge management beyond the narrow group.\(^78\)

A coherency observation with regard to the African research institutes is that there would be benefit in strengthening their linkage to the APP, given the common attention being paid to APSA issues. The South African-based think tanks are funded directly by the Embassy in

\(^78\) Options could include forms of programme “sparring” with key resource persons and the establishment of a password protected information portal. A further option could be the formation of an Africa peace and security sub-group of the WGSS involving a wider selection of Danish stakeholders.
Pretoria as part of a small regional programme, which presents a risk should this programme eventually close.  

4.5 Observations in relation to the focus of Danish APSA support

The foregoing analysis of APSA’s operationalization and the experiences from Denmark’s long-standing support present a number of possibilities for the future.

- The experience strongly suggests that Denmark is a valued partner. It has this position courtesy of its active engagement rather than the size of its contribution. The active engagement has been made possible through flexible, responsive and well-aligned programming and an active dialogue.

- The increasing number of Danish peace and security interventions suggests the need to ensure overall coherency, knowledge sharing and possibilities for synergies between programmes. A way of doing this would be to involve the Africa Programme for Peace (APP) in the Whole of Government Steering Group (Samtænkingsstyregrupper).

- The focus of the next phase of the APP on the APSA priorities is highly relevant. There is a need to promote operational linkages between the AU and RECs on the one hand and UN, World Bank, AfDB etc. on the other. There is a particular need to counter the asymmetries emerging, most notably between the AU and the RECs. However, this cannot be forced from outside. The upcoming APSA Review and new Road Map provides a vehicle for generating movement and Denmark can support this process. There are political issues that need to be addressed that relate to the most appropriate balance between the AU and the sub-regional organisations – and the AU needs to be sensitive to these. However, partners such as Denmark have potential to support the development of functional desk-to-desk cooperation between the organisations that can in turn help strengthen the political coherency.

- Denmark can support a needed review of the ASF, where recent developments have raised fundamental questions concerning the division of roles.

- In relation to the wider APSA issues (especially PCRD), there is a need for further reflection on roles, taking account of comparative advantages and actual capacities. Member states need to be brought more closely into this discussion and the scope for linking to the G7+/International Dialogue should be explored. Given its role in the latter, and its good relations with the AU, Denmark could support this process. Danish stabilisation and bilateral support programmes (including ad-hoc grants) can be integrated into this process so that synergies are exploited.

- In view of the rather limited linkage between the APSA capabilities and AU/REC member states, there would be value in Denmark using its possibilities for political dialogue and bilateral programming to strengthen the visibility of APSA capabilities at country level. APSA itself is a somewhat abstract term but the capabilities involved can be expected to be more meaningful. A similar outreach could be supported in the dialogue with the AU/RECs.

- Denmark can use its position on global aid effectiveness issues (such as the through the International Dialogue) to promote greater openness to African partnerships and movement on burden-sharing.

---

79 Despite pressure to broaden their funding base, the think tanks remain vulnerable to shifts in donor support. This was demonstrated by the closure of IDASA in 2013.
5 Conclusions

The AU and the sub-regional peace and security organisations are faced with the challenge of responding to crises on the continent at the same time as they are developing the capacity to do so. Not surprisingly, therefore, the overall picture is uneven. By and large, the sub-regional organisations are less advanced on operationalising APSA capabilities than the AU. This asymmetry should be a cause for concern as it threatens the ability of the pillars upon which APSA rests to deliver outputs of sufficient timeliness and quality.

In general, progress on operationalizing the core APSA capabilities areas has increased in tempo over the past few years and is being matched by an increasing assertiveness by the AU and certain of the sub-regional organisations on African crisis and post conflict situations, most recently exemplified by the response to Mali. There is also an increasing connectivity to the global peace and security architecture, as epitomised by the United Nations and its specialised agencies. As it demonstrates its willingness to take its share of responsibility for resolving African crises, the AU is demanding a fair representation in decision-making on them and access to financing and other resources. Compared with the incoherency demonstrated by the AU and member states over the response to Libya and Côte d'Ivoire, the response to Mali has been stronger even though, ultimately, it was not fast enough and revealed limitations in the role of the sub-regional organisations.

Mali has provided a number of lessons learned with implications not just for the operationalization of the APSA but also for the way the global security architecture operates:

- **Firstly**, there is an urgent need to fully operationalize the ASF, particularly its rapid deployment capability. The Chairperson has proposed an alternative concept providing for a strengthened AU-led immediate reaction force based on a lead nation framework. However, it is not yet clear how this marries with the existing work that has already been done on the RDCs or how it resolves one of the major constraints affecting AU PSO, which is financing.

- **Secondly**, the AU Peace Fund requires a substantially increased level of contribution if it is to reduce the currently overwhelming dependence on external partner support (which supplies 98% of funding for PSO) and ensure predictable, flexible and sustainable funding for African led peace initiatives. In addition to addressing AU member states’ limited AU Peace Fund contributions, this also points to a need to resolve the UN’s reluctance to fund (through assessed contributions) UN mandated African regional peace operations and/or find alternative methods of burden-sharing.

- **Thirdly**, there is an urgent need to improve the decision-making ability and cohesion of AU and REC responses to crisis. The issue here is not so much early warning as the failure of early response. These areas lie at the core of APSA and should therefore underpin objectives for its future development.

The AU Peace and Security Council, the Continental Early Warning System, preventative diplomacy and the Panel of the Wise, and the African Standby Force are absolutely central to the APSA and are rightly prioritised. The AU is, however, increasingly taking the view that a number of other capabilities need to be taken into account. These include security sector reform, counter terrorism, post conflict reconstruction and development, maritime security, small arms and light weapons proliferation, and disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration.
By and large, the operationalization of the wider APSA capabilities is much less developed than the core APSA areas and there is substantial policy and technical work required. A key issue here concerns the role that the AU, the sub-regional organisations and member states should take compared to other, often more specialised and better financed, agencies. Resolving this requires determining where the comparative advantages of the different actors lie. In some cases, it can be argued that specialised agencies should be prepared to give “space” to the African organisations, through involving them in decision-making and developing partnerships. There are some examples of this approach emerging in the areas of post conflict reconstruction and development, early warning, and security sector reform.

Recent assessments indicate that there is a need to improve the coherency of the system as a whole, including its linkages to regional and global initiatives, capacities and the assistance available from partners. There are asymmetries that threaten to undermine the progress currently being made. These fall into four main areas: (a) within the APSA itself (i.e. between four of the five main core areas and the wider capabilities; (b) between the AU and the sub-regional organisations, all of whom are markedly weaker; (c) between the African organisations and their global counterparts, and (d) between the African organisations and their member states. None of this is new but the progress now being made by the AU and certain member states is requiring re-thinking at the regional and global level.

With an increasing commitment to contributing to the resolution of African peace and security issues – in particular through the strengthening of the capacities of leading African institutions – these developments have implications for Danish security assistance and the way it is organised. The report sees that the overall coherency of the Danish support would be strengthened through extending the arrangements already in place for stabilisation support to other programmes, in particular the Africa Programme for Peace, which is currently the main channel for supporting the APSA. This would enable greater concentration of effort, sharing of knowledge and exploitation of synergies that are available.

In summary, on the development of APSA and its link to the global security architecture, the report sees that:

- APSA has emerged as the key peace and security policy framework at AU. Its focus is broadening to include a range of supporting capabilities as well as linkages to areas such as governance. There is a good logic behind this but their operationalization must be based on a partnership with specialised agencies and a realistic assessment of comparative advantage.
- The African Governance Architecture (AGA) is not as advanced as APSA and the APRM shows that progress on it can be expected to be more difficult due to the need for concrete member states’ buy-in.
- There are asymmetries that threaten to undermine APSA’s progress: (a) within the APSA itself (i.e. between four of the five main core areas and the other, wider capabilities that are not as developed); (b) between the AU and the RECs, all of whom are markedly weaker; and (c) between the African organisations and their global counterparts, especially the UN and World Bank.
- The African Union is consolidating its position as the paramount African peace and security organisation. This is not least thanks to the intensive capacity building and support that it has received over the last decade. Further institution building needs to be matched by a demonstration of seriousness and competence from the AU and a
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willingness to engage it and give it space from global agencies in response. This needs to extend beyond political dialogue and involve operational partnerships.

• The Mali experience is resulting in (a) renewed thinking on early response, (esp. rapid deployment) and (b) sharpening up of APSA generally with increased focus on prevention. The AU has become more assertive and more engaged with global processes as a result. However, Mali also demonstrates that the capabilities required are not yet in place to allow the AU to meet its political and operational expectations.

• There is also a pressing need to improve the availability of predictable and sufficient financing for peace and security initiatives via the AU Peace Fund, although it is unrealistic to expect this to cover also the costs of Peace Support Operations. On this, there needs to be further effort expended by the international community given the concerns about the funding constraints of UN assessed contributions.

• Interaction between AU and REC/RMs is uneven but improving. There is regular dialogue but the functional level contacts between desks require extension. The RECs’ capacities in terms of political decision-making, staff capacity and financial resourcing are highly variable. Limitations impact on the ability to deliver concrete results on APSA capabilities and restricts subsidiarity in practice.

• Operational interaction between the AU and the UN is deepening and broadening. But major policy issues remain, esp. on PSO financing. A renewed effort is required to find an acceptable model.

• EU is the other significant partner. The Africa Peace Facility is financing both PSO (AMISOM, AFISMA) and APSA operationalization.

• The linkages to the new aid architecture (New Deal etc.) are unclear. The AU should be pulling greater weight here through advocacy and engagement.

• There is a clear potential for APSA to support global cross-cutting issues (R2P, UNSCR 1325, rights etc.) but they are not yet being fully exploited. The PSC, PoW, CEWS and ASF all have major roles to play in relation to R2P but the response is overly ad-hoc (constrained by resources).

• The ASF is in need of review so that the lessons learned from recent African-led peace support operations can be assimilated. The Chairperson’s African Immediate Crisis Response Capacity (AICRC) initiative and the ASF’s Rapid Deployment Capability (RDC) need to be harmonised.

• The APSA road map provides a basis for alignment. It will be reviewed by end 2013 and should take into account also the on-going evaluation of the EU’s Africa Peace Facility. A new road map is expected for 2014+.

In relation to Danish policy issues, the report sees that:

• Denmark is a modest but valued partner. It has this position courtesy of its active engagement rather than the size of its contribution.

• The increasing number of Danish peace and security interventions suggests the need to ensure overall coherency, knowledge sharing and possibilities for synergies between programmes. A way of doing this would involve the Africa Programme for Peace (APP) in the Whole of Government Steering Group (Samtækningsstyregruppen).

• It is highly relevant for the third phase of the Africa Programme for Peace to focus on the APSA, especially its core areas. There is a need to promote further operational linkages
between the AU and RECs on the one hand and between them and the UN, World Bank, AfDB etc. on the other.

- Denmark could use its position on global aid effectiveness issues (such as the through the International Dialogue) to promote greater openness to African partnerships and movement on burden-sharing.
## Annex A: Status of APSA and related instruments at AU level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peace &amp; Security Council (PSC)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Meets regularly (400 meetings since 2002). Annual meetings with UNSC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental Early Warning System (CEWS)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Increasing capacity &amp; feeds into PSC and PoW. Open source, AU based, also some capability amongst RECS but insufficient linkage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Standby Force (ASF)</td>
<td>Initial Operating Capability</td>
<td>Has initial operating capability. Road Map III leading to full operating capability in 2015 (but unlikely to be met). RECs at different levels of capacity. Needs review in light of AFISMA/AMISOM lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panel of the Wise (POW)</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>Increasing engagement. Mediation Support Unit and PoW Secretariat established.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU Peace Fund</td>
<td>Operational but inadequate</td>
<td>Approx. 8% of AU regular budget (target 12%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Main APSA elements mentioned in PSC Protocol 2002

### Other related peace and security initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AU Border Management Programme – AUBP</td>
<td>Under implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Conflict Reconstruction &amp; Development - PCRD</td>
<td>Under implementation</td>
<td>AU PRCD Policy 2006. African Solidarity Initiative (ASI). Range of issues require further clarification, including vision &amp; synergy with other AU and int. instruments (esp. UN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation Support Unit</td>
<td>In place</td>
<td>Operational and supporting PoW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disarmament, Demobilisation &amp;</td>
<td>AU role being clarified</td>
<td>AU Comprehensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reintegration (DDR); small arms (SALW); Security Sector Reform (SSR)</td>
<td>Framework on SSR (being implemented with UNDP &amp; ASSN). African Strategy on SALW.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common African Defence and Security Policy (CADSP)</td>
<td>Policy framework adopted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AU Liaison Offices/Field missions</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>JFA support for capacity building in place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counter Terrorism</td>
<td>ACSRT operational. Developing model laws etc. &amp; link to UN CT agenda</td>
<td>AU Plan of Action for Prevention &amp; Combatting of Terrorism; African Centre for the Stud and Research on Terrorism (ACSRT) in Algiers. Special Representative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Integrated Maritime Strategy</td>
<td>Initial steps being taken</td>
<td>Task Force established in AU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women, Peace &amp; Security</td>
<td>Limited progress</td>
<td>AU Special Envoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change and security</td>
<td>Limited progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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