



Clingendael

Netherlands Institute of International Relations

Beyond Transitions: UNDP's role before, during and after UN Mission withdrawal

Megan Price

Lina Titulaer

CRU Report



Clingendael

Netherlands Institute of International Relations

Beyond Transitions:

UNDP's role before, during and after UN mission withdrawal

Megan Price

Lina Titulaer

Conflict Research Unit, The Clingendael Institute

The Hague

September 2013

Status of the Document: Independent report of the Clingendael Conflict Research Unit

The present study explores kinds of preparation, foresight and analysis that contribute to the ability of enduring actors, and the UNDP in particular, to backstop progress and continue positive momentum as a UN peace mission withdraws. Within the broader context of the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, there is both demand and opportunity to learn from recent UN transition experiences. This project's objective is to highlight both particular and common challenges, opportunities and useful preparative practices for consolidating peace in the context of a mission transition. It is presented to the broader public to inform current discussions, and directed toward UNDP policy advisors to inform future guidance.



Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael'

Conflict Research Unit

Clingendael 7

2597 VH The Hague

Phone number: +31 (0)70 3245384

Telefax: +31 (0)70 3282002

Email: cru-info@clingendael.nl

Website: <http://www.clingendael.nl/cru>

© Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael. All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright holders. Clingendael Institute, P.O. Box 93080, 2509 AB The Hague, The Netherlands.

Contents

- Introduction..... i
- List of Abbreviations iii
- Executive Summary v

- 1 Case Study Synopses..... 1
- Timor-Leste 2
 - Early and well-resourced planning efforts..... 2
 - Joint programming prior to drawdown 4
 - Innovations for resource mobilisation 5
 - Post-mission analytical capacity..... 7
 - Capacity Building 8
- Chad.....10
 - Abrupt exit of MINURCAT, planning for withdrawal10
 - Resource mobilisation and the RC Office12
 - Clarifying urgent priorities: the DIS.....13
 - Continuation of political engagement.....15
- Sierra Leone17
 - Developing a clear exit strategy.....17
 - Follow-on measures19
 - Value of early resource planning20

Utility of triple-hatted leadership	21
Preparing a single 'Joint Vision'	22
The value of joint programming	23
Nepal	25
Ability to assess field dynamics.....	25
Maintaining political engagement after the mission	26
Expanding the RCHC Office	27
Staff (and asset) transfer.....	28
Mainstreaming conflict-sensitivity	29
Resource mobilisation	30
2 Findings & Analysis.....	33
UN Integration & Implications for Transition Planning	34
Preparing the Residual Presence	39
National Capacity Building	45
Resource Mobilisation & Effective Donor Engagement.....	49
3 Concluding Discussions	53
Annex: Mission Background Summaries	56
Timor-Leste	56
Chad	57
Sierra Leone	58
Nepal	59

Introduction

On 4 February 2013, the UN Integration Steering Group, chaired by the Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping, put forward the *Policy on UN transitions in the context of mission drawdown and withdrawal*. In response to increasing demand from Member States, as well as UN Headquarters and field staff, the document seeks to provide strategic guidance for improved planning and management of mission withdrawals. Referring to the transition of both peacekeeping as well as special political missions, the policy presents key principles and clarifies roles of various UN actors, based on lessons and effective practices collected from across the UN system. While the development of the policy closely involved DOCO, UNDP and other development partners, the policy focus centres on the lead departments of missions, DPKO and DPA, against the backdrop of a broader spectrum of relevant actors.

UNDP recognised the need for further insight into the ways mission transitions affect its Country Offices and staff. UNDP's role in supporting areas commonly featured in Security Council mandates often places it in the position to step up and fill gaps as a mission withdraws. Thus, mission transition can have a significant operational and programmatic impact on the UNDP Country Office. Despite this, UNDP currently lacks a guidance for its staff in managing these periods of UN reconfiguration. A January 2013 *Evaluation of UNDP Support to Conflict-Affected Countries in the Context of UN Peace Operations*, also notes this gap. To address this omission, the Policy and Planning Division of BCPR is now leading the development of UNDP guidance for mission transitions.

As an initial step to the development of that guidance, a lessons learned study was proposed to review how past mission transitions have been prepared for and managed in different settings. The Clingendael Conflict Research Unit, in consultation with BCPR, took on the study with backing from the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Department of Stability and Humanitarian Aid. The ensuing research sought to identify and explicate, from the perspective of field staff, outstanding facets of a transition that merit further guidance or attention. The case study selection was determined by the Policy and Planning Division of BCPR, in consultation with DPKO and DPA counterparts. The cases include mission transitions in Timor-Leste, Sierra Leone, Chad, and Nepal, collectively comprising an assortment of distinct scenarios from which to draw a broad range of findings.

The following report analyses recurring and particular challenges and opportunities that UNDP field staff are exposed to over the various stages of a mission transition, from planning to post-mission programming. These field perspectives are necessary to appropriately inform the anticipated guidance, and ensure both its focus and advice remain relevant to field practice. The results of the study were drawn from several interviews with (former) field staff of either a UN mission, a Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator's Office, or a UNDP Country Office, in addition to a review of external literature as well as UN documentation provided by UNDP, DPA, and DPKO. The individuals interviewed represent a small and purposefully selected sample of the UN field staff from the various missions reviewed. Several interviewees held high-level positions, which afforded them a strategic vantage point from which to derive their observations and inform their opinions. With that in mind, the following initial findings are offered with the caveat that they primarily represent the views and experiences of those within leadership positions, and their advisory staff. Interviews for this study were conducted remotely; no fieldwork was undertaken.

List of Abbreviations

AJSU	Administration of Justice Support Unit
BCPR	Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (UNDP)
BSM	Bureau for Security and Movement
CONSAHDIS	<i>Coordination Nationale de Soutien aux Activites Humanitaires et du DIS</i>
CTA	Chief Technical Adviser
DDR	Disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration
DfID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
DIS	<i>Détachement Intégré de Sécurité</i> , Chadian Integrated Security Unit
DOCO	UN Development Operations Coordination Office
DPA	UN Department of Political Affairs
DPKO	Department of Peacekeeping Operations
DRSG	Deputy Special Representative to the Secretary General
ERA	Early Recovery Advisor
ERSG	Executive Representative of the Secretary General
FCOs	Field Coordination Offices
IMPP	Integrated Mission Planning Process
JAU	Judicial Advisory Unit
JSPU	Joint Strategic Planning Unit
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MDTF	Multi-Donor Trust Fund
MINURCAT	UN Mission for the Central African Republic and Chad
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PBC	Peace Building Commission
PBF	Peace Building Fund
PBF	Peacebuilding Fund
PBSO	UN Peacebuilding Support Office
PCS	Peace Consolidation Strategy
PDA	Peace and Development Advisor
PNTL	<i>Polícia Nacional de Timor-Leste</i> , Timorese National Police
PRS	Poverty Reduction Strategy
RC	Resident Coordinator
RCHC	Resident Coordinator Humanitarian Coordinator

RCHCO	Resident Coordinator Humanitarian Coordinator Office
RCO	Resident Coordinator's Office
RCS	Resident Coordination System
SRSG	Special Representative of the Secretary-General
TSS	Transition Support Strategy
TST	Transition Support Team
UN PFN	UN Peacebuilding Fund for Nepal
UNAMSIL	United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone
UNCT	United Nations Country Teams
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDG	United Nations Development Group
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEST	United Nations Electoral Support Team
UNFPA	United Nations Fund for Population Activities
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNIOSIL	United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone
UNIPSIL	United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone
UNMIN	United Nations Mission in Nepal
UNMIT	United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste
UNOHCHR	UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights
UNPOL	United Nations Police

Executive Summary

The departure or significant reconfiguration of a UN peace mission signals a critical phase in a country's journey toward resilient peace.¹ How these transitions are planned for and managed can be a determining factor in either the consolidation of progress or backsliding on stability gains after a UN mission has reconfigured or exited. As the national government asserts its increasing capacity and responsibility, the UNCT can play an important role in helping identify existing capacity gaps and supporting national actors to address them. Recognizing this, UNDP has recently devoted attention to looking more meticulously at what mission transitions mean for its Country Offices, activities and staff. This study aims to contribute lessons from previous UN mission transitions.

The study explores four distinct contexts in which a UN mission transition has taken place, providing a number of interesting lessons for the managers of future transitions, and UNDP in particular, to learn from. Timor-Leste, Chad, Sierra Leone and Nepal all exhibit various factors and circumstances that set each apart from other missions, while also revealing commonalities that allow recurring patterns to emerge. The case studies each present interesting facets of a particular transition. The Findings & Analysis chapter pulls together common themes in order to outline the bigger picture they assemble.

The case studies

In Timor-Leste, the recent departure of the UN Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT) was characterised by a robust planning process that commenced two years before the December 2012 departure date. Though the Joint Transition Plan and the UNCT Transition Plan together stand as an example of early and well-organised planning, they are primarily oriented towards continued support in the mission's focus areas. UNMIT and national authorities worked closely together during the transition planning, yet the UNDP's role appears to have been undercut by its more limited human resources, and particularly its lack of general analytical or strategic planning capacity. Balancing and coordinating the much larger UNMIT capacity with that of UNDP partners also played a role in the dynamics of joint programming, which affected UNDP's residual role after the mission left. Similarly, international donors were not robustly engaged in planning, which some argue contributed to a somewhat listless response to the UN transition plans.

1 A similar understanding of 'consolidated' or 'self-sustaining' peace is put forward in Caplan, R. (2013) 'Policy Implications' in *Exit Strategies and Statebuilding*. p. 314.

The UN Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (MINURCAT) has earned the unfortunate reputation as one of the more chaotic transitions in UN experience. A patent example of political imperatives determining the time and pace of a mission transition, the case underscores the need for contingency planning that includes both the mission and UNCT partners. The fall-out of MINURCAT's departure left a heavy burden on the remaining UN agencies, funds and programmes, which were also without a Resident Coordinator during the critical months of the mission's withdrawal. Interviewees suggested that earlier integrated planning between the UNCT and MINURCAT could have prepared both to better manage the precipitous drawdown of the mission. In the face of a quick and minimally prepared transition, UNDP's attention was duly focused on continuing support to the Chadian gendarme force, the *Détachement Intégré de Sécurité*. This was seen as a successful initiative that eventually opened entry points for more robust institution building within the Chadian security sector.

The gradual and calibrated transition in Sierra Leone presents a stark contrast to that of MINURCAT. Three successive and gradually reduced missions (the peacekeeping mission, UNAMSIL, to an Integrated Office, UNIOSIL, to an Integrated Peacebuilding Office, UNIPSIL) provide a good example of the potential for follow-on missions to facilitate smaller, more manageable adjustments to the UN's presence. Integration between the mission and the UNDP was actualised in collectively setting and monitoring benchmarks to pace the transition. This enabled UNDP, other UNCT partners, and national authorities to gradually assume tasks that were previously carried out by the mission. UNDP was also directly involved in resource planning for the UNAMSIL transition, working alongside the mission's liquidation team. The continuity of UNCT leadership, a triple-hatted role, over the course of multiple transitions was also seen as a key element of integration, promoting a more unified UN approach and maintaining a steady course over multiple reconfigurations.

Lastly, the transition in Nepal can hardly be discussed without mentioning the Transition Support Strategy (TSS), which significantly strengthened the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator's Office (RCHCO). As the UN Mission in Nepal (UNMIN) withdrew, the RCHCO worked to anticipate and address residual capacity gaps. Assuming a 'service provider role', the RCHCO brought in analytical and strategic planning capacity and opened several regional offices in Nepal's more remote regions. Regular analytical updates from the field, as well as integrated peacebuilding analyses, and a Multi-Donor Trust Fund were all put towards encouraging UNCT agencies to undertake joint-programming initiatives that contributed to a comprehensive peacebuilding approach. This was seen by field actors to be a slow yet welcomed shift from the post-conflict approach sensed during UNMIN.

Findings & Analysis

The overarching analysis of the case studies presented a number of concrete findings, and occasionally some actionable recommendations. These can be found listed in the Findings & Analysis chapter, under four principle headings: UN Integration & Implications for Transitions; Preparing the Residual Presence; National Capacity Building; and Resource Mobilisation & Effective Donor Engagement. Summaries of each of these sections follow below.

UN Integration & Implications for Transitions

The capacity disparity between UNCT partners and the mission can affect substantial integration and planning in preparation for the transition. Mechanisms must be sought to ensure UNDP is enabled to play a sufficient role in transition planning. This often depends on both systematic opportunities and available capacities for integrated planning.

- Early integrated mission planning can trench important channels between the mission and UNDP. Joint contingency planning offers another practical exercise in this regard.
- Where possible, co-location among mission and UNDP planners appears advantageous.
- Providing UNDP or the RCO with strategic planning staff early in a transition may help avert compromising UNDP capacities during planning and after a mission exit.
- Surge capacities, dedicated mission liaison staff, or technical missions from HQ are helpful practices, but do not ultimately address underlying UNDP capacity deficits.
- Donors' increased concern for successful transitions could be constructively matched by support for positions and programmes that facilitate successful reconfigurations.

Joint programming can build the residual capacities of UNCT partners, facilitating task handover. The benefits are optimised through core support, breadth and depth of joint programming.

- 'Lynchpin actors' should coordinate joint programmes, bearing equal responsibility to all partners. Senior leadership can rouse commitment to joint programming. Prior experience in both mission and UNCT settings is valued of both senior leadership and lynchpin actors.
- Developing collaboration mechanisms at the field level helps ensure the practicality of joint reporting structures, lateral communication, and shared activities.
- Joint activities in multiple working areas are effective in building broader working relationships and preparing residual capacities. Divisions of labour should avoid leading to silo approaches as this could undermine handover later.
- Joint monitoring of progress made can offer UN partners sufficient lead time to prepare for new support arrangements.
- Joint progress reports can encourage UN partners to designate joint benchmarks, indicators, and share monitoring responsibilities.

Preparing the Residual Presence

Finding appropriate and sufficient funding to strengthen an RCHCO during a transition period poses a challenge. Moreover, the added value role of an RCHCO, its capacity and size should remain in step with the country context, donor environment and the needs of the UNCT.

- The enlargement of an RCHCO could focus on addressing conflict-prevention and peacebuilding priorities. This is also likely to gain broader donor support after a mission drawdown.
- Strengthening an RCHCO sometimes requires rapid recruitment. Temporary vacancies, renewable for up to two years, and modalities to recruit an assembled RCHCO team may provide two options to explore.
- The added value of the RCHCO appears to be anchored in political acumen, as well as advisory and coordination capacity. Adequate staff are required to optimise such a role.
- Acting as a 'service provider', the RCHCO should hold conspicuous consultations with the agencies and offer demonstrable follow-up on their needs and expectations.
- The expansion of an RCHCO should also involve setting an exit strategy, as its relevance is sure to evolve, and likely decline, in the years after a transition period.

Donors could view analytical capacities as investments in peacebuilding and conflict-sensitivity.

- Cooperation and co-funding between DPA and UNDP have produced different options for supplying analytical capacity in post-mission contexts.
- Information management systems to usefully connect analysis at the strategic level (within the RCHCO) with programme decision-making at the operational level (UNCT country directors) is vital to maximise the applicability of analysis.
- Emphasising analysts' contribution to strategic programming, conflict-sensitivity and peacebuilding can diminish concerns of 'politicisation', while increasing national demand for such capacities and, thereby, prompting donor support.
- Projectizing analyst positions may be more successful in gaining donor support.
- Donors championing conflict sensitivity should support the capacities needed to operationalize it. Making conflict-sensitivity or peacebuilding requirements part of project proposals is one way donors can effectively build demand for such analysis.

Cross-UN recruitment and staff transfer procedures should be redressed. However, other obstacles, related to practicalities, budgets, schedules and necessary skills, still remain.

- A joint task force could be assigned to looking into how recruitment procedures impact the flexibility and agility of field level recruitment and staff transfer during mission transitions.
- Programme management skills and relevant substance knowledge could be promoted in mission staff capacity building in order to increase the possibility of transfer to the UNCT.
- Joint programming between a mission and UNDP, may open interesting opportunities for boosting residual capacities and relevant staff transfers. As possible, such transfers should be planned for well in advance to accommodate administrative procedures.
- Co-funding positions may offer one way forward in easing cross-UN recruiting.

National Capacity Building

The opportunity for UNDP to assert a stronger role in capacity building can be actualised if its expertise is made available at the field level and also enabled to engage with the mission.

- Entry points for collaboration between UNDP and the mission include incorporating missions' technical assistance into longer-term strategies, strategically sequencing activities, and helping design and monitor benchmarks for handover procedures.
- Continuity is clearly an asset to a capacity-building strategy. In this way, it may be useful to second a capacity-building strategic expert to the mission directly, and upon mission drawdown, transfer the post to the RCHCO or a UNCT partner.

More attention is needed for the political implications of national capacity building, and its potential to disproportionately empower certain groups or state institutions. This calls for strengthened analytical and capacity-building expertise in the field.

- Capacity-building expertise should be reinforced with political and contextual analysis, from pre-planning to implementing, monitoring, and scaling down.
- Where possible, capacity-building experts within the UNCT should collaborate with the political affairs unit of a mission or, after a mission's exit, an RCHCO Peace and Development Advisor or similar political advisory posts.
- Joint funding (likely between DPA and UNDP) may be a useful mechanism to support the continuity of a political analytical capacity to inform capacity-building programmes.
- Donors could support efforts to maintain the conflict sensitivity of capacity-building programmes by funding such posts.
- Finding constructive, innovative and amenable ways to carry out ongoing capacity analysis is necessary to adjust programmes in step with growing national capacity.

Resource Mobilisation & Effective Donor Engagement

Awareness of the 'donor temperature' is key to planning transitions that are consistent with post-mission resources. Moreover, this donor temperature is open to influence.

- Donors' domestic political climate, incentives to pursue bilateral relations or other priorities, and perceptions of the country's stability can all be monitored to advise strategic planning for the size and ambition of post-mission activities.
- Transition plans should include donor participation and engagement, to an appropriate extent, to facilitate lasting donor commitment during the transition.
- Anchoring transition strategies in contextual analysis can contribute to donor confidence. This links with the need for analytical capacity within the UNCT.
- Over-reliance on conventional forms of donor support may delay seeking out alternative funding arrangements. Out-of-the-box approaches should garner UNCT and HQ leadership support as a precondition to pursuing new financing sources.
- Joint funding strategies, or direct financial support from the mission during a draw down, may offer new ways forward. Further exploration of the facility and administrative (as well as political) implications of such arrangements would be useful. In any case, such innovative thinking should be encouraged.

1 Case Study Synopses

The following case study synopses provide a brief overview of four UN peace mission transitions, highlighting relevant lessons as reported by interviewees. The synopses are summarised in such a way as to draw attention primarily to the lessons learned and, where possible, to practices that are useful in addressing challenges. The topics featured in the synopses were selected according to their perceived relevance to UNDP, including the RC/HC office. Per topic, the discussion is divided between 'what' and 'why'. The former describes critical aspects of a useful practice or potential challenge. The latter works situate the issue in a transition context.

Timor-Leste

Early and well-resourced planning efforts

What: In some respects, preparation for the drawdown and exit of UNMIT could be considered a model of a robustly organised and, on the mission side, appropriately resourced exercise. The value of early and dedicated planning efforts appears to be a clear lesson learned from previous UN exits from Timor-Leste. Attention to national participation as well as alignment to National Development strategies was evident throughout the process. Explicit focus was put to the areas of UNMIT's work requiring further support after the mission's departure, anticipating the activities and resource needs for this. Not surprisingly, the UNCT was thoroughly incorporated into the implementation of this plan, although its participation in the early preparation was somewhat circumscribed by its stretched capacity and the strong focus on UNMIT tasks.

The disparity between the human resources available to the mission and those available to the UNCT agencies likely played a role in the dynamics of transition planning. While UNMIT was able to dedicate staff explicitly to planning meetings and strategizing, UNCT staff were challenged to take part in planning tasks beyond their regular programming scope. In a pragmatic effort to bridge the gap, three UNMIT staff, importantly each with prior agency experience, were assigned specifically to planning for the transition with UNCT actors, and met with the heads of agencies. These actors also played a crucial role in aligning four UN agencies' results frameworks with DPKO, facilitating an innovative transition funding arrangement, elaborated below. Strong consideration should be given to reinforcing the planning and coordination capacity of the agencies, and the RC office, in the run up to a mission transition. This is particularly true as strategic priorities – likely to shape the nature of the UNDP's post-mission engagement – are being defined.

Why: UNDP was clearly engaged in the transition planning process. However, its human resource constraints compared with those of the mission meant that it was not, in practice, able to play an equal role in the process. Planning for the transition, a process-heavy exercise, meant additional work for UNDP actors, but was not proportionally matched by supplementary resources or a reduction in regular demands on the staff. While deemed useful, the dedication of UNMIT staff and their meetings with UNCT heads were a helpful response to a symptom. However, the underlying problem to be addressed in this case is the Country Office's planning capacity constraints in strategic periods. A comparably limited role in mission planning, including transition, undermines UNDP's ability to help shape realistic, necessary priorities for post-mission programmes.

It is reasonable to predict that capacity needs of the Country Office increase after a mission withdraws its substantial resources and UNDP picks up additional activities. However, consideration must be given to how capacity needs of the UNDP and other agencies increase during the run-up to a transition, particularly in the areas of strategic planning, administration and budgeting, and coordination. While all sights are typically set on 'the day after' a mission departs, early planning can mean capacity challenges in the months or even a year ahead of this date. Taking a broader perspective, transition planning is best understood as part of long-term integrated mission planning, rather than a separate activity toward the end of a mission's final mandate. The (re)negotiations of multiannual strategic plans, such as the UNDAF, or the entrance of a new government, are potentially useful opportunities to initiate dialogue on the form and function of the UN presence in a foreseeable post-mission future. While recognising that transition strategies should be part of mission design, providing UNCT with a surge of planning staff ahead of an anticipated transition could also help to avert overstressing programme staff as planning and coordination activities accelerate. As there is currently a strong push for early and comprehensive exit planning, this is likely to be an increasingly recurring issue.

Likewise, UNDP could benefit greatly from additional capacity to carry out contingency planning and the ability to agilely respond to late game-changers. In preparing its follow-on support programme for the Timorese National Police (PNTL), the UNDP Country Office was obliged to wait until the belated confirmation that there would be no follow-up political mission, hence UNPOL would be leaving. Had UNDP already been equipped with a team of transition planning staff, the negative consequences of both this delay and prior weak joint planning (elaborated below) may have been at least partially mitigated.

UNDP field offices are rarely, if ever, amply staffed, and calls for increased capacity are all but cliché. However, calculated choices can be made about investments that bear potential for strong and lasting returns. Strategic planners may not only increase UNDP's influence in planning for transition, but also act as a force multiplier for the Country Office. The benefits of a few additional strategic planning staff may alleviate the burden on several programme staff during transition planning, and help to set reasonable and relevant transition objectives so as to diminish staff overextension after the mission has left. Alternatively, a 'budget neutral' approach could be taken, whereby the programming responsibilities of a few staff members are decelerated and/or shifted, enabling them to dedicate more time to mission transition planning and priority setting.

Lastly, in its own transition plan, the UNCT stresses coherence with the UNMIT mandate, and directs resources towards programmes that are, in the main, designed to continue certain mandate objectives after the mission departs. There appears a need to review how planning for the uptake of residual activities may limit the UNCT's ability to adjust the UN approach in the country. Interviewees consistently report, and documents reflect, a prioritisation of residual UNMIT activities. Notably, the transition planning did not make use of an updated context analysis to inform the setting of relevant priorities. Field actors reported an unofficial 'moratorium' placed on country assessments due to a growing 'analysis fatigue' within the government. This apparent trade-off may challenge donors' commitment to New Deal principles. It will be pertinent in the coming months to see how or whether the influence of UNMIT's mandate on transition planning has a lasting legacy within the UN presence. Moreover, it will be important to understand how that legacy affects the UNCT's ability to respond to evolving dynamics within the country.

Joint programming prior to drawdown

What: As roundly pointed out by interviewees, the high level of integration between the UNCT and UNMIT was a first step in preparing for transition. The activities of UNDP in particular were aligned with UNMIT early on and continued to be further integrated throughout the mission's presence. Joint programming, particularly in the areas of security, justice and rule of law, was promoted between the mission and the UNCT in anticipation of the pending mission exit. Although programmes will vary per context, interviewees pointed to governance, decentralisation, and support to justice institutions (including the police and corrections) as areas that are likely to require support after a mission's exit. A combined UNDP-BCPR and DPKO field mission was deployed from HQ to help identify areas for deepened collaboration during UNMIT's transition period and to 'ensure adequate capacity remains to support and advise the Government'.² Interviewees held this initiative to be particularly helpful in identifying needs in anticipation of the mission drawdown and emphasised the usefulness of HQ support in this way. This appears as a relatively easy best practice to replicate.

Some good examples of coordination have been beneficial for enduring actors to take over residual activities, for instance between the UNDP Justice System Programme and UNMIT's Administration of Justice Support Unit (AJSU). The AJSU's sharing of information and its report on the justice sector roadmap were greatly appreciated and helpful for the transition. Field staff also made reference to the practicality of joint work plans, using aligned documents that specify tasks, designate roles and clarify at what point roles should shift. These forward-looking practices could help in preparing for the departure of mission staff, which may otherwise disrupt collaborative activities more abruptly. Moreover, such coordinated planning does not necessarily require joint budgeting, which can be prohibitive in terms of administration and aligning budget cycles.

Several interviewees mentioned the joint team for electoral support as an exceptional example of UNDP-UNMIT collaboration and joint management. The UNDP-UNMIT comprised team (United Nations Electoral Support Team, UNEST) cooperating under the supervision of a UNDP Chief Technical Adviser. This arrangement enabled reporting to both UNMIT's Democratic Governance Support Unit and to the UNDP Country Office, and ultimately to the DSRSG for Governance. The managing arrangement was said to facilitate staff interoperability, effective communication, transparent decision-making and a detailed, unequivocal delegation of tasks, all of which contributed to the effectiveness of the cooperation. The ability of the CTA to understand the practicalities and priorities of both the mission and the UNDP was also seen as an important factor of success.

Contrastingly, joint programming between UNDP and UNPOL to support the reform of the Timorese National Police (PNTL) highlighted the need for better guidelines and management arrangements for inter-agency communication and information sharing across UN actors and bilateral partners. This may be especially salient for the security sectors, which could be hindered by confidentiality issues or a strict reporting hierarchy within UNPOL. The plan to transfer some of UNPOL's civilian advisers from the mission to the UNDP was seen as a useful idea for helping to ensure continuity and institutional

2 UNDP-DPKO Joint Mission on Rule of Law, Justice and Security. 16-24 August 2010, Timor-Leste, p.6.

memory in this crucial area of continuing UN support. However, it appears that the plan, though formulated well in advance, was somewhat frustrated by a lack of communication or integrated planning between UNPOL and UNDP, and delayed by late decisions regarding the post-UNMIT reconfiguration³ and rigid, protracted recruitment procedures.

Why: In some cases, an area of mutual focus provided both an incentive and the opportunity to increase communication between the mission and UNDP actors and initiate joint programmes. This facilitated a common understanding between UNDP and UNMIT on what issues to address and which strategies to use to do so. For these benefits to be optimised, attention and (more importantly) resources must be dedicated early on to building field-level coordination and communication between UN partners into mission design. Moreover, strong backing from HQ, mission and the UNCT leaders is crucial. In Timor-Leste, the triple-hatted DSRSG and the joint HQ UNDP-DPKO field visit were judged valuable in this regard. New HQ arrangements in the Global Focal Point for police, justice and corrections could encourage similar supportive actions in the future.

The Timor-Leste case offers examples of both successful and less effective cross-UN cooperation. Though problematic to isolate specific factors of difference, UNDP field staff observed that management and communication structures could either facilitate or frustrate collaboration between the mission and the UNDP. Above all, interviewees stressed the need for balanced reporting lines, collaboration across several levels (strategic, executive, technical), and inclusive decision-making mechanisms. Each of these components was seen to be an essential element of effective joint programming in terms of contributing to smooth handover. Increasing reliance on UNDP civilian capacities in the later stages of a mission's deployment can prompt earlier action in building residual capacity. Division of labour should guard against enforcing silo-style working. For example, mission actors may lead technical implementation, but could encourage UNCT partner accompaniment in activities as appropriate. Limiting UNDP's input to a financial or administrative role can undermine the opportunity to strengthen its capacities and longer-term strategies in areas they may eventually take over from the mission. Strategic decision making, benchmarking progress goals and capacity-building objectives, and working at the operational level, all represent areas where UNDP partners could provide input and concurrently build knowhow before a transition. Again, the impetus for establishing such arrangements was seen to come 'from the top', implying the need for strong backing and design from both mission, UNCT, and HQ leadership.

Innovations for resource mobilisation

What: It cannot be said that resource mobilisation for Timor-Leste has matched the post-mission financial needs, so plainly mapped out in the transition planning documents. This has led to exploring different approaches to fund planned programmes, as well as the adjustment of projected activities. Voices within the UNDP Country Office reported that donor disinclination had not been recognised early enough, which could have spurred on new strategies for resource mobilisation.

3 Many within the mission, agencies and DPA expected a Special Political Mission to follow UNMIT, potentially extending UNPOL's presence. These expectations were, ultimately, not realised, prompting UNPOL to focus belatedly on handover.

Although all field actors share responsibility for this, it was pointed out that different UN actors have distinct roles to play. Emphasis was placed on the need for UNCT leadership to remain properly informed of the general 'donor temperature'. This necessitates maintaining regular dialogues with, in addition to the host government, embassies, international financial institutions and multilateral development banks. Central donor coordination systems should be supported to reduce the transaction costs, and increase the efficacy of such dialogues. Such interactions should also encourage donor involvement in transition planning, to an appropriate extent. The lack of such involvement was seen as a weakness of UNMIT transition planning. Interaction with donors at this level was seen to be within the remit of the RC, or the DSRSG prior to exit, although UNCT leaders could play a secondary role in terms of keeping specific donors up-to-date on programme planning. It was argued by UNDP Country Office staff and leadership that, at the field level, they were best placed to focus on relationships with relevant line ministries or government officials. By solidifying programme alignment with national priorities, they could subsequently carry out discussions with particular donors relevant to a specific programming area. In addition to these efforts, support from UNDP HQ in identifying new or alternative funding sources was seen as greatly desired. Should innovative funding arrangements be pursued, the RC's support and enthusiasm can be crucial in convincing donors to diverge, even if slightly, from conventional practices.

One innovative approach piloted in Timor-Leste merits mention. As its own staff capacity was being reduced, UNMIT funded four agencies to implement specific mandated tasks. This approach was strongly endorsed by the outgoing SRSG and triple-hatted DSRSG as working to the comparative advantage of different UN actors in the spirit of the recent Civilian Capacities (CivCap) initiative. Breaking down barriers between of 'blue and black' funds may bring with it a number of administrative complexities, and could incentivise agencies to emulate and assume mission mandate tasks. Nonetheless, it stands out as a pioneering approach that deserves attention. In the Timor-Leste case, those agencies (UNDP, UNFPA UNICEF, UN Women) receiving UNMIT funding signed Memorandums of Understanding in New York, designating the necessary reporting lines between them and the Secretariat. Overall, the arrangement sets a precedent, as an option whose outcomes, both in terms of resource efficacy and financial auditing, should be watched for in the coming months. Within the UN system in Timor-Leste, it was highly regarded as a trailblazing and pragmatic solution to come out of the CivCap initiative.

Why: In the context of a mission exit, resource mobilisation becomes particularly pressing as agencies, funds and programmes often anticipate increasing or reinforcing their activities to help take over from the mission. Although the UNCT transition documents in Timor-Leste clearly outline the gap between raised funds and anticipated needs, this was not particularly successful in mobilising donors. Some reasons given for the lacklustre funding commitments were the increasing tendency of larger donors to work bilaterally, general donor fatigue, and the view that donors were not sufficiently engaged in the transition planning. Given this, suboptimal funding scenarios should be planned for and alternative sources sought. Interviewees indicated the need for more 'out-of-the-box' thinking to take place at the field level, where funding strategies could be tailored to operational realities. This would require close strategic collaboration between agencies and the RC office, as well as promotion from the UNCT leadership. In such cases, HQ can play an important role in backing new strategies.

It would appear that mission and UNCT are responsible for both reading and influencing the donor climate. This crucially includes encouraging commitment through engaging relevant donors in transition planning, and clarifying which programming areas they are able and willing to support after the mission exit. Here it should be noted that, in integrated mission contexts, the departure of a triple-hatted DSRSG can leave a gap, as a new RC must be recruited. Moreover, the eventual RC will occupy a position of comparatively less political leverage than the predecessor. This can have implications for, among other things, maintaining donor relations.

Post-mission analytical capacity

What: It was reported that the political affairs office of UNMIT was maintained for as long as possible, and even included in the final liquidation team. However, given that the office is reliant on both the mandate and the assessed funds of a mission, its stay in a country is inevitably temporary. UNDP representatives interviewed underscored the degree to which the UNCT had relied on the analytical capacity of the mission, not having in-house capacity for political and context analysis themselves. Although the reasons for this dearth are complex and layered, many interviewees indicated that such 'operational costs' were not often supported by donors. Others felt that a conservative resistance to 'politicising' agencies' work has also deterred stronger efforts to build analysts into programming teams.

This lack of context-analysis capacity within the programme was strikingly juxtaposed against the conflict-sensitive approach to development that the UNDP Country Office emphasises and aspires to. Such an approach arguably necessitates a strong level of analysis and ongoing risk assessment. The UNDP Conflict Prevention and Recovery Unit has engaged an international Chief Technical Advisor to work for six months with the Ministry of Social Solidarity's Department of Peacebuilding and Social Cohesion on conflict prevention. At the request of the government, the advisor was brought in to support the development of national capacity for strategic planning and analysis, as well as provide conflict-sensitivity analysis directly. UNDP staff reported that currently there was no general capacity for political or conflict analysis to inform broader UNDP programming, although such information was greatly desired both at the strategic level and for particular events, such as elections.

In addition to this, a Peace and Development Advisor is being recruited to the RC Office, co-funded by DPA and UNDP. While the Conflict Prevention Unit advisor post is intended to support and strengthen specific capacities within the Ministry for Social Solidarity, the Peace and Development Advisor will act as a resource to the RC office and the UNCT, providing strategic planning advice and context monitoring. For the beneficial impact of this position will be determined by the quality of, not only the analysis delivered, but also the mechanisms developed to share and integrate the advice into programming. The recruitment of both the CTA and PDA speaks to the post-mission need for context analysis, linking to peacebuilding and conflict prevention aims as well as development objectives. The government's appreciation of this role, according to field staff, can mitigate concerns of the 'politicisation' of UNCT agencies. Building national analytical capacity thus appears to be one effective way to incorporate contextual analysts into projects, while simultaneously raising the government's appraisal of such actors.

Why: While the CTA position was seen to be necessary in any case, the post is understood as all the more relevant for programming in the context of the post-UNMIT environment and assisting in the development of national strategic capacities. Underlying this concern for UNDP access to analysis capacity is the recognition that development projects are often impacted by the political climate in a country, particularly in areas of governance and peacebuilding. Moreover, there is a clear need to ensure that development programmes remain conflict-sensitive, given the volatile history of the country. In the case of Timor-Leste, increasing national awareness of and responsibility for conflict-sensitive development has helped embed local demand for these analytical and strategic capacities.

Similarly, government support for such analysts is greatly advantageous, if not essential. It is not uncommon for national actors to see such an actor as a 'political watchdog', a cause for some trepidation. Presenting the beneficial impact that analysts could have on programming and strategic planning for the government as well as the UNCT appears to be a persuasive approach for building the context analysis capacity of the UNCT. Building donor support for such 'operational costs' may be more successful if part of the analytical capacity is expressly invested in building national skill sets to be absorbed into national institutions, civil society, academia and the like.

Capacity Building

What: Concern has been raised over the lack of specific and dedicated capacity-building expertise within UNMIT, despite national capacity building being a central theme of the UN intervention. Beyond staff who directly provide support to national partners, 'expertise' here refers to two aspects of capacity building. The more obvious is the technical side of appropriately planning, pacing, sequencing and measuring capacity-building progress. The second is the strategic and analytical aspect of recognising the political implications of capacity building.

This issue has strong implications for the success of residual activities. At its very core, the sustainability of gains made – and, likewise, that of UNCT projects – is tested by the ability of national actors and institutions to respond appropriately and effectively to challenges. Several interviewees asserted that missions should more systematically engage UNDP's or other agencies' expertise in civilian capacity building from an early stage in a mission's deployment. UNCT staff proposed providing mission staff training or support to enhance their effectiveness in contributing to a more long-term strategic approach. It was suggested by a cross-section of interviewees that different agencies, funds and programmes, UNDP in particular, could have a potential comparative advantage in this regard, citing their longevity in the country as well as access to capacity-building expertise. The systematic application of UNDP's civilian capacity to related mission activities may offer concrete inroads for early, systematic integration.

However, in the case of Timor-Leste, interviewees were unable to recall UNCT resources that had been dedicated to pursuing a comprehensive capacity-building strategy. Such a strategy could include conducting baseline capacity assessments and (perhaps more crucially) absorption assessments, developing a long-term capacity development strategy, assessing risks in creating imbalanced power structures, recruiting for capacity-

building skills to complement technical expertise, and providing ongoing strategic guidance and evaluation on progress made. The previously discussed lack of analytical capacity within the Country Office becomes pertinent here, as it is not clear whether in-country capacity could realistically take on such roles. Undertaking such an initiative would undoubtedly require a capacity-building expert among the leading programme staff, and potentially the collaboration of the mission's political affairs section.

Lastly, continuous re-evaluations of national capacities led to a clear and voiced 'analysis fatigue' from national partners. This has somewhat hindered the measurement of progress in certain areas of national performance which are necessary to inform UN actors' dialogues with local counterparts regarding programming. The challenge has been at least partially overcome by including performance indicators in regular project evaluation, which are used by UNDP to attract donor support and are therefore perceived as less objectionable. This reveals an opportunity for donors to play a constructive role, making demonstrable capacity gains part of their government dialogues.

Why: Discussions regarding capacity building in transition settings touched on both the technical and political factors. On the one hand, technical expertise and operational experience, often the focus of capacity-building programmes, could benefit from further supplementation in strategic planning, identifying and sequencing appropriate targets, as well as gauging benchmarks for handover procedures. Such a project should, from the beginning, be accompanied by the guidance of a longer-term programme, potentially best led by the UNDP Country Office, or the agency anticipated to carry on support after the mission transition. These practical aspects underscore the need for capacity-building expertise within programme leadership. Such capacity should be able to convincingly present coherent capacity development strategies, ensure that investments reflect needs and respect political balances, and design clear results demonstrations on a realistic basis in order to build support for the endeavour. This could be considered a potential area for UNDP to strengthen its comparative advantages and assert a stronger partner role earlier in a mission's deployment.

It is also essential to recognise that choices of who receives capacity-building attention, and what kind of support this includes, can be politically charged, disproportionately empowering certain actors or institutions. A capacity-building expert among the leading programme staff, one aware of the political implications of such programming, could increase the chances for a more strategic approach. Again, strengthening the analytical capacity within the UNCT bears great potential to enhance various programmes. This presents a strong argument for funding such a position through standard budgets, as the position should be able to serve multiple projects. These suggestions were made in an effort to distil useful elements for successful (meaning sustainable) development of national capacity that remains sensitive to the power structures they may consolidate.

Chad

Abrupt exit of MINURCAT, planning for withdrawal

What: The abrupt exit of the UN Mission for the Central African Republic and Chad (MINURCAT) peacekeeping mission at the end of December 2010 led to major challenges for the remaining UNCT actors and the RC's office. On 15 January 2010, the Government of Chad requested the withdrawal of MINURCAT within three months. UN resolution 1923, adopted on 25 May 2010, extended MINURCAT's mandate to December 2010, effectively leaving eight months to prepare for the complexities of the transition.⁴ This included preparing the Resident Coordinator's Office to take over responsibility in support of the UNCT. With only this brief period to plan, the UNCT quickly produced a development strategy, which was discussed at the level of the Policy Committee, to manage the transition and identify how the UNCT agencies remaining in the country could support the Government of Chad. The mission departure and UNCT assumption of specific MINURCAT activities were subsequently outlined in a plan issued by the Policy Committee at HQ level, involving the SG Executive Office, DPA, DPKO, UNOHCHR, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF and other agencies.

Because MINURCAT was not a structurally integrated mission, existing planning consultation mechanisms were never established between the UNCT and MINURCAT, with the exception of field security team meetings. During the transition period, UNCT was reportedly not kept abreast of the succession plans for MINURCAT to handover various mandate responsibilities, such as protection of civilians, rule of law tasks, and implementing a comprehensive plan for conflict prevention and human rights. The lack of communication structures as well as the hurried nature of the transition were frequently cited as reasons for the breakdown in handover procedures. Priorities identified by the Policy Committee referred to the fulfilment of positions within the RC's and UNDP office, but no additional resource allocation was provided to implement these tasks. Furthermore, the UNCT had previously been engaged in humanitarian relief, while MINURCAT had conducted protection of civilians tasks, highlighting a gap between their respective responses. The UN agencies were neither informed with sufficient lead time nor consulted at senior management level.

4 The Chadian government reconsidered its earlier request for mission withdrawal within three months. See S/2010/115. Ongoing consultations between the mission and Chadian government extended the mandate for two months. (UNSC/1913/2010)

Moreover, the field offices were not consulted on the issue of securing necessary resources. These factors present major challenges for the effective functioning of remaining UNCT to absorb residual tasks. An actor from the field argued that a lack of support and prioritisation from HQ caused critical challenges in areas related to conflict prevention and peacebuilding, aid effectiveness, resilience, political analysis and advice, coordination planning and M&E.

First, concerns were raised about whether the Chadian security forces would be able to adequately protect the population. Based on this uncertainty, it was agreed that the UNCT would develop an early recovery plan by 1 December 2010, prioritising early recovery interventions in support of the Government, in line with the existing early recovery programme and durable solutions strategy. This was implemented by the UNDP Country Office under supervision of the RC. It coincided with the finalisation of the Government's early recovery strategy for eastern Chad in late 2010. Subsequent to this, the UNDP, DOCO and OCHA, together with MINURCAT, carried out a comprehensive mapping of tasks, assets and staff to be transferred from MINURCAT to the UNCT. The mapping focused on identifying areas where the capacity of the UNCT and RC's Office required further strengthening in light of perceived urgent gaps. The mapping exercise was a key activity that made it possible, to a certain extent, to prioritise activities. Key areas in which the UN was expected to play a critical role were further addressed in the 2011 SG report on protection of civilians.⁵ Consequently, expectations were high, while no additional measures were taken to strengthen the RC office, nor were human or financial resources made available to the UNCT to take on any additional responsibility.

Why: Given the nature and timing of MINURCAT's exit, this transition is one of the few cases in which departure of the mission had to be planned in an abrupt and abbreviated manner. However, it is important that remaining UN actors are prepared for handover of residual programmes, even if a transition is not expected. Scenario exercises, contingency planning and stronger political foresight may have helped to better prepare the UNCT for such exigent circumstances. This requires more resources and capacity than typically dedicated to UNCT, which indicates an important risk management role for the mission's political and civil affairs sections, to work on forward analysis in collaboration with the RC office and UNCT heads of agencies. In the MINURCAT case, given the timeframe of eight months and the lack of capacity within the RC office and the UNCT, trying to ensure a smooth transition was, to put it mildly, a looming challenge.

Integrated mission planning from the beginning of the peacekeeping mission could have been helpful to tackle some of these challenges. In this regard, planning for mission handover under time-pressured circumstances could become easier should UNDP already be involved in planning procedures during the MINURCAT mission. This could contribute to identifying more sustainable post-mission priorities while MINURCAT was still present. The circumstances being what they were, the mapping activity was seen as a helpful and focused way to prepare for handover.

5 Report of the Secretary-General on the protection of civilians in Chad, S/2011/278.

Resource mobilisation and the RC Office

What: Many challenges in MINURCAT's transition were related to the difficulties in resource mobilisation. All things being equal, an adequately resourced RC office is able to support the UNCT during a mission handover process and in coordinating the takeover of residual programmes. In the case of Chad, however, it was exceedingly difficult to attract resources or strengthen the RC Office once MINURCAT withdrew. Although the remaining actors were facing a complex and potentially volatile security environment, many interviewees reported insufficient effort was made by HQ or the international community to strengthen the capacity of the RC Office and the UNCT. The RCO and UNCT offices' reliance on voluntary funding means that strengthening these offices with increased staff capacity depends on convincing donors of the relevance of UN staff costs, which can be a hard sell. Moreover, should an RC depart unexpectedly, it is difficult for DOCO or UNDP to replace that capacity on such short order with voluntary funds.

The SG Report on the protection of civilians in the east of Chad states that efforts were made to strengthen the RC office.⁶ These intentions to strengthen the RC office with a coordination specialist, strategic planning officer, Peace and Development Advisor and an Early Recovery Advisor correspond with findings from interlocutors in the field. However, despite what is claimed in various documents, interviewees who were in the field at the time report that no practical arrangements for real funding or human resource inputs were made. As discussed above, this was understood by field actors as primarily a consequence of insufficient effort made by HQ or the international community to mobilise funds to fulfil these positions.

Due to an unexpected departure of the RC in December 2010, no RC was in place during MINURCAT's exit, creating a leadership vacuum at a critical period of the transition. Although a former RC was called out of retirement to play an interim role from February 2011, the RC Office was without capacity or staff over the course of transition from the end of 2010 to July 2011. This period also encompassed the ending of the UNDP country programme cycle, as well as the UNDAF cycle, and the (problematic) MINURCAT liquidations period. This was seen as, in a way, 'adding insult to injury' in the case of the abrupt MINURCAT departure. Interviewees reported that the remaining UNCT actors, lacking sufficient resources or support, could only work in a 'fire-fighting' manner in order to prevent a collapse of the UNCT in the wake of MINURCAT's departure. Creating additional capacity for residual programmes was not prioritised at the time, and sustaining existing ones was already proving difficult.

As a consequence, it was very difficult to strengthen the RC Office with experienced (senior) staff because of lack of funding and the fact that such postings became less desirable given the increasingly apparent severity of the situation. Only after a slow and heavy bureaucratic process was the RC able to recruit a PDA in April 2011, with funding support from UNDP-BCPR and DPA. Once the interim RC was replaced with the new RC in July 2011, a personal assistant and one strategic adviser were attached to the RC Office to assist the RC in coordination, planning, political analysis and advice, M&E, communication and thematic functions. The gap between these demands and human resources dedicated are clear.

6 Ibid.

During the transition from MINURCAT to UNCT there was a missing bridge for effectively handing over responsibilities. A field staff member reported that in early 2013, DOCO, together with UNDP-BCPR, extended support to the RC Office by attaching coordination support positions, including a strategic planning officer, to fill the gap created by the withdrawal of MINURCAT. This, of course, was a full two years after the mission's exit.

Why: Strengthening of the RC Office can provide the UNCT with several benefits that can contribute to a smooth transition. The RC Office is able to assume overall responsibility for and coordination of the operational activities for development of UN programmes carried out in the country. Moreover, the RC plays an important role in resource mobilisation and priority setting. The RCOs' added value lies in their planning, advisory and coordination capacity. Thus, while the leadership role played by individual RCs is essential, they need adequate staff support in order to optimise effectiveness. One interlocutor suggested that the relatively quick recruitment procedures for temporary posts could be usefully applied in such urgent transition situations. As implied in their name, the longevity of these posts is not guaranteed, but positions are eligible for extension for up to two years.

In the case of Chad, the difficulties in mobilising resources for the RC Office reflected a wider funding crisis that affected all agencies, funds and programmes. While there was a great deal of support for the humanitarian agenda, there was perceived donor disinterest in the country's longer-term development agenda. Being the focal point for the comprehensive early recovery plan and, together with UNHCR, for the Chadian Integrated Security Unit (French acronym, DIS) programme, UNDP's programmes were at risk of collapsing when no funds were attracted. In a kind of catch-22 dilemma, such a crisis could have been at least partly mitigated had a well-supported RC been in place and able to meet with influential donors as well as government representatives to clarify the complexities and urgency of the situation on the ground. As a consequence, remaining UNCT actors report having missed the opportunity to become a strong player in supporting the country's longer term development agenda.

Clarifying urgent priorities: the DIS

What: Once it was unmistakably clear that MINURCAT would be withdrawing, efforts were made by the departing mission leadership and the UNCT to draw donor attention to certain priorities closely linked to preventing instability. Many concerns were related to the sustainability of Détachement Intégré de Sécurité (DIS) following the departure of MINURCAT. The DIS, with critical UNPOL support, had been able to protect citizens in the east and provide security support to the humanitarian and development workers in that area. The mission's rapid departure threatened to potentially create, at best, a security vacuum or, at worst, an unsupervised and unpaid armed group.

In an effort to avoid either scenario, UNDP and UNHCR supported the Chadian Government in its responsibilities to take over the DIS programme, establishing the Joint Support Programme for the DIS. Its objective was to sustain international support to the DIS to ensure the protection of refugees, internally displaced persons, host communities and humanitarian actors engaged in emergency or development activities in the area. The joint UNDP-UNHCR programme, in addition to supporting the DIS, also worked with its administrative support structure, CONSAHDIS (*Coordination Nationale de Soutien aux*

Activites Humanitaires et du DIS), and the Government Bureau for Security and Movement (BSM).

The Chadian Government, having taken on its national responsibility in this respect, contributed to the durability of the DIS and a continuation of the protection of civilians after the mission withdrew. UNDP, having an office in the capital, was able to provide technical assistance and capacity building to DIS personnel, as well as uniforms and equipment. UNDP currently finances the operational costs of the CONSAHDIS and DIS-HQ. Moreover, it has supported the deployment of a police adviser to assist CONSAHDIS in developing operational oversight of DIS activities. With this support, the administrative architecture of CONSAHDIS was finalised in 2011. UNDP's Judicial Advisory Unit has supported DIS by providing training in investigation techniques and reporting procedures, as well as by building working relations between the police, judiciary and other security actors. UNHCR, meanwhile, provided operational support in the east of Chad and was responsible for logistical support.

Resource mobilisation also affected the continuation of the DIS. The UN Peace Building Fund provided bridging support of US\$2 million for the DIS in 2010. Further funding was provided by the US and the European Union, but this fell far short of half of what was required. The revised national plan for the sustaining of DIS spelled out the creation of a DIS administrative and management unit from January 2011. The Government of Chad committed to fund all DIS personnel costs, including the CONSAHDIS, which amounted to approximately US\$7 million. The programme required a further US\$14 million in donor assistance for logistical and facilitation support. The Government also requested assistance from the United Nations to mobilise and manage donor funds.

UNDP administered contributions to the DIS through a Multi-Donor Trust Fund (MDTF), while contributions could also be made directly to the UNHCR. Under the MDTF, other agencies were also able to seek and receive funds for activities complementary to the support of the DIS, facilitating a multiplier effect. A Joint Steering Committee consisting of representatives of the Chadian Government, UNDP and UNHCR as well as key donors governs the fund and makes decisions regarding allocation. In the year following the MINURCAT withdrawal, the UNDP ensured the minimum support of training and allowed salaries to continue to be paid, thereby mitigating the risk of a dangerous situation emerging. In May 2011, the Secretary-General declared Chad eligible for additional PBF funding, which meant there was guaranteed initial funding by the PBF, among other donors, along with government funds to pay salaries for 2011. Prevailing shortages remained for 2012 and 2013.

Interviewees pointed to sustained support of the DIS programme post-MINURCAT as the most successful outcome of the UN in the wake of the mission's departure. In this regards, the Chadian Government is attributed a great amount of credit, as it has been able to consistently and reliably provide significant financial support to the programme. However, voices from the field also explained that future commitments on the part of the Government were not always certain.

Why: The continuation of the DIS and the success of the programme is credited to the continued support by both the Chadian Government and UNDP and UNHCR. The experience underscores the need to prioritise residual programmes, with clear stability

and security implications. While resource mobilisation remained difficult, the DIS is seen to contribute to enhancing security in eastern Chad. The use of standing funds, in this case the PBF, may provide the best available option in such situations. Although the situation was far from ideal, interviewees pointed to the efforts of dedicated staff members across the UNCT and UNDP, both in the field and at HQ level, as having helped to avoid a breakdown in functioning of the Country Team.

Continuation of political engagement

What: As pointed out in other case studies, the exit of a mission also means the exit of its previous political analysis capacity. In the case of Chad, attempts to create a follow-up peacebuilding mission led by DPA never materialised. Interviewees pointed to the sensitive relationship between the Government of Chad and remaining UN actors as an area that could have benefited from more political support, particularly from HQ.

While the peacekeeping mission had reliable access to various parts of the Government, this gradually diminished once the mission left. Interviewees suggested that this was due to the fact that UNCT did not have access to the same assets, such as the political backing of the Security Council, assessed funds, or political analysis capacity. In this regard, the absence of an RC during the transition phase made political dialogue difficult. The interim RC was able to continue the interface with the government in the post-MINURCAT context to a certain extent. Yet, due to the temporary leadership gap, the UNCT was unable to strengthen its (political) engagement with the Government during the transition phase.

The conditions under which MINURCAT departed complicated the political environment for the remaining UN actors. The Government of Chad proclaimed MINURCAT's withdrawal a victory for domestic peace and security efforts. MINURCAT, on the other hand, was perceived and portrayed as ineffective, damaging the reputation of the UN in Chad. Because of UNDP's assistance, in cooperation with the EU and other bilateral donors, during the 2011 electoral cycle, it was necessary to convince the Government that the UN and UNDP in particular remained a neutral and impartial partner. Liquidation procedures were particularly difficult in terms of withdrawing UN assets, held by the Chadian Government as 'collateral' for unfinished projects. The RC office was confronted with residual payments of the MINURCAT mission, adding more acerbity to an already tense relationship between the Chadian authorities and the remaining UN actors.

The recruitment of a Peace and Development Advisor was much delayed, which meant that the PDA did not arrive in the RCO until a year after MINURCAT's departure. Slow bureaucratic procedures were seen to be the cause of the delay, but also a lack of clarity about the PDA's tasks and the position's potential political implications. Given the concurrent transition of leadership in the country, this issue deserved due diligence and careful discussion. Given the sensitivity of deploying a political analyst within a post-mission setting, it was important to convey to the Government the programmatic nature of the PDA's role in the Country Office. The PDA's tasks were formulated in relation to peacebuilding and development. UNDP, supporting the Chadian government was able to establish a successful cooperation which stands as a possible best practice.

Because of slow recruitment procedures, the PDA, once employed was not able to help bridge the gap between the departing mission and the UN Country Team. Moreover, due

to the existing lack of capacity within the RC Office, the PDA had to dedicate the lion's share of time to building up the RC Office and providing coordination mechanisms for the UNCT. This points to the importance of adequately staffing the RCO to ensure that those appointed to particular posts can dedicate their time to their added value function. For example, had a coordination officer also been recruited, this could have allowed the PDA to concentrate on the primary task of providing contextual guidance and advice to the RC. Given the difficulties encountered in recruiting a single position, recruiting to fill several positions simultaneously may not have been feasible. Thought could be given to arranging human resource modalities whereby several RCO staff positions could be assembled as a team and collectively recruited through a single procedure.

As RC Office capacity grew, the PDA was able to provide political analysis on Chad and to engage national authorities. One of the interviewees from the field argued that the role of the PDA was couched within programmatic terms and had a heavy emphasis on providing added value to existing projects. The PDA has become an important figure, eventually accepted and, reportedly, appreciated by government authorities. In this way, the PDA is able to assist the RC in bridging the gap between the Government of Chad and the UNCT.

Why: Although the nature of the UNCT differs from that of MINURCAT in its focus on programming, a certain level of political analytical capacity is necessary to face the challenges of the mission leaving and to be able to bridge the political gap. In the context of Chad, the rushed departure of the mission made it virtually impossible to sustain a political capacity in the country. There was also a need for a strategic and programmatic shift of focus from stability and security to long-term peace and development. Interviewees suggested that, while not the typical justification for a PDA, such a person could play a helpful gap-filling role during a transition. This post, however, would necessarily respond to a programming need, and thus be relevant primarily in the context of gradually transitioning the UN presence towards a longer-term peacebuilding, conflict prevention and development approach.

It took a year for the PDA to be attached to the RC office, but once deployed this person was able to undertake political analysis of the country and fulfil other PDA relevant roles, such as opening spaces for dialogue and advising the RC and the UNCT on conflict-sensitive programming. Key to this eventual arrangement was the gradual acceptance and eventual enthusiasm of the Chadian Government regarding the presence of the PDA. An important lesson here is that the visible contributions a PDA makes to programming can increase the likelihood of government acceptance, particularly in politically tenuous environments.

Sierra Leone

Developing a clear exit strategy

What: In the case of Sierra Leone, the UN planned the drawdown and withdrawal of the various missions carefully, elaborating mission objectives into benchmarks for transition. The exit strategy that the UN Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) developed was closely linked to the core reasons for its initial deployment: the cessation of conflict, the extension of State authority throughout the country, and national control over revenue sources such as diamond and gold mining.⁷ Likewise, the mandate goals set by the Security Council included building the capacity of the army and police, reintegration of ex-combatants, restoration of government control over diamond mining, consolidation of state authority throughout the country, and ensuring progress to end the conflict in neighbouring Liberia.⁸ These goals were developed into benchmarks set to guide the 2005 drawdown of UNAMSIL, while at the same time addressing the existing security challenge and ensuring that the mission could gradually hand over responsibilities to the Sierra Leone army and police.

As the drawdown was executed over several years, there was time for forward planning and benchmarking, which allowed stakeholders to collectively monitor agreed indicators of progress. This provided local parties with sufficient lead time to plan and prepare for withdrawal.⁹ UNDP programmes also contributed to completing UNAMSIL benchmarks in various ways. Since 2002, UNDP's programmes have focused on the following three areas: 1) recovery and peacebuilding; 2) governance and democratic development; 3) poverty reduction and human development. UNDP was also involved in the completion of the DDR programme and worked together with the Government and national police in initiating the *Community Arms for Development Program*.¹⁰

In addition, UNDP took the lead in supporting the Government's National Recovery Committee as it worked to formulate its National Recovery Strategy, identifying the

7 DPKO (September 2003) *Lessons Learned from United Nations Peacekeeping Experiences in Sierra Leone*, Peacekeeping Best Practices Unit, p.12.

8 Fifteenth Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone, S/2002/987.

9 Durch, W. (2012) "Exit and Peace Support Operations" in *Exit Strategies and State Building*, Oxford Scholarship Online, p.95.

10 Molloy, D., *DDR in Sierra Leone 1999-2005, a contemporaneous view (Aug 2003) of the lessons learned and an overview of the pitfalls of DDR in Liberia 2003-2009*.

recovery needs of each district in the country. UNDP, the Government of Sierra Leone, the UNCT and civil society were involved in planning to meet the relief and recovery funding needs for the year following the departure of UNAMSIL. Marked progress in the benchmarking system made it clear to all parties involved, UNCT, mission and national counterparts alike, when it was appropriate to gradually transfer to another type of UN support. Such an approach could be promoted as standard practice, particularly in integrated missions. Cooperation and joint planning between the relevant government departments, UN development agencies, UNAMSIL and donors within the National Recovery Committee was an initial step towards an integrated approach to planning for the transition to peace building.

Prior to the formal confirmation of an integrated follow-on mission, UNAMSIL took early steps to address the expectations and tasks that would fall to the UN agencies, funds and programmes remaining after the mission's 2005 exit. UNDP assigned an element of their Transition Support Team (TST)¹¹ to work with UNAMSIL on behalf of the UNCT and devise a support plan, emphasising ongoing UN support in the provinces. The Civil Affairs section of UNAMSIL also developed a strong partnership with the UNDP-TST following the 2004 local council elections. This cooperation sought to build national capacities, supporting resourcefulness and strategic thinking in their approach to addressing development needs.¹²

UNDP's TST staff were housed in offices directly adjacent to the UNAMSIL liquidation team, which was said to enhance integrated planning and implementation of the transition. Moreover, a microwave link was set up between UNAMSIL and UNDP headquarters and a UNDP VLAN was installed in the integrated office.¹³ By making these arrangements, the UNDP-TST and UNAMSIL were able to jointly identify day-to-day issues before they became problems. Both the UNDP-TST and the UNAMSIL liquidation team also worked closely with lead agencies in the field offices, to either prepare for the closure of the office, or to enumerate a list of equipment needed to continue operations.¹⁴ Because of the success during the transition to UNIOSIL, UNDP-TST was later also established to assist with integrated planning of the transition from UNIOSIL to UNIPSIL.

Why: The clear exit strategy of UNAMSIL made it possible to gradually transfer responsibilities from the mission to the Government and the remaining UN actors in the country, enabling all actors to contribute to the maintenance of stability and long-term peacebuilding.¹⁵ This was particularly salient in terms of supporting the Government's resumption of responsibility for law enforcement and security provision. Previous experiences, notably the sudden withdrawal of Nigerian troops in early 2000, kept planners aware of and sensitive to the risks of prematurely withdrawn support creating a security vacuum. Early steps to integrated planning were taken, facilitated by UNDP's contribution to the completion of UNAMSIL mandate benchmarks, involvement in the

11 Originally this entity was assembled to support Local Councils during the decentralisation process. It was administered by UNDP and reported to the DSRSG/RC.

12 Civil Affairs Section of UNMASIL (2005) End of Mission Report, p. 25.

13 After-Action Review, Liquidation of UNAMSIL (July 2006), p.2.

14 Ibid, p.3.

15 DPKO Best Practices Unit (September 2003) Lessons Learned from United Nations Peacekeeping Experiences in Sierra Leone.

development of the National Recovery Strategy, and support to the National Recovery Committee. This demonstrates how a central role for UNDP as enduring actor at the beginning of planning integrated missions could help to support a smooth transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding activities.

There is not an established consensus, however, on whether the TST model is a best practice to follow. Other voices argue that because the Transition Support Teams were based within UNDP and not in the integrated office, the TST was perceived to be part of UNDP. Rather than rely on coordination by the TST, different agencies expressed a preference to maintain a leading role in different regions.¹⁶ Although different contexts may dictate different choices, a similar function could perhaps be played by the RCO, who is responsible for coordinating UN efforts, rather than by one of the agencies directly.

Follow-on measures

What: The follow-up mission to UNAMSIL was the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone (UNIOSIL). It comprised a small office with five components focusing on the key area of its mandate, namely: peace and governance; human rights and the rule of law; civilian police; military and public information.¹⁷ From January 2006, the UNAMSIL Deputy Special Representative to the Secretary General (DSRSG) became the Executive Representative to the Secretary General (ERSG) of UNIOSIL and Resident Coordinator (RC) of the UN Country Team. This continuity of leadership reportedly helped to ensure follow-up on the commitments made during the transition and a prevailing interest in UN integration. UNIOSIL's mandate was anchored in the objectives to consolidate peace and assist the Government of Sierra Leone in strengthening the capacity of state institutions; accelerate progress towards the Millennium Development Goals; improve transparency; and build capacity to hold free and fair elections in 2007.¹⁸ This signified and facilitated a transition in terms of moving from a stability-focused mandate to a mandate that sought to address issues of state building.

A transition plan between UNAMSIL and UNIOSIL was adopted in December 2005, and focused on: building the capacity of the national army and police; completing the reintegration of ex-combatants; restoring government control over diamond mining; and consolidating state authority and regional security-related developments.¹⁹ After the previous UNAMSIL peacekeeping forces had left Sierra Leone, a handful of military advisers remained to liaise with both the Sierra Leone national security agencies and the British-led International Military Advisory Training Team. UNIOSIL was established as a monitoring mission for an initial period of 12 months. Together with the government of Sierra Leone, UNIOSIL developed a Peace and Consolidation Strategy (PCS) that enhanced synergy and collaboration between national and international actors and implemented the Poverty Reduction Strategy (PRS) in order to achieve the mandate's

16 Kaldor, M. and Vincent J. (2006) Evaluation of UNDP assistance to conflict-affected countries, UNDP Evaluation Office.

17 S/RES/1620 (2005).

18 After-Action Review (2006), Review of the strategic planning and implementation of the transition and integration for the UN System in Sierra Leone, p.1.

19 Ibid, p.2.

objectives.²⁰ After a one-year extension, the United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office in Sierra Leone (UNIPSIL) was established in 2008, focusing on economic, social and institutional development. It is headed by an ERSG and led by the Department of Political Affairs.

UNIPSIL's mandate calls for a fully integrated office, with a clear division of tasks. The mission therefore worked closely with staff of essential UN development and humanitarian agencies and it was agreed that UNIPSIL would not engage in programme implementation but would provide political and technical advice to support UNCT efforts. One of the interviewees argued that, because programmes have a longer-term life cycle, the eventual departure of UNIPSIL in the future is not expected to create great disruption to programme implementation.

Why: Sierra Leone presented a context in which the option for a follow-on mission was not only available and amenable to the government, but also judged highly relevant. Granted, this combination of factors is not found in every case. But such circumstances, if responded to with solid planning and clear objectives, can facilitate a calibrated and well-sequenced transition process. The case of Sierra Leone demonstrates the potential benefits of follow-on missions for continued peace consolidation. Mandates were provided to each of the three missions by the UN Security Council, which reflected progress made in the country and identified a new layer of challenges to address in order to consolidate gains. This reflects the growing awareness within the international community that stability does not equate to lasting security. Such recognition should be logically followed by a growing demand for continued political and contextual analysis in a post-mission context. Moreover, transition must be treated as a process, not an exit date. For this, longer-term projects, such as the revitalisation of state institutions and a growing economy, warrant continued yet adjusted assistance in a post-conflict country.

Value of early resource planning

What: In the case of Sierra Leone, and the drawdown of UNAMSIL, there was sufficient time to discuss and negotiate the mandate of the new integrated office. Likewise, conscientious processes for building national stakeholder buy-in and bringing donors on board were conducted in due course. Prior to the formal confirmation of an integrated follow-on, both UNDP and UNAMSIL took early steps to identify and address the capacity and material needs of UN agencies, funds and programmes that would remain after the mission exit. Early meetings were initiated with the SRSG, heads of agencies and country directors to determine existing support capacity and anticipate further needs.²¹

The involvement of the Peacebuilding Commission ensured continuity for peacebuilding efforts and supported the transition and reconfiguration of assistance by other parts of the UN. A Peacebuilding Cooperation Framework tool for resource mobilisation, the Compact, was established in December 2007, that could serve to improve dialogue, cooperation and coordination among stakeholders from both Freetown and New York.²² The Compact supported the framework during the 2007 election process. Its aim was to

20 Ibid, p.1.

21 After-Action Review, Liquidation of UNAMSIL (July 2006), p.2.

22 See SC/9202 (2007) at: <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2007/sc9202.doc.htm>

define the mutual responsibilities and commitment of the Sierra Leone Government and the PBC in the identified peacebuilding priority areas: youth empowerment and employment; consolidation of democracy and good governance; justice and security sector reform; and capacity building.²³ It was pointed out, however, that it remains to be seen whether the PBC in Sierra Leone will actually be able to increase donor-mobilisation in the country.

Why: Early planning of the transition from the UNAMSIL peacekeeping mission to the UNIOSIL and, eventually, the UNIPSIL mission enabled remaining actors to more easily assume the tasks and assets planned in the handover. What the UNAMSIL exit also makes clear is that these planning efforts must be sufficiently resourced with staff, transport vehicles and communication equipment, as needed. It also appears that co-location, where possible, among transition planners in the UNCT and the mission may enhance the efficiency of integrated planning.

Utility of triple-hatted leadership

What: UNAMSIL featured a triple hatted structure; the DSRSG was also the Resident Coordinator, Humanitarian Coordinator and UNDP Resident Representative. Through this arrangement, the mission could develop policy and operational partnerships with UNDP in areas of common interest, such as DDR, and the restoration of state authority and services.²⁴ Also, common analysis between political/security actors and humanitarian/development agencies prepared the way for coordinated action. The triple-hatted DSRSG worked to include both UN and non-governmental actors in consultative processes in order to align both the humanitarian and political imperatives of the mission. In this way, UNCT agencies were substantively involved in decision-making processes, enabled to assert their policy and operational concerns, as well as obtain access to UNAMSIL facilities.²⁵ Together, the mission and government partners of the Country Team developed a Joint UN Peace Building and Recovery Strategy, followed by the longer-term UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF). There was also united effort of both the mission and the UNDP in supporting the government to develop its own National Recovery Programme (2002), and Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP) covering the period from 2005 until 2007.

UNIPSIL's ERSG was multi-tasked in providing strategic and political advice as well as using good offices and diplomacy to mobilise financial resources. Many interlocutors argue that the established type of leadership contributed to greater integration of UN political and development work in Sierra Leone. One interviewee, central in these processes, reflected that such strong cooperation at the field level came after some necessary relaxing of 'agency loyalties'. Because of its central leadership position, the ERSG was in a position to pull the UNCT into closer alignment through incorporating various existing plans into one single strategy. By doing so, a number of established policies and multiyear strategies, like the iteration of the UNDAF, a separate

23 Iro, A. (2009) The UN Peacebuilding Commission, Lessons learned from Sierra Leone. University of Potsdam, pp. 45, 75.

24 Doss, A. (2004) End of Mission Report Handover Notes On completion of assignment in Sierra Leone. Freetown: Economic Development Unit, p.4.

25 Ibid.

peacebuilding framework of the PBC, or priority plans for the PBF were replaced with the single joint vision in December 2008.

Why: The ability of the triple-hatted ERSG to gain the trust and commitment of field staff across the UN presence helped to mitigate the potentially divisive tendency of staff to strictly follow different protocols or strategies of various agency headquarters. Many interlocutors argued that this process was enhanced through strong leadership and personality. The joined up approach was seen to have also been more effective in providing support to the Government. It allows the UN to speak with one voice and has been reportedly useful in preventing divisions between the political and development side of UN operations.

Preparing a single 'Joint Vision'

What: Within the framework of the benchmarks defined in the Joint UN Vision, UNIPSIL and the UN Country Team agreed on a joint programming, monitoring and evaluation approach. The Joint Vision, according to interviewees, succeeded in integrating humanitarian, peace and security, and development mandates into a single coherent document.

In its first year of operation, 2008, UNIPSIL introduced a number of tools to implement its mandate and achieve greater integration with the UNCT. Under the leadership of the ERSG/RC/HC, UNIPSIL and the UNCT staffed a Joint Strategic Planning Unit (JSPU) that took the lead in preparing the two-year interim Joint Vision and in outlining the peacebuilding priorities of the mission and the UNCT for 2009–2012 (agreed 1 December 2008). In preparation for the Joint Vision, the JSPU conducted a thorough mapping of existing programmes to identify potential duplication and synergies.²⁶ The JSPU was funded with contributions from UNDP (DOCO), PBSO, UNIPSIL and UNICEF/UNFPA. Its main task has been to oversee the implementation of the Joint Vision, coordination with donors and relations with the PBC through PBSO.

Moreover, the Government of Sierra Leone was concurrently in the process of developing the Agenda for Change, which was meant to be the national peacebuilding strategy that would apply to the Government and donors. Creating momentum, this enabled the mission to initiate the Joint Vision Document building from the Government's own Agenda, linking together the goals of the UNIPSIL mission and the 18 UNCT agencies in Sierra Leone. By doing so, the common vision made it clear how tasks and responsibilities were divided and what purposes and objectives were addressed.²⁷ The Joint Vision outlines 21 programmes to be undertaken by the 18 agencies, funds and programmes and establishes a Multi-donor Trust Fund in support of these programmes. UNDP is involved in 11 of the 21 programmes, including those related to: Democratic Elections and Political Dialogue; Access to Justice and Human Rights; Support to Democratic Institutions; and Local Government and Decentralisation.²⁸ At the request of

26 DPA Lessons Learned Study (2010), p.15.

27 *Joint Vision for Sierra Leone* (2009).

28 UNDP's involvement in Joint Vision Programmes: Democratic Elections and Political Dialogue, Access to Justice and Human Rights, Finance for Development, Public Sector Reform, Data Collection Assessments and Planning, Mitigating External Threats to Security, Security Sector

the ERSG, the Peace Building Commission (PBC) endorsed the UN Joint Vision and the Government's Agenda for Change and committed to align its future support with these strategic documents. With this approach, parallel efforts that risk duplication were avoided. Furthermore, the Joint Vision document replaced other documents, such as the UNDAF of the Country Team and the PBC Strategic Cooperation Framework. By doing so, it was able to integrate in a single document different priorities and approaches, including those of national and international partners, towards the transition process.

Why: The UN Joint Vision made it possible to create one single vision for the future of Sierra Leone, including both the Government of Sierra Leone and enduring UN and non-UN actors. Many joint programmes already existed and continued under the UNIPSIL mandate, meaning that various agencies were already engaged and actively cooperated in this process. It is important to note here that the ERSG was a principle driver behind the Joint Vision of Sierra Leone. Because of his position bridging both the mission and the UNCT, as well as engaging with the Government, the ERSG was able to align the priorities and programmes of several stakeholders, perhaps most centrally those of the Government.

The value of joint programming

What: In the lead up to the mission's exit and following the 2004 Local Council elections, UNAMSIL civil affairs developed a strong partnership with the UNDP as it assisted the Government in the rehabilitation of civil authority infrastructures. This involved facilitating the return of government officials and traditional leaders to their respective areas of responsibility. The extension of state authority throughout the country is considered one of the most significant achievements of the peace consolidation phase in Sierra Leone, thus helping to establish the stability that a transition seeks to maintain.²⁹ It is held as a good example of the complementarity of different organisations, with UNDP contributing expertise and programme funding and management, while UNAMSIL civil affairs provided staff and equipment throughout the country.

Similarly, joint programming between UNAMSIL, UNDP and UNICEF in the DDR section was seen as a successful contributor to establishing sustainable stability. While the DDR programme closed upon the exit of the mission, linked or complementary programmes continued, such as the Community Arms Collection and Destruction Programme. This required a plan for the transfer of operational management responsibilities. UNDP contributed to this process, providing donor liaison, financial and procurement management, legal management and adding a development angle to existing programmes.³⁰ However, voices were not all positive regarding the reintegration part of the programme. Some argue that the programme was too focused on the immediate needs and not able to address reintegration from the perspective of community

Reforms, Support to Democratic Institutions, Local Government and Decentralisation, Youth Development and Employment, Environmental Cooperation for Peacebuilding.

29 Doss, A. (2004) Op. cit., p.6.

30 Ibid. p.10.

strengthening and involvement.³¹ Matching skills to demands and building national capacity in this regard remained a challenge.³²

Still, remaining UN actors were able to sustain the momentum created during the peacekeeping mission and facilitate a continuation of the programmes in accordance with the terms of the programme documents. In this regard, one field actor noted that a staff transfer from UNAMSIL to UNDP during the transition to UNIOSIL would have been ideal and contributed to a smooth transition.

Why: The drawdown of a mission has an impact on the UNDP in terms of programming and operations but also provides an opportunity for it to support the transition towards peacebuilding or a longer-term, development-driven approach. Joint programming allows various actors to combine expertise and resources in order to enhance the impact of the UN's contribution to consolidating peace and promoting sustainable development in Sierra Leone. The former DSRSG of UNAMSIL sought to integrate humanitarian and development perspectives and, in areas of common interest, involve these actors in decision-making processes.³³

Integrating perspectives of the UNCT at such an early stage prepares the peacebuilding mission for its withdrawal and smooth handover to residual programmes. While UNIPSIL was in the position to provide technical and political expertise, UNDP exerts its added value through its programming competency. According to some actors from the field, another added value of joint programming is the aligning of assessed and voluntary contributions towards mutual ends. Such integration may allow the entire UN presence in a country to provide more cost-effective and efficient services.

31 Ljunggren, B. in Kaldor, M. (2006) Evaluation of UNDP Assistance to Conflict Affected Countries, case Sierra Leone. UNDP Evaluation Office.

32 Ibid.

33 Doss A. (2004) Op. cit., p.4.

Nepal

Ability to assess field dynamics

What: UNMIN's initial drawdown in 2008 meant the loss of a strong field presence formerly maintained through UNMIN Civil Affairs Section's Regional Offices. This was foreseen by the mission and UNCT leadership as a critical gap, and measures to address it were commenced before UNMIN's January 2011 exit. As part of the Transitions Support Strategy, funded by a handful of donors, as well as BCPR, four Field Coordination Offices (FCOs) were opened in four districts of the country (July–December 2010), supported by the expanded RCHCO. The offices were initially staffed with an international head (P4 level, in some cases transferred from OCHA) and three to four national support staff, to maintain a UN presence in the more remote areas of Nepal and to keep 'eyes and ears' on the ground.

The Transition Support Strategy (TSS), of which the FCOs were one component, was presented to donors as an RCHCO programme designed explicitly to respond to foreseen challenges in the wake of the UNMIN exit. Despite the lack of a comprehensively integrated transition planning process, mission and UNCT leadership collaborated in identifying issues related to the mission transition, including the need for stronger field presence. Both political and diplomatic skill, as well as a keen awareness of the donor environment and the national stakeholder landscape, proved integral for building support for the TSS. Unquestionably, the continuity of the RC leadership was an asset. Interviewees close to the process of setting up the TSS stressed that resource mobilisation for its establishment could risk competing with development funding sought by UNCT partners. As elaborated below, this influenced the strategic framing of the TSS, as a programme focused on conflict-prevention. Interviewees highlighted this as an important lesson learned for effective resource mobilisation that remained sensitive to the fundraising strategies of other UN agencies.

Three FCOs currently remain and are now completely staffed by nationals, as both a cost-saving and sustainability measure. The FCOs facilitate field visits for UNCT agencies and development partners, who are also able to access humanitarian and development information collected by the FCOs and channelled through the RCHCO. At the RCHCO level, this information contributes to and is integrated with analysis carried out by DPA Liaison Office analysts and RCHCO (including FCO) staff. The extent to which the information is used for the purposes of conflict-sensitive programming or peacebuilding approaches is up to the agencies, and UNDP field staff reported experiences varied

widely. Many reported that the RCHCO's regular updates were not necessarily practical for programming purposes, but direct consultations could be helpful. RCHCO staff underscored the wider strategy of their updates in terms of creating a broader awareness of the links between development and peacebuilding. Promisingly, it appears such analytical support is increasingly requested and appreciated by the UNCT partners.

Why: Beyond the added value of having access to the more remote areas of the country, establishing the field offices also had a direct effect the RCHCO's ability to establish relationships with local leaders and populations, as well as collect necessary information of ground realities and develop analysis on the social trends affecting the districts. These dynamics are analysed in terms of their humanitarian impact and their bearing on the consolidation of peace and development in the regions. The FCOs contribute to monitoring and to the response to structural aspects of social exclusion, which has the potential to breed conflict and mobilisation in the districts. Here it is important to understand the contribution of the FCOs not in terms of individual field bulletins, produced bi-weekly and not necessarily suited to inform programming directly. Rather, the work carried out by the field offices, as a whole, contributes to a wider peacebuilding approach, whereby humanitarian and development trends are framed in a way that underscores their impact on the peace process. This broader perspective reinforces the ability of UNCT agencies to clarify their contributions to peacebuilding. This said, it is worth evaluating how UNDP's own field offices and capacity for context analysis and project monitoring, linked more directly to its conflict-sensitive programming, affects the perceived added value of more general centralised analysis from the RCHCO and FCO.

Maintaining political engagement after the mission

What: In addition to the loss of regional offices throughout the country, the UNMIN exit posed another challenge for UN presence in Nepal: the loss of a political engagement capacity. In December 2010, the decision was taken to continue DPA's presence in Nepal in the form of a DPA Liaison Office, staffed with four analysts (two national, two international) as well as national support staff. Supported by both extra-budgetary DPA funds as well as administrative support from UNDP, and co-located in the RCHCO, the DPA Liaison Office reports to both the RCHC and DPA-HQ. While the Liaison Office provides analytical input to development partners when and where it can, it is up to the agencies whether and how to build this analysis into their projects. Close coordination and, where appropriate, collaboration between UNDP and DPA field presences is essential to maximise the benefits of such an arrangement.

This arrangement appears to be unique in terms of mission transition. It offers an additional option for DPA-UNDP collaboration in providing support to the field. Typically, the two entities co-fund a Peace and Development Advisor (PDA) who works to integrate analysis on multiple levels (political, developmental, humanitarian). Contrary to this, the Liaison Office is expressly dedicated to monitoring, analysing and informing UN partners on the political processes of Nepal. The advantages in this case for hosting a Liaison Office include maintaining the continuity of DPA's presence and engagement, the ability to access DPA expertise on a short-term basis as needed, and the option to provide good offices for convening development partners and national political actors. On the other hand, a typical PDA, playing an integrated analysis role in the RCHCO, was also

considered relevant in Nepal. Arrangements were made to have such a function carried out by a DfID-funded Peacebuilding Advisor.

Why: This unique arrangement reflects a stated priority of DPA to increase coordination with UNDP Country Offices, in particular given their common areas of work. This opens up an opportunity for donors to support such collaboration, as such initiatives are primarily funded through DPA's additional voluntary contributions. At the time of UNMIN's departure, the political situation in Nepal was still unstable, posing a clear risk for the continuity and sustainability of the stability gains made during the mission's tenure. Given this, the mission leadership recognised, and convincingly reported to the Policy Committee in New York, the need for continued political capacity after UNMIN's departure. The capacities of the DPA have been seen as particularly relevant for several of the UNDP Country Office projects, particularly: Constitution Building; Elections; and those under the Peacebuilding and Recovery Unit, such as the Collaborative Leadership and Dialogue project, and the Conflict-Sensitive Development initiative. Lastly, the Liaison Office was reported to be a valued partner of the UNDP-led Integrated Rehabilitation Programme for discharged Maoist combatants.

UNDP cooperation appears to be a *sine qua non* for the Liaison Office as it relies on UNDP's administrative support to maintain its office in Kathmandu. Given this, it is clear that both must dedicate time and human resources to developing cooperative relationships. This can pose challenges if not initiated early or sufficiently backed by leadership. Reflecting on their experience, some UNDP representatives note that interpersonal working partnerships, built around mutually relevant, concrete projects, can lead to more productive and appreciated collaboration than do formal reporting procedures or mandated information-sharing meetings. However, a critical aspect is ensuring adequate and equal reporting to both the DPA in New York and the RC in the host country. Locating the Liaison Office within the RCHCO appears to be a useful practice in this regard, though not in and of itself sufficient. The co-funding with UNDP also ensures dual reporting.

While the specifics of the arrangement are particular to Nepal, linking RCHCOs and DPA staff can have an added value in countries where political analysis and engagement is deemed relevant to the UN's continued support of peacebuilding and development activities. Such a scenario can be expected in contexts where political processes are still in flux and/or where political groups form within the same contours as marginalised groups or former parties to the conflict.

Expanding the RCHC Office

What: The Transition Support Strategy, a programme established in early 2010 in anticipation of an UNMIN exit, envisioned an atypically large Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator (RCHC) Office, including the above mentioned deployment of field offices. The RCHC at the time was able to successfully convince donors and, crucially, the heads of the UNCT agencies, of the usefulness of such a large RCHCO. This political skill had to be backed by evidence that the RCHCO was also working to the benefit of the UNCT and other development partners. As such, the RCHCO reports committing to a 'service provider' role, dedicating its resources and energies to providing useful field information and analysis to development actors working in Nepal. It was reported by UNCT agency

representatives that fulfilling this service provider role necessitates conspicuous consultation with the agencies and follow-up on their expressed needs and expectations.

The human resources required for staffing such a large office (five staff scaled up to 60 in a matter of 18 months) necessitates early planning and extended periods of recruitment. Currently, the RCHCO is challenged by the fact that the programme was proposed for two years, which some argue, in retrospect, is an unrealistically short horizon driven by donor temperance. Others, primarily voices within the UNCT, perceive that the expanded RCHCO in the immediate transition period was greatly valued, but that their role and contribution has waned and an exit strategy is now more appropriate than a revived fundraising strategy.

Why: Setting up a strong RCHC office has the potential to provide the UNCT with several benefits in the months and early years following a mission exit. In Nepal, these include access to the field, and monitoring and analytical support, should UNCT partners choose to make use of these assets. Additionally, it would appear that a strong RCHCO can be well equipped to assist with annual reporting, encourage joint programming between agencies, and work in practical ways to avoid overlap of UNCT activities throughout the regions of the country. However, for such an arrangement to work efficiently, it must work to beneficially respond to the needs of the UNCT agencies, not all of which may be quickly or easily persuaded of the necessity of such a large RCHCO.

The strength of the RCHCO appears to have been elemental in fostering a stronger peacebuilding and conflict-prevention approach, in contrast to the 'post-conflict mentality' which prevailed during and directly after the UNMIN mission. This is further elaborated in the section on mainstreaming conflict-sensitivity. Looking forward, this role of the RCHCO should be designed with an exit in mind. The goal to mainstream and embed a peacebuilding approach in the programmes of the UNCT partners eventually requires that this role devolves to agency leadership and national actors. Nevertheless, the catalysing function is well placed within UNCT leadership early on, as it was speculated that a lateral campaign by a single UNCT agency, or small contingent of championing agencies, would have encountered more resistance.

Perhaps a little counter-intuitively, the broad outreach of the RCHCO in its service provider role may hinder its resource mobilisation. Its services have come to be seen by partners as something of a 'public good', undercutting the felt obligation of donors to step up and shoulder the financial responsibility for services previously rendered to all and out of good will.

Staff (and asset) transfer

What: The recruitment of previous OCHA staff into the RCHCO was seen to be a good idea that was impeded by heavy bureaucracy, inspiring many to identify cross-UN recruitment as an area for immediate attention and redress. The practice of UNMIN recruiting national staff for substantive positions was seen to help build a strong pool of national capacity for the remaining UN actors to draw upon. However, what may have been a tactical advantage for transferring to the UNCT appears to have been obstructed by the UN recruitment processes, as well as the financial limitations on UNCT agencies to absorb such capacities. It would appear that the majority of UNMIN national staff joined other international organisations in Nepal rather than the UNCT, signalling a loss of

institutional memory in its 'organic form'. Exceptions to this trend, individuals who were eventually hired into a UNCT position, pointed to the requirement for programme management skills as a barrier for many former-UNMIN candidates. The transfer of material assets from the mission to the UNCT was seen as another (typical) bureaucratic headache that could have been better managed by delegating authority to oversee and approve the transfer of equipment to staff stationed in Nepal.

Why: Anecdotal reports indicate information accumulated by UNMIN's civilian and political affairs offices was not adequately distributed to other UN actors. This may have been a result of the operational distance between UNCT and UNMIN. It appears a great deal of the analytical resources produced by UNMIN were not transferred to remaining UN actors after the mission's exit, but rather sent to be 'warehoused in New Jersey'. Information sharing with the UNCT during the mission's deployment was also considered generally insufficient, creating a situation where handover information during the transition was seen to be too little and too late. While the transfer of information and documentation is itself an important issue deserving attention, interviewees reported that the negative impact of this could have been ameliorated had the actors producing those analyses been better retained within the organisation. Clearly, investing earlier on in more robust information-sharing mechanisms between the UNCT and UNMIN could have carved useful channels for handover, and also ensured UNCT did not lose access to accumulated information and data upon the mission's departure.

Mainstreaming conflict-sensitivity

What: The UNDP Peacebuilding and Recovery Unit, supported by the RCHCO and UNICEF, have taken up an explicit initiative to mainstream conflict-sensitivity. With UNDP Conflict Prevention Programme (CPP) acting as the secretariat, these actors provide training and support to government officials and local district representatives responsible for planning and oversight of development activities. The initiative also dedicates resources to mainstreaming conflict-sensitivity within the UNCT. These efforts fall in line with a greater trend among UN actors to address the root causes of conflict in Nepal and the contribution development can make to peacebuilding, as consistently outlined in several development and peacebuilding strategies, such as the UNDAF. It was underscored by several actors supporting this activity that such an approach is not viable without strong analytical support within the UNCT. Such staff must be able to not only analyse the roots of (latent) conflict but to also incorporate this knowledge directly into conflict-sensitive development programming. Moreover, as not all UNCT partners fully appreciate the value of changing their programmes to be more conflict-sensitive, support from the RCHC was deemed as particularly important.

The RCHCO also encourages UNCT agencies to entertain a broader conception of the impact their programmes have on peacebuilding. The RCHCO points to the provision of its field bulletins and integrated analyses as working towards this end. Synergistically, the UN Peacebuilding Fund for Nepal (UN PFN), managed by the RCHCO, has proved an effective incentive for UN partners to develop and implement programmes that contribute to peacebuilding. Recent changes to the UN PFN also require programmes to align with conflict-sensitive practices. It was seen as useful for RCHCs to receive explicit training in conflict-sensitivity, enabling their potential role as a champion of conflict-sensitive principles within the UNCT.

Why: This is seen to be a necessary shift in approach since the UNMIN mission, from a 'post-conflict mentality' to a 'conflict-prevention mode of working'. That is, attention has deviated from a strict focus on the immediate consequences of conflict, towards a more acute awareness of the longer-term and more structural factors that underlie conflict. While this perspective has been advocated since before the departure of the mission, its assertion within UNCT programmes and activities has been gradual. Operational constraints and resistance were seen to be couched in agencies' and programmes' reluctance to adjust their ongoing projects, the lack of robust indicators to demonstrate the value of conflict-sensitive programming, and the perceived risk of development actors becoming 'politicised'.

Resource mobilisation

What: Initial resource mobilisation was seen to be highly successful in the wake of UNMIN's exit. This was generally attributed to the following elements: an eager donor environment; certain political constraints to development partners working bilaterally; the political savvy and fundraising skill of the RCHC and the UNDP country leadership; close and constant dialogue with the donor community; and the strong context and political analysis underlying the programmes proposed. As mentioned above, another important lesson to emerge from interviews was the need to ensure that fundraising for the expansion of the RCHCO did not compete with UNCT agencies' resource mobilisation. Rather, the office should provide assistance that supported UNCT fundraising. Attention was also drawn to the usefulness of the UN Peacebuilding Fund for Nepal, managed by the RCHCO and used to promote (joint) projects among the UNCT agencies to stimulate an understanding of their contribution to peacebuilding. It was noted that having a single funding channel was much more efficient for the RCHCO to manage, and also helped to streamline priorities and approaches in conversations with donors. Moreover, management of this fund provides the RC with leverage to incentivise UNCT-wide policies or approaches, such as promoting conflict-sensitivity.

As the TSS approaches its own funding horizon, certain regrets were voiced that the transition programme was proposed to last only two years. It could be argued that an 'end-state' would have been a more appropriate determination of the programme's timeline. However, it would appear that both donors and Government representatives were more comfortably persuaded by an 'end-date' proposal. What is more, the accountability structures and political timelines of most donor aid programmes are not flexible enough to accommodate end-state proposals. Furthermore, and particularly with regard to the TSS, donor confidence and support is likely to be influenced by donors' trust in the programme leadership. Should programmes become too reliant on particular personalities, this can become a liability for the sustainability of the programme and its funding.

Why: Once again, the lesson is asserted that transition processes are ill-suited to firm deadlines or relatively short-term funding schemes. Likewise, it was suggested that programmes based on competent and thorough analysis of ground realities were more likely to garner donor support. Thus investment in these capacities, either through the RCHCO or within agencies, may bring the UNCT strong returns. However, experiences within the RCHCO and DPA reveal the need to make clear to donors that such analysis is only made possible through substantial financial and human resource support. Assuming

a service-provider role may be useful for outreach and strong relations among development partners. However, if the support provided comes to be seen as a 'public good', it may actually decelerate donor commitment.

Lastly, the continuous and close dialogue between the RCHC and donor community helped to maintain consensus among relevant actors on the priorities for donor support to peace and development in Nepal. In 2010, the RCHCO was able to facilitate the collective authoring of a Peace and Development Strategy (PDS)³⁴ for Nepal, as envisioned by its largest donors. Reported to be a unique approach, there is reason to question the international community's action in terms of its implication for national ownership. On the other hand, it does present a model of enhancing donor coordination and commitment, with thought given to interaction with national priority setting.

34 Available online at: <http://un.org.np/sites/default/files/English%20Version.pdf>.

2 Findings & Analysis

The case studies have presented useful data and perspectives from the field. While such information is enlightening in its own right, it is the more distanced overview of the case studies that enables us to sift out predominant themes and emergent patterns, in other words: our findings. In the following chapter, four areas are identified as persistently relevant in each of the contexts studied: UN Integration & Implications for Transition Planning; Preparing the Residual Presence; National Capacity Building; and Resource Mobilisation & Effective Donor Engagement. The analysis of these four areas tunes our ears to a rising refrain: the need to strengthen both strategic and analytical capacities within various areas of UNDP's work in the field.

UN Integration & Implications for Transition Planning

In planning for mission transitions, the findings concerning UN integration ring familiar. Integrated planning can enable actors to identify and capitalise on comparative advantages, prepare residual capacities in step with a transition's headway, and perhaps most usefully, establish mutually-recognised objectives and indicators of a country's progress. Like envisioning exit strategies themselves, integration is best actualised from the very inception of a mission, and developed in tandem with the evolution of a mission's mandate and UNCT activities. In essence, both transitions and integration are processes that are all too often treated as discrete events. Both must be pursued as persistent activities. These comfortable axioms, however, are challenged by the realities of implementation. Two aspects stand out among the findings: the disparity between the planning capacities of the mission and UNCT actors; and factors for optimising joint programming.

Central Finding: Disparity between capacities of the UNCT and the mission

Across the case studies, integration – or the lack thereof – emerged as an influential factor in how post-mission priorities were defined, resourced and later implemented. Yet, even in integrated missions the planning capacities of the UNCT and mission can be asymmetric. Where UNDP was enabled to play a substantive role in either defining the pace of and/or strategies for the transition, it appeared better prepared for its role post-mission. Moreover, analytical and strategic input from UNDP appears to encourage the forging of new UN objectives and priorities post-mission, responding to dynamics of the country context. Such a role demands dedicated strategic planning expertise and ideally context analysis capacities within the RCHCO or the UNDP Country Office.

Even in well-integrated mission settings, as seen in Timor-Leste, limits on staff capacity or influence may constrain UNDP's role in transition planning, and its ability to negotiate priorities for post-mission programmes. Contrastingly, in the case of UNAMSIL in Sierra Leone, UNDP was substantively integrated into mission planning from the initial mandate implementation through to the transition process. Here, UNDP's contribution to meeting the mission's mandate benchmarks, as well as its involvement in the development of the National Recovery Strategy facilitated early integrated planning with UNAMSIL. A dedicated UNDP Transition Support Team liaised directly with Lead Agencies in the provinces, mission staff, and UNAMSIL's liquidation team, in preparing for the mission's gradual drawdown. Such capacities undergirded UNDP's role in and preparation for the UNAMSIL transition, and were assembled again in later transitions.

The transition in Nepal offers an interesting deviation. The general operational distance between UNMIN and the UNCT, in a way, exempted the remaining UN actors from taking on many residual tasks of the mission. According to interviewees, this was one factor allowing the remaining UN agencies, UNDP and the Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator's Office particularly, to put forward new programmes responding to both the country's evolving needs and the UN's changing approach. These programmes, including the RCHCO's Transition Support Strategy, appear to be propelling a shift from 'post-conflict' tactics of the mission toward 'conflict-prevention and peacebuilding' approaches of the remaining UNCT. Central here were the increased strategic planning staff of the RCHCO, as well as its analytical capacities posted in Kathmandu and field coordination offices. Bolstered conflict-sensitivity and analysis capacities within the UNDP Country Office are also playing a role in this gradual process.

Had such capacities been available to either the RCO and/or UNDP during the MINURCAT transition in Chad, or had integrated planning been taken up from the mission's launch, field officers contend that the exit would not have been as unstructured. Strategic planning staff, as part of UNDP's regular budget, could not only contribute to preparing for predictable horizons, such as elections or UNDAF renewals. They could also carry out contingency planning and assist with the arising of unexpected events. The abrupt end of MINURCAT and the late decision not to follow UNMIT with a special political mission are two such scenarios. Moreover, UNCT strategic planners could actively collaborate with missions' civil and political affairs units, further strengthening genuine UN integration.

Take away lessons:

Mechanisms must be sought to ensure UNDP is enabled to play a sufficient role in transition planning. This often depends on both regular opportunities and available capacities for integrated planning.

- In terms of opportunities, integrated mission planning at the commencement of a peace mission can trench important channels between the mission and UNDP. The (re)negotiations of multiannual strategic plans, such as the UNDAF or a National Poverty Reduction Strategy, are potential platforms to hold concrete discussions on the form and function of the UN presence in a post-mission future. Joint contingency planning offers another practical exercise in this regard.
- Where possible, co-location among mission and RCO or UNDP planners appears advantageous, lowering both the transaction costs of collaboration and operational costs in terms of sharing equipment (vehicles, radios, computers and the like). Administrational obstacles may need to be addressed.

The real challenge, however, is providing UNDP Country Offices and the RCO, with sufficient planning capacities to fully engage with mission staff. This appears primarily a matter of resource allocation.

- Providing UNDP or the RCO with strategic planning staff early in a transition may help avert overstressing programme staff as planning and coordination activities accelerate. Such actors can also mitigate the risk of setting unrealistic post-mission objectives, which can end up compromising UNDP capacities after a mission exit.

- Bridging efforts, such as surge capacities, dedicated mission liaison staff, or technical missions from HQ are helpful, but do not ultimately address underlying capacity deficits. The Civilian Capacity initiative may provide options to fill gaps.
- The case studies provide a few examples of how such capacities could be projectized, or in some cases directly supported by donors. The Transition Support Team in Sierra Leone and the Transition Support Strategy in Nepal provide replicable models.
- Donors are also poised to contribute, as their increased concern for successful transitions could be constructively matched by support for positions and programmes that are likely to facilitate successful reconfigurations.

Central Finding: Conditions for optimising joint programming Mission-UNCT collaboration is a key element of UN integration and can actualise several of its benefits. The case studies provide us with pertinent examples of successful joint programming, as well as possible bottlenecks, both adding to an understanding of 'what works'. In the lead up to foreseen mission exits, joint programming can help prepare enduring actors, like UNDP, to take up residual programmes. This is best facilitated when joint programmes receive support from senior leadership, are managed by lynchpin actors, and enable partners' engagement at multiple working levels.

Field staff interviewed noted specific substantive areas where integration between a mission and the UNDP was both a 'natural fit' as well as relevant for preparing UNCT actors for post-mission roles. These included elections and governance, decentralisation, justice (including police and corrections), and disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration. Yet, the core support, depth and breadth of such integration were seen to be stronger determinants of success than a given substance area. Core support refers to the capacities dedicated to coordinating the programme and its implementation. Depth indicates substantive and regular staff interaction between partners at multiple levels, from the top-brass to the operational staff. Lastly, breadth signifies the extent to which partners engage in various aspects of the programme, from administration to strategy development to implementation. This aspect is particularly relevant to preparing partners early on to assume a larger role in a programme area post-mission.

The UNPOL-UNDP joint programme for the Timorese National Police demonstrated how relegating UNDP's role to contract management undercuts opportunities for enduring staff to prepare for their future strategic and technical support role. As a counter example, in verifying Maoist combatants in Nepal, DPA and UNDP, among others, developed a thorough coordination structure. Partners' input was organised at strategic-political levels as well as technical and operational levels. This coordination proved durable and later facilitated a UNDP-led Inter-agency Reintegration Programme (UNIRP), which, though highly sensitive politically, continued past UNMIN's exit.

Additionally, the value of leadership and backing from above was also roundly recognised. Synergy and coordination are not typically self-propelling, particularly in the early stages. Enthusiasm (or demand) and direction from senior staff is a helpful, compelling factor. This was, reportedly, all the more effective if leaders were able to understand 'both sides', the mission as well as the UNCT, and the processes and cycles to

which each adhere. Unsurprisingly, triple-hatted figures, such as those posted in Sierra Leone and Timor-Leste, were greatly appreciated in this regard. Co-funding and joint management structures also bear strong potential to balance partners' roles in collaborating, and elicit dual or even joint reporting. Likewise, interviewees across different case studies pointed to the value of 'lynchpin' positions, a central figure of a joint endeavour who bears the ability and responsibility to respond equally to all UN partners. This was seen as particularly useful in fostering understanding and solidarity between UNCT and mission actors, a common initial hurdle in joined-up work.

The case studies also demonstrated ways for UN Headquarters to contribute. Dispatching a joint HQ UNDP-DPKO technical mission to identify potential joint programming areas in Timor-Leste provided not only leadership and impetus, but also technical advice from a 'birds-eye-view'. This provides a potential avenue to pursue through the Global Focal Point for police, justice and corrections. Co-funding and substantive interaction between DPA and UNDP at the programming and policy levels has proven apt to support positions (Peace and Development Advisors), or even offices (Nepal DPA Liaison Office). Similarly, co-funding and co-management could be used to provide 'lynchpin' positions with dual reporting duties and express responsibilities for increasing synergy among partners.

Take away lessons:

In transition settings, joint programming can build residual capacities of UNCT partners, facilitating smooth handovers between a mission and enduring actors. The benefits are optimised when attention is paid to core support, depth and breadth of joint programming.

- Core support can be provided by 'lynchpin actors' who coordinate a joint programme, bearing equal responsibility to the various partners. Similarly, senior leadership backing was iterated as necessary for rousing commitment to joint programming. In both instances, experience of 'both sides' of the UN was highly appreciated and identified as a critical factor of success.
- Depth can be expedited through joint reporting structures, designated lines of lateral communication in addition to vertical reporting, balanced representation of partners at strategic as well as technical levels, and joint monitoring on the progress toward programme objectives.
- Coordination arrangements were often best built from below around concrete activities, and thereby in tune with the practicalities, working rhythms, and substance of a joint programme.
- For facilitating sufficient breadth, concrete joint activities in multiple working areas, rather than simple information sharing, were reported more effective in building working relationships and preparing residual capacities. Divisions of labour and working to partners' comparative advantage (or technical prowess) should avoid leading to silo approaches, as this could undermine handover later.
- Opportunities should be sought, while working together, to strengthen UNCT partners' capacity and leadership role in managing a programme. This may allow enduring actors the sufficient time and space to build up residual programmes.
- Joint monitoring also offers partners (national, mission and UNCT alike) sufficient lead time to prepare for new support arrangements. The Sierra Leone case study provides strong examples of such calibrated reconfigurations and joint strategies.

Donors are well placed to incentivise and support effective integration at various levels.

- Donors can encourage co-funding between UN departments and agencies, in an effort to balance the management of and commitment to joint programming by UN partners in the field. Similarly, they can provide funding that is designed to be used explicitly in a joined-up programme or initiative.
- Stipulating the need for joint progress reports can help streamline reporting while encouraging UN partners to designate joint benchmarks, indicators, and share monitoring responsibilities.
- Donors can encourage joint HQ field missions, like that in Timor-Leste, by supporting the joint projects or programmes identified in the resulting assessments. Donors could also request such joint missions host analytical capacity, in addition to technical capacity, to properly identify areas where the UN will likely need residual capacity after a transition. Again, the Global Focal Point for police, justice and corrections may prove useful to arrange such joint missions.

Preparing the Residual Presence

UN Missions inevitably reconfigure as the dynamics of a country evolve, impacting the added value of their presence. A main assumption underlying this research is that mission withdrawals can lead to increased responsibilities and new roles for enduring actors, both remaining UN programme staff and national authorities alike. In a post-mission country, the reduction of resources, both human and financial, can constrain enduring actors' ability to meet domestic expectations and standards of practice previously set by the mission. If not sufficiently prepared for, such a situation risks backsliding on peacebuilding gains. This section dedicates attention to three aspects that appeared key to preparing longer-term UNDP actors, as well as other agencies, for their post-mission role. These include: strengthening the Resident (and Humanitarian) Coordinator's Office; analytical capacity of UNDP actors; and mission staff transfers.

Central Finding: Strengthening the Resident Coordinator's Office Depending on the extent of its capacities, the Resident (and Humanitarian) Coordinator's Office (RCHCO) can play several important roles in the run up to, during and post-mission transition. With that in mind, it was stressed multiple times, by both RCHCO actors and UNCT staff, that an RCHCO must primarily respond to the needs of the agencies as they adapt to the evolving circumstances of the national transition process. Provisional RCHCO expansions should reflect a 'service provider role' for the UNCT and also envision and plan for its own exit strategy. Lastly, funding strategies to enlarge RCHCOs should remain sensitive to development fundraising, avoiding competition.

Continued engagement with the host government, as well as the resident international community tend to be the most visible of an RCHCO's roles, as they often link to resource mobilisation and political support for the UN's presence. Lessons learned in Chad serve as a tough reminder of the critical importance, and possible sensitivity, of this role. Continuity of leadership, where possible and beneficial, helps to avoid leadership gaps at critical transition periods. As demonstrated in Sierra Leone, this can promote the maintenance of long-term strategies and follow-up on agreed commitments. Such continuity is not always possible, as when a triple-hatted DSRSG of an integrated mission is replaced by a regular RC. Nor is continuity always desirable, as transitions can signal an appropriate devolution of the UN's clout and leverage in a country. This was an underscored point in the case of Timor-Leste.

In some cases, however, the transition period called for robust central UN leadership after the mission's exit, particularly in Nepal, where the RCHCO was well-equipped, and Chad, where it was not. As an RCHCO is increasingly capacitated, its role might expand to facilitating joint programming, helping to reduce transaction costs of coordination and, where relevant, leading UN-wide strategies as, for example the Timor-Leste UNCT transition strategy, or the Sierra Leone Single Joint Vision. The RCHCO in Nepal sets a strong example of convening and coordinating with international donors, and administering a Multi-Donor Trust Fund. This gives the RCHCO important leverage vis-à-vis UNCT agencies, and has been effectively used to promote inter-agency collaboration, conflict-sensitivity and peacebuilding.

As elaborated in the following section, analytical capacity stands out as a potential added value of the RCHCO, as political and civil affairs advisors inevitably depart along with their missions. RCHCOs should be regularly evaluated for their relevance to UNCT needs, as these needs will inevitably evolve in the years following a transition. The role of an RCHCO is likely to be most relevant in the year leading up to and immediately following a mission transition. In this way, enlarged RCHCOs should also plan and commit to drawdown strategies, underscoring the value of gradual, calibrated transitions, exemplified in the Sierra Leone case.

The case studies illustrate, with a variety of scenarios, how the efficacy and role of the RCHCO is largely determined by the capacities with which it is supplied. The case of Chad stands as an example of the challenges and risks of under-equipping a post-mission RCHCO, while in Nepal the well-staffed office pushed the boundaries of what may be expected in a transition setting. Interviewees identified coordination specialists, political advisors, and strategic planners as pertinent RCHCO capacities in transition settings. Typical challenges included funding and recruitment in order to staff an RCHCO, and avoiding competition with UNCT fundraising. In Nepal, these challenges were addressed by making the enlargement of the RCHCO part of a programme, the Transition Support Strategy, and framing it as conflict-prevention rather than development, thus tapping separate donor funding channels.

Take away lessons:

The added value role of an RCHCO is likely to change over the course of a transition. Its capacity and size should remain in step with the country context, donor environment and the needs of the UNCT.

- The leadership of the Resident Coordinator appears essential in transition periods, particularly for engaging donors, negotiating priorities, and maintaining relations with local authorities. The added value of the RCHCO appears to be anchored in political acumen, as well as advisory and coordination capacity. The RCHCO requires adequate staff support to optimise such a role.
- Acting as a service provider, the RCHCO should hold conspicuous consultations with the agencies and offer demonstrable follow-up on their needs.
- The expansion of an RCHCO should also involve setting an exit strategy, as its relevance is sure to evolve, and likely decline, in the years after a transition period.

Finding appropriate and sufficient funding to strengthen an RCHCO during a transition period poses a challenge, as many priorities are put to donors at this time. The case studies reveal both ways to address the challenge, as well as potential consequences of not doing so.

- As the RCHCO relies primarily on voluntary funding, strengthening its office depends on convincing donors these operational costs, including staff posts, are relevant. This is not an easy sell, particularly in countries experiencing post-mission 'donor drift'. Similarly, in unexpected transitions, such as Chad, staffing the RCHCO can become an orphaned priority.
- To avoid competing with development fundraising, the enlargement of an RCHCO could focus on addressing conflict-prevention priorities. This is also likely to gain support after a mission drawdown, as attentions shift from (post-)conflict approaches toward peacebuilding.
- Short notice RCHCO staff recruitment was seen as particularly difficult. The relatively expedient procedures for temporary vacancies could be used to fill the gap, and renewed for up to two years, covering a critical period of transition. Another option may be to arrange new modalities for the recruitment of several RCHCO staff positions as an assembled team. Innovative and more flexible models should be explored, possibly through the facility of a joint task force.

Central Finding: Analytical capacities post-mission In each of the case studies, transitions also meant the withdrawal of analytical capacity housed in the DPA or DPKO mission. Such capacities are backed by both assessed funding and a Secretariat mandate, neither of which are available to remaining actors, UNDP included. However, in the interest of making post-mission programmes conflict-sensitive, and in an effort to boost contributions to peacebuilding, some case studies offered innovative ways to supply analytical capacities after a mission withdrawal. Efforts to increase the governments' appreciation and even demand for context analysis support can allay unease over politicisation and spur donor support.

There is growing awareness that stability may prompt a mission exit, but is not sufficient to guarantee lasting security; other – sometimes latent – political, economic, and conflict factors demand continued attention. However, this is difficult to reconcile with the limited analytical capacity available post-mission. Development initiatives and the political climate of a country inevitably impact one another. Contextual analysts can help map out this inter-relationship to inform strategic programming choices. As mission exits often align with national elections, analytical capacity can be used to (re)negotiate programme priorities during a post-mission change in government. From interviews with field staff, such analysts appear best placed at two linked levels: strategic oversight, typically the domain of the RCHCO, and operational programming, within UNCT Country Offices. Moreover, information management to integrate analysis at the strategic level, and share it between agencies at the operational level, enables UN partners to 'read from the same playbook', and understand their role as part of a broader strategy.

There is, granted, some resistance to dedicating such capacities to UNCT actors, and UNDP in particular. The risk of 'being politicised' has entrenched some reluctance to equip Country Offices with analysts. However, as demonstrated in Timor-Leste and Chad, fostering government appreciation (even demand) for analysts and advisors can

effectively help to mitigate that concern. Building analytical and conflict-sensitivity skills within national institutions (both governmental and non-state) appears to increase national appreciation for and acceptance of such experts among UNCT staff. This in turn may prompt donor support, or facilitate projectizing such skills. Recruiting analytical capacity for a UNDP Country Office was also seen to raise operating costs, which struggle to inspire donor sympathy or accrue funds. Yet, in connection with the New Deal, donors may increase their demands and support for strong context-analysis in development and assistance proposals. Promisingly, donor support for Peacebuilding Advisors, Peace and Development Advisors, and the like is reportedly increasing.

The case studies offered a variety of innovative ways to support analytical capacities after a mission exit. DPA and UNDP have co-funded Peace and Development Advisors in some cases, which can provide both the RCHCO and the UNCT with strategic planning advice and context monitoring. In Nepal, the DPA Liaison Office, co-funded with UNDP, the RCHCO field coordination offices, and a donor-funded Peacebuilding Advisor within the RCHCO, all work to provide updates on political, humanitarian, and development trends, as well as integrated analyses on how those trends impact peacebuilding. These analyses are regularly delivered to the UNCT agencies, the resident international community and Nepal government. The difficulty for agencies to incorporate this analysis into programming, however, exposes the need for connections to be made with analysts at the operational level, for example within the office of the UNDP country director. Similarly, UNDP's work in Nepal to mainstream conflict-sensitivity enabled it to incorporate conflict analysts into project budgets. While the analysts are not equipped to provide all programmes and agencies with tailored conflict and context analysis, they are working to build such skills throughout the UNCT as well as in Nepal governance structures and relevant ministries. As peacebuilding and conflict-prevention activities scale up after a mission exit, this momentum could be converted into recruitment and funding strategies to post context analysts within the RCHCO, or perhaps the UNDP Country Office.

Take away lessons:

The departure of a mission is often a first critical step toward building sustainable peace. Donors should be encouraged to see analytical capacities as sound investments in peacebuilding and conflict-sensitivity.

- Cooperation and co-funding between DPA and UNDP have produced different options for supplying analytical capacity in post-mission contexts. Further collaboration merits exploration, ideally by joint teams.
- The case studies demonstrated how context and conflict analysis can help link broader peacebuilding and conflict prevention aims with development and humanitarian activities. Mission transitions typically catalyse these priorities.
- Information management systems, as well as interpersonal coordination, are needed to usefully connect analysis at the strategic level (within the RCHCO) with programming decision-making at the operational level (UNCT country directors). Inter-agency analytical coordination is also vital.
- Building government support for such analysis appears an effective way of diminishing trepidation of 'politicisation'. In Chad and Timor-Leste, support was garnered by emphasising analysts' direct contribution to strategic programming,

conflict-sensitivity and peacebuilding. Building national analytical skills, for example mainstreaming conflict-sensitivity training in relevant ministries, as was done in Timor-Leste, can also increase national demand for such capacities, and thereby can prompt increased donor support.

- Though including analysts in operational budgets may be more sustainable, it may not have donor support. Projectizing such positions may be more successful, as seen in Nepal through the Transition Support Strategy, and through the Conflict Prevention Programme in Timor-Leste.
- Donors championing conflict sensitivity should look to support the capacities needed to operationalize it. Making conflict-sensitivity or peacebuilding requirements part of project proposals is one way donors can effectively build demand for such analysis. The Nepal case study provides an example through its RCHCO-managed MDTF.

Central Finding: Staff Transfer and Recruitment Though many recognise that capacity needs of a UNDP Country Office are likely to increase after a mission exit, early planning and preparation for a transition can mean capacities are also stretched in the months leading up to a transition. Transferring staff from the shrinking mission to the UNCT, in a kind of UN osmosis, is often met with practical impediments. Some such obstacles are bureaucratic, while others are more pragmatic. In either case, identifying and working to address the obstacles – particularly in transferring national staff – would be useful.

As a mission draws down, its staff, particularly nationals, come available to apply their skills with remaining UN actors. In some respects, transferring such staff into the UNCT or RCHCO can help increase residual capacity and retain institutional memory in its 'organic form'. Yet, in several cases, the practical idea to transfer relevant mission capacities to the UNCT programmes was frustrated by bureaucratic and procedural requirements. Such instances were found in Nepal and Timor-Leste, prompting interviewees to avidly underscore the need to redress cross-UN recruitment in the field.

However, this obstacle should be somewhat nuanced, as it is not recruitment procedures alone that encumber mission staff's absorption into UNCT agencies. First and foremost, UNCT recruitment must be based on agencies' needs and budgets. Relevant substance knowledge may disqualify some mission staff from joining agencies, though mission staff from elections, justice, governance and police sections were seen as potentially valuable to UNDP programmes after a mission departs. Some skill sets that agencies typically require, such as programme and project management, are not often developed by mission staff. Timing can be another practical factor, as mission drawdown cycles may not align with UNCT vacancy cycles. In most scenarios, national staff were seen to be the most likely to transfer, as they remained in the country after the mission exit and possessed necessary language skills and local experience. Missions that recruited national staff for substantive positions, Sierra Leone and Nepal in particular, were seen to help strengthen the local capacity pool that enduring UN actors could draw from after mission closure.

Take away lessons:

Though cross-UN recruitment and staff transfer procedures could be redressed, other obstacles related to straightforward practicalities, budgets, schedules and necessary skills still remain.

- A joint task force could be assigned to looking into how recruitment procedures impact the flexibility and agility of field level recruitment and staff transfer during mission transitions.
- Mission staff, and especially nationals, who possess programme management skills and/or relevant substance knowledge, appear more likely to successfully transfer to UNCT agencies. This could be taken up in staff capacity-building programmes, typically part of mission liquidation.
- Joint programming between a mission and UNDP, may open interesting opportunities for relevant staff transfers and boosting residual capacities. As possible, such transfers should be planned for well in advance to accommodate administrative procedures. The transfer of five civilian advisors from UNMIT-UNPOL to the UNDP's police support programme provides an example of transferring relevant capacities, as well as potential bottlenecks confronted.
- Besides cost-efficiency, increasing national staff in UNDP Country Offices can benefit local ownership. Moreover, interviewees from the field see the growth of national staff as an important signal of increasing national capacity and responsibility.

National Capacity Building

Inevitably, as a mission withdraws, the emerging stability of a country will be tested. National authorities' ability to respond appropriately and effectively to the typical and the unexpected trials of governing determines the endurance of that stability. Thus capacity building before, during and after a mission transition is a key contributor to the sustainability of gains made during the mission. Interviewees pointed to capacity building as a strength that UNDP could assert more compellingly. One aspect of this is focused on a niche area of identifying and managing the political aspects of capacity building.

Central Finding: UNDP's potential leadership role Many interviewees questioned whether peacekeeping missions were appropriately suited to lead capacity-building initiatives due to their shorter deployment horizons and technically-focused approaches. Recognising mission actors' specific technical expertise and operational competencies, these assets could be constructively supplemented by UNDP's longer-term approach and strategic perspectives on capacity building. However, there was little evidence from the case studies that UNDP was dedicating such strategic expertise to linking with mission technical assistance. This presents a potential area for UNDP to assert a stronger partner role and engage earlier in a mission's deployment.

Capacity building is, according to some staff, UNDP's 'bread and butter'. However, in the field UNDP could increase its strategic leadership role more effectually, particularly in contexts where UN DPKO missions provide technical assistance. The Timor-Leste and Chad case studies demonstrate both the likelihood and the challenges of UNDP assuming capacity-building projects in former mandate areas after a mission has left. The Chad case, in particular, highlights the risk of creating a security vacuum, should support to building security forces be suddenly withdrawn. Both cases outline the value of UNDP substantively engaging with mission capacity-building activities early on to support or even lead strategic planning, the identification and sequencing of capacity objectives, or setting benchmarks for handover. Such activities also expose entry points for earlier and more systematic UN integration, as well as the continuity of support after a mission exit.

Both mission and UNDP staff interviewed recounted ways in which UNDP could engage more robustly and earlier with mission capacity-building actors, and particularly in sectors where UNDP is likely to carry on support after the transition. One potential role for UNDP entailed providing mission staff with training on effective mentorship. Other suggestions focused on UNDP's input into sequencing programmes for more effective

long-term institution building. Though unclear whether substantial capacity could be made available, a cross-section of interviewees suggested UNDP could help conduct baseline surveys, absorption capacity surveys, and jointly develop progress-monitoring models for a mission's capacity-building activities. Co-locating mission and UNCT staff in government offices or institutions receiving capacity-building support presents a concrete opportunity to harmonise quick impact activities with longer-term programmes. Such arrangements could also facilitate joint monitoring and planning programme adaptation.

These contributions would entail collaborating closely with mission training units to build technical assistance activities into longer-term strategies. Hereby, short-term confidence building gains sought by the mission could be cohered to longer-term strategic skills and institution building, typically a rising focus as a mission withdraws. Many contended that mission training programmes should regularly engage the UNDP, or the agency foreseen to continue support in the post-mission setting. As implied above, this was iterated in several locations as a compelling avenue for integration and/or joint programmes.

Take away lessons:

The opportunity for UNDP to assert a stronger role in capacity building can be actualised if it makes its strategic expertise available at the field level, able to inform programming as well as engage with the mission.

- For UNDP Country Offices to assert a stronger role as a leader in capacity building, close and early cooperation with mission capacity-building activities are key. Incorporating missions' technical assistance work into longer-term and institutionally-focused capacity-building strategies, as well as helping to design benchmarks for handover procedures are potential entry points.
- Linking with missions to help monitor capacity-building progress enables UNDP to play a crucial role in identifying targets, analysing appropriate indicators of growth, and strategically sequencing activities. Such work also directly contributes to the Country Office's preparation to assume a stronger capacity-building role after the mission departs.
- This area provides ample opportunity to pursue joint programming and integration between UNDP and the mission. Co-locating UNDP and mission experts presents a concrete practice to facilitate harmonised approaches to government support.
- Continuity of a capacity-building expert is clearly an asset. In this way, it may be useful to second a capacity-building strategic expert to the mission directly, and upon mission drawdown, transfer the post to the RCHCO or a UNCT partner.

Central Finding: Political side of national capacity building Capacity building empowers certain national actors or institutions. This ability to affect power distributions makes capacity building a political endeavour. A capacity-building expert among the UNDP programme staff, one aware of the political implications of such programming, could increase the chances that national capacity programmes remain sensitive to the power structures they may consolidate.

As argued above, capacity building is not merely a technical process. Capacity building, like other kinds of direct assistance, is a form of 'capital' granted to specific parties. And

like any form of capital, it is open to both constructive use and misappropriation. The selection of which institutions or groups receive support, and the nature of that support has the potential to alter power relations. The political aspects of capacity building thereby warrant dedicated analytical expertise. Yet, there was little evidence that such analytical capacity was regularly and systemically put to capacity-building programmes on the ground. This point links closely with findings above, outlining the need for more analytical capacity and attention for conflict-sensitive programming after a mission exit.

An acute understanding of group dynamics and representation in various government institutions should inform UN actors of the risks that imbalanced support may pose. Mapping this political landscape requires an analytical expert among the leading programme staff, and particularly one who is familiar with and sensitive to the political implications of capacity building. While a mission is still present, efforts could be made to link such an expert with the mission's political affairs section. Others pointed out that such an expert could be supported by a UNDP-DPA co-funding arrangement.

The case studies illustrate how a combination of strategic foresight and political attentiveness could enhance the conflict-sensitivity of capacity-building programmes. The development and support of the security sector is, unsurprisingly, a particularly sensitive area in this regard. As noted earlier, the rapid departure of MINURCAT risked leaving the *Détachement Intégré de Sécurité*, the armed forces UNPOL had been training, without support, salaries or direction. The security implications of such departure are not difficult to imagine. As another example, in taking up support to the Timorese National Police, there were reported difficulties with veterans of the resistance bypassing the regular meritocracy promotion procedures. The politically-charged issue was, according to senior level interviewees, both systemic and socially entrenched, and thus at odds with UNDP's more decentralised approach to mentoring and training. UNDP staff who were familiar with the programme recognised that having a capacity-building expert with experience in such sensitive impasses would likely have been a valuable asset.

Some interviewees indicated that external consultants and analysts had been contracted to assist with the development of some UNDP capacity-building projects. Yet, the value of analysis is not confined to pre-programming alone; longer-term analytical capacity is necessary as capacity-building programmes are rolled out, implemented, and periodically adjusted. A central aspect of this is accurately and continually gauging national capacity, in order to re-scale assistance as necessary. This obliges a nuanced knowledge of how to assess progress in different sectors and correctly identify factors propelling advancement. Moreover, the pace of national capacity development may have to be reconciled with other political imperatives urging a mission's departure or programme phasedown. In such cases, handover strategies for UNCT partners should be readied and promoted for donor support. Misjudging progress made by national institutions risks overestimating their resilience, as witnessed in the 2006 crisis in Timor-Leste. Yet, this too runs into obstacles in the field. One recurrent issue confronting UNDP was mounting opposition to continual performance appraisals, which were increasingly regarded as intrusive and redundant. Capacity-building experts could be helpful in designing monitoring programmes that are more sensitive to these attitudes and better received by national counterparts. Demonstrating progress is critical for garnering donor support, as well as appropriately scaling programmes. These can be convincing grounds on which to build national support for recurrent capacity analysis.

Take away lessons:

More attention is needed for the political implications of national capacity building, and its potential to disproportionately empower certain groups or state institutions. This calls for strengthened analytical and capacity-building expertise within the UNCT, and perhaps located within UNDP Country Offices.

- Capacity-building expertise should be reinforced with political and contextual analysis throughout programming, from pre-planning to implementing, monitoring, and scaling down.
- A capacity-building expert among the leading programme staff, one aware of the political implications of such programming, could increase the chances for a more strategic approach.
- Where possible, capacity-building experts within the UNCT should collaborate with the political affairs unit of a mission or, after a mission's exit, an RCHCO Peace and Development Advisor or similar political advisor post.
- Donors who have committed to the principles of the New Deal, should act on their pledges by supporting efforts to maintain the conflict sensitivity of capacity-building work.
- Increased joint funding and co-management (likely between DPA and UNDP) may be a useful mechanism to support the continuity of a political analytical capacity to inform capacity-building programmes. This is particularly relevant as programmes graduate from technical skills training to institution building, as is often the case during transitions.
- The reassessment of national capacities is necessary to adjust programming in-step with national progress, a critical aspect to mitigate backsliding and consolidate gains. Finding constructive, innovative and amenable ways to carry out ongoing capacity analysis is necessary to appropriately adjust programmes in step with growing national capacity.

Resource Mobilisation & Effective Donor Engagement

Various causes may contribute to donor decline after a mission is closed. This belies single approaches or silver bullet solutions. Nevertheless, discussions with interviewees and examples from their experiences did point to a few concrete practices for forestalling, or at least foreseeing donor drift. A mix of both innovative funding arrangements, as well as more traditional donor engagement were presented. These comprise a rough sketch of the facilities and good practices available to field staff as they work to drum up resources in preparation for a mission reconfiguration.

Central Finding: Ways of addressing donor drift It is a common dilemma that mission transitions may lead to a decline in donor commitment, just as the responsibilities and activities of UNCT actors may be expanding. While some factors of donor support cannot be directly influenced, this should not distract UNCT actors, and the RC in particular, from opportunities to engage donors and pursue innovative strategies. The funding arrangement between the departing UNMIT mission and UNCT agencies provides a strong example of innovation and leadership in transition settings. Perhaps more important than building significant donor support, transition plans must reflect an accurate perception of the donor climate, and tailor ambition to realistic prospects.

The most commonly cited reason for the deceleration of support is donors' need to prioritize competing and urgent needs. If a mission exit is interpreted as a signal of stability, it can have a de-prioritizing effect. Donors may also find bilateral relations with a country increasingly feasible and politically expedient, particularly as a government begins to assert its consolidated authority more soundly in the international community. Both situations were said to lead to donor drift after the exit if UNMIT in Timor-Leste. Such issues are not typically within the UN's ability to address, beyond perhaps typical diplomatic negotiations. However, the Timor-Leste and Nepal case studies indicate the importance of donor engagement in transition planning and its potential implications for sustained donor support. Interviewees in Timor-Leste suspected dwindling post-UNMIT support was at least partly attributable to weak donor engagement during planning. Contrastingly, interlocutors from the Nepal case stated confidently that a concerted effort to convene donors and substantially involve them in jointly identifying transition priorities helped secure their sustained commitment.

Clearly other factors were at play. As outlined above, donors in Timor-Leste had various incentives to adjust their support. Nepal demonstrates an atypical case in which donor

commitment appeared to increase after the mission left. Concurrent UNCT leadership attributed this to donor recognition and concern of the country's continued political fragility. Moreover, reportedly, many donors found it difficult to initiate bilateral development projects, encouraging them to channel support through the UNCT's existing programmes and trust funds. Nevertheless, as many of these conditions are not within the control of the UNCT or RCHCO, monitoring the donor climate and strategic forecasting were seen to be the main options available to manage the risk of support reductions. However, focus can also be aimed at issues that do lie within the UN's capacity to act, namely engaging donors in transition planning to build their commitment after the mission's departure.

This involves not only convincing donors of the added value of the transition programme, but also mapping donor interest in terms of substantive areas they intend to support. Donor commitments are best guided by national action plans, and joint-donor programmes could potentially be devised to align with national strategies, as was the case in Nepal. Some interviewees indicated the value of designating lead donors for particular areas. Others also pointed to the value donors appeared to place on transition plans and programmes that were demonstrably grounded in robust context analysis. However, a more general consensus centred on the value of coordinated or joint multi-donor strategies for transitions. Such practices may have further implications for processes linking to New Deal Compacts, or UNDAF renegotiations. Again in the case of Nepal, the role of the RCHCO, and the RC in particular, was roundly recognised and appreciated. Here both the continuity of the RC's leadership role, as well as the individual's politically adept diplomacy and convening capacity were noted as potent factors of success.

Of course other UN actors also have a part in accruing donor support for the post-mission presence. UNDP field actors stressed their role was best played in their dialogues with line ministries, and solidifying their position as a preferred implementing partner of the government. UNDP staff also recognised that transitions may mean the arrival of new implementing actors, with whom UNDP and other agencies will need to coordinate. This may also present opportunities to re-allocate budgets for the purposes of cost-efficiency. When discussing the role of HQ in supporting post-mission resource mobilisation, several field-level interviewees suggested actors at this level may be well-placed to identify new or alternative sources of funding or dedicate political support for innovative approaches to financing programmes. Timor-Leste provides one example of pioneering new funding arrangements with HQ support. With strong backing from the mission leadership, the shrinking UNMIT mission conceded its comparative advantage and dedicated funds from its remaining budget to UNCT agencies to complete mandate tasks. While such a practice is a temporary measure, it may set interesting precedents for handover activities and the adjustment of joint programmes over the course of a transition.

Take away lessons:

Awareness of the 'donor temperature' is key to planning transitions that are consistent with post-mission resources. Moreover, this donor temperature – if understood correctly – is open to influence.

- There are a number of factors that will influence the donor climate in the run up to and after a mission's exit. These include, inter alia, donors' domestic support and political cycles, the appeal of bilateral relations, the urgency of other donor priorities, and the perceived stability of the country going forward. If these factors cannot be influenced outright, they can be monitored and used to advise strategic planning regarding the size and ambition of post-mission activities.
- Transition plans should include donor participation and engagement, to an appropriate extent, facilitating lasting donor commitment during the transition. Like transition planning itself, such engagement must continue throughout various UN configurations so that donors are consistently aware of and prepared for beyond-the-horizon strategies. This donor engagement should be strongly guided by national priorities and declared strategies, as was the case in Nepal.
- Anchoring transition strategies in contextual analysis, besides being a best practice in its own right, can contribute to donor confidence in a transition plan. This links closely with the need for analytical capacity within the UNCT.

Additionally, exploring options to use the UN's own funding arrangements in a more flexible manner may more effectively capitalise on UN partners' changing comparative advantages during transition.

- A keen awareness of the evolving donor environment should be matched by a willingness and creativity for pursuing innovative funding strategies. Over-reliance on conventional forms of donor support may delay necessary efforts to seek out alternative funding arrangements. Out-of-the-box approaches should seek council from the mission, UNCT and HQ leadership, as their support will be a necessary precondition to pursuing new sources of financing.
- Joint funding strategies, or direct financial support from the mission during a draw down can offer new ways forward, as demonstrated in Timor-Leste. Further exploration of the facility and administrative (as well as political) implications of such arrangements would be useful. The pioneering approach that propelled this idea into action, emboldened by the Civilian Capacities initiative, should be supported and encouraged by donors and HQ leaders, as should other 'out-of-the-box' and innovative strategies that aim to channel funding more effectively.

3 Concluding Discussions

The findings and analysis of the previous chapter are not the end of the story. In fact, they are meant to illuminate some pathways forward. By exposing a few underlying assumptions and begging some important questions, this chapter thus aims to invite further discussion and revelation about the complexities of managing mission transitions.

Building capacity, the backstory

Throughout the study, the need to strengthen UNDP capacity appears somewhat as a leitmotif. The presumed benefits range from enhancing UNDP's role in preparing transitions, to a more strategic approach to strengthening national capacities, to undergirding programmes with stronger context analysis and conflict sensitivity. But the decision to dedicate such capacities to UNDP Country Offices or Resident Coordinators' Offices are not determined by the potential benefits alone. Clearly, and in the most literal sense, there are also costs to consider. When calls are made for 'more capacity' this ultimately translates to more funds to support specific staff with specific expertise. The voluntary funds on which UNDP's programmes rely are by no means boundless. Thus, resource allocations can often appear as zero-sum decisions. Does the presumed multiplier effect of a strategic planner or analyst justify belt-tightening in other areas? Our answer would likely be yes, with some qualifying conditions.

First of all, ensuring these posts are correctly positioned to optimise their programming impact is a critical factor. As seen in the case studies and discussed in the analysis, the strategic level and the programming level are not always sufficiently linked in the field. Thus, the bigger picture analysis may be presented, but it must also fit within the frame of activities and operations. Secondly, and closely related, the value of the analyst's impact must be observable, or in some way verifiable, to justify the resources dedicated. This presents a familiar challenge and should encourage further work on methodologies for demonstrating the impact of peacebuilding approaches and conflict-sensitivity.

The impact of analytical capacity

When specifically discussing the potential to increase UNDP's analytical and political advisory capacity in the field, several discussions are stimulated. One regards the link between context analysis and conflict-sensitive programming. While few would dispute the need for context analyses to inform programming, the rigour of that analysis and the

political space available for it remain unsettled issues. Can the need for objective analysis be met while still maintaining a relevance to existing programmes, strategies, and relationships with national partners? There are also compromises to consider in whether to make analysts part of specific projects, or include their posts within standard operations budgets. While having an in-house analyst available to various programmes appeals to a sense of comprehensiveness, linking an analyst to a particular project is likely to increase specific and verifiable impact. On the other hand, while 'projectizing' analysts may be the more pragmatic route in terms of funding, there may be a trade-off in limiting these actors' role to a single programme. In either case, targeted funding will be called for.

Donors' potential role

Here, donors are in a position to play a crucial role. What are the implications of the New Deal for supporting stronger analytical capacities within post-mission presences? How can a growing demand for robust context-specificity lead to concrete actions to supply interventions with the necessary expertise? What opportunities do donors have to not only support such expertise, but ensure that it is concretely applied to programming? Funding proposal prerequisites may be one concrete possibility. Another promising way forward may be to encourage more explicit demand from the national authorities. Building national capacities for conflict-sensitivity and analysis appears to simultaneously build support for analytical capacities within programmes. Of course, this is not a straightforward solution. The political implications of context, and especially conflict, analysis should not be misjudged or dismissed. They require nuanced dialogue and candid recognitions of the sensitivities and boundaries of an analyst role.

Strengthening an RCHCO

This brings us to the value of in-country UN leadership, typically situated within the RC(HC)O. This role also materialised as a prominent factor of difference in the case studies. What was less consistent was the myriad of responses to supporting the RCHCO. For example, while the continuity of leadership was lauded, or sought, in some cases, it is often dependent upon the set-up of the mission and the approval of the government. There are, for example, practical obstacles between post-mission continuity and having a triple-hatted DSRSG lead the UNCT during a mission. Such a high-level representative would not be expected to take on a regular RC position should the mission leave behind a UNCT-exclusive presence. Political appraisals must also be taken into account to ensure that the in-country leadership is appropriately scaled to the leadership of the national authorities. However, downscaling the UN's role in this way does not necessarily require a break in continuity. For example, the advisory office of a former-DSRSG may provide a strong pool of candidates to either step up, or directly support an incoming RC. Though, this would imply confronting the entanglements of cross-UN recruitment.

What options are available or could be devised to more efficiently and effectively strengthen an RCHCO? Are the skills needed particular to transition, whereby a standing roster of 'RC transition teams' could be assembled? Or is the necessary capacity more contingent on the country context, in which case continuity would appear as an important asset? If the former is the case, such a transition team may focus on propelling a

strategic shift over the course of the transition, moving away from the stability priorities of a mission and toward setting and acting on a new agenda for consolidating peace. On the other hand, if a premium is placed on continuity, it is likely to engender a stronger handover focus, whereby enduring actors centre their activities and steady their sights on an enduring strategy. There are clearly benefits and draw-backs to each approach, the balance of which is certainly context reliant.

Joining forces

Lastly, when speaking of the continuity or transition of strategies, we are drawn toward a conversation about cross-UN collaboration, including not only joint programming but also joint planning. Clearly collaboration between the mission and UNDP – if well managed and appropriately balanced – can build residual capacities and facilitate smoother transitions. This study has identified a few barriers and enablers to collaboration. Human resources has been discussed as one factor. Joint funding may be used to support key positions that synergize the work of different programmes or actors. These could be, for instance, ‘lynchpin’ actors or staff transferred from the mission to the UNCT. Moreover, joint-funding for programmes has the potential to maintain balanced commitments and relationships between UN partners. Joint reporting structures are yet another concrete way of ensuring actors are ‘reading from the same playbook.’

Yet such suggestions beg the question: Can we assume that a list of best practices could or should be systematically implemented? Or are the blockages and facilitators of collaboration more a matter of chemistry on the ground, challenging the general applicability of recommendations? In the case studies it was found that, while leadership and backing ‘from above’ was seen as vital, actual mechanisms for coordination and collaboration are best designed ‘from below’. This would indicate, perhaps, that enshrining best practices should hedge away from micro-managing or pre-determining how partners in the field set up their joint-programming structures. To be sure, success is a mix of good practices and good people. Thus, for our purposes here, it is useful to build up knowledge on the side of good practice. Expectantly, new UN arrangements responding to the Civilian Capacities initiative should open both funding opportunities and work streams to better align the activities of various UN partners. Donors are able to play a constructive role here in both incentivising and monitoring such alignment.

Success is a legacy, not a finish line

On a final note, a primary lesson of mission transitions is that stability does not guarantee consolidated, lasting peace. Investments must continue beyond the cessation of violent threats, and work to mitigate the longer-term threats to social stability. This may require a shift in perspective of some UN actors. The success of a mission is not concluded at its exit date. The resilience of the stability gained will not be known until long after a mission has left. Thus, it is certainly in the interest of all UN partners to properly prepare the support systems they leave behind, both national and UN partners alike.

Annex: Mission Background Summaries

Timor-Leste

Since 1999 the United Nations has deployed five different missions in Timor-Leste. The first mission, established in the wake of Timor-Leste's secession from Indonesia, was the United Nations Mission in East Timor (UNAMET) and lasted from June to October 1999. UNAMET was followed by the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), deployed from October 1999 to May 2002 to help build the new nation's self-governing capacity. UNTAET held executive and administrative authority in the territory during the country's transition to independence. This was followed by the United Nations Mission of Support in East Timor (UNMISSET), from May 2002 to May 2005, mandated to support the government's core administrative structures, while devolving operational authority to the responsible national institutions. The United Nations Office in Timor-Leste (UNOTIL), a Special Political Mission, lasted from May 2005 to August 2006 and supported the government in developing state institutions including the police, and human rights observers.³⁵

A general level of stability and the increasing sovereignty of the Timorese Government prompted planning for the exit of UNOTIL, anticipated in May 2006. However, an unexpected eruption of violence and a major political upheaval from April to July of that year proved the danger and fallacy of equating apparent stability with lasting peace and security. UNOTIL remained, aided by security forces dispatched by regional powers, primarily Australia. The United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT) was then established in August 2006 as a response to a request by the President of the National Parliament and the Prime Minister. Security Council Resolution 1704 (2006) called UNMIT to support the national authorities in consolidating stability. This included encouraging political recourse to address the underlying causes of its internal political crisis, which had displaced up to 150,000 people. Further to that end, UNMIT was to help prepare the country for the 2007 presidential and parliamentary elections. In its efforts to reassert the rule of law, the UNPOL component of the mission was mandated to support the Timorese National Police (PNTL) while the mission conducted a review of the needs of the broader security sector. Like missions before it, UNMIT also had a role in strengthening national capacity to monitor and promote human rights. As an integrated mission UNMIT was also mandated to work and coordinate with UN Country Team

35 See <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unmit/background.shtml#>

making maximum use of assistance in post conflict peace building and capacity building.³⁶ The mission included up to 1,608 police personnel and 34 military liaison officers.

In September 2011, the Government and UNMIT signed a Joint Transition Plan for UNMIT's withdrawal, initiated by Security Council Resolution 2037 (Feb. 2012), which cited major progress since the 2006 unrest.³⁷ Resolution 2037 extended the mandate until 31 December 2012, five months after the scheduled parliamentary elections, and eight months after the 2012 presidential elections. Despite prior expectations that UNMIT would be followed by a Special Political Mission, lack of interest on the part of the newly elected Timor-Leste government ultimately declined the option. Timor-Leste now hosts an exclusive UN Country Team presence. The recent appointment of a non-resident Special Advisor is an innovative modality to support peacebuilding and statebuilding in the country and strengthen the partnership between the UN and the Government.

Chad

In 2003, the east of Chad became a spill-over refuges for those fleeing conflicts in Darfur and the Central African Republic. The refugee flow increased regional tensions, and put further pressure on Chadian President Déby, in power since the 1990s.³⁸ In a response to the distressing humanitarian situation, the activities of armed groups in the east of Chad, and ongoing cross-border attacks between rebel groups, the United Nations Mission in Central African Republic and Chad (MINURCAT) was established by Security Council Resolution 1778 (2007). The Chadian government agreed to the deployment of a civilian police operation but declined a UN military operation. The mission did, however, include roughly 50 military liaison officers, with the Government's approval.

MINURCAT did not have an explicit political mandate. Its mandate authorised the deployment of a UN civilian and police mission and a European military force (EUFOR) to assist Chadian police in the protection of refugees, internally displaced persons (IDPs) and humanitarian workers and to ensure humanitarian space in the east of the country. To carry out this mandate, MINURCAT supported the Government of Chad in creating a 850-strong Chadian police gendarme force, the Détachement Intégré de Sécurité (DIS). The DIS's main tasks were to maintain law and order in refugee camps and sites with high concentrations of IDPs, and to assist in securing humanitarian activities in eastern Chad.³⁹

A January 2009 Security Council Resolution stressed great concern over armed activities and rampant banditry threatening civilians and humanitarian space in the north-eastern and eastern parts of the country.⁴⁰ As of March 2009, MINURCAT took over the military

36 S/RES/1704 (2006).

37 S/RES/2037 (2012).

38 International Crisis Group (2008) Chad: A new conflict resolution framework: executive summary and recommendations. Africa Report N°144.

39 S/RES/1778 (2007).

40 S/RES/1861 (2009).

component of EUFOR, with 300 police, 25 military liaison officers, 5,200 military personnel and additional civilian staff. By 28 February 2010, the mission had scaled down to 3,531 troops, 24 military observers and 259 police officers. These uniform personnel were supported by 565 international and 524 local civilian staff.

At the request of the Chadian government, the mission withdrew on 31 December 2010. The Chadian Government assumed full responsibility for the protection of its citizens, with support from and remaining UN actors.⁴¹ The sudden nature of the departure, created a high risk for instability and put great pressure on residual programming.

Sierra Leone

The conflict in Sierra Leone erupted in May 1999 when former leader Foday Sankoh of the Revolutionary United Front attempted to overthrow the Government of Sierra Leone. What followed was a period of civil war that caused 70,000 casualties and left 2.6 million people displaced. In response to the ongoing crisis, the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (UNOMSIL) was established in July 1998. Its mandate was to disarm combatants and rebuild the country's security forces. The mission worked for a time alongside the Economic Community of West African States Monitoring Group (ECOMOG), the sub-regional military force, led by Nigeria. Domestic political pressure in Nigeria led the backbone force to withdraw in 2000, leaving a security gap and putting great pressure on the continuation of UNOMSIL. The involvement of the United Kingdom contributed to restoring stability and reinforce deployment of the UN mission. A ceasefire between the warring parties was signed in May 1999, followed by the Lomé Peace Agreement.

The DPKO-led United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) was established by UN the Security Council on 22 October 1999.⁴² Its mandate was to ensure security and freedom of UN personnel, to monitor the ceasefire, create confidence-building mechanisms, facilitate humanitarian assistance, support human rights, and to provide support during the elections. UNAMSIL's initial 6,000 military personnel included 260 military observers. Due to continued civil unrest, Security Council Resolution 1289 (2000) revised the mandate of UNAMSIL, expanding its military component to 11,100 personnel, and increased the mission's civil affairs, civilian police, administrative and technical components. Further expansions followed in 2000 and 2001, with military personnel growing to 17,500, including 260 military observers, which was the largest peacekeeping mission at the time.⁴³

UNAMSIL's mandate ended in 2005 and was followed by the United Nations Integrated Office for Sierra Leone (UNIOSIL), comprising 304 staff. This mission was to help consolidate peace and establish economic dividends and social benefits to build national stability.⁴⁴ Its mandate focused on supporting the Government of Sierra Leone in: '[...]

41 S/RES/1923 (2010).

42 S/170/1999.

43 See <http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unamsil/background.html>

44 S/1620/2005.

building the capacity of State institutions to develop and implement a strategy for addressing the root causes of the conflict and accelerate progress towards the Millennium Development Goals'.⁴⁵ This included developing a national human rights Plan of Action and Commission. Other objectives included supporting the National Electoral Commission leading up to the 2007 elections, and strengthening the country's security sector.

UN Security Resolution 1829 (2008) created the current United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office (UNIPSIL), headed by the Secretary General's Executive Representative (ERSG). UNIPSIL, established on the 1st of October 2008, originally consisted of a small staff of 70 people. UNIPSIL covers both political and development activities. Among other things, the office offers support and training to national police and security forces, building the capacity of democratic institutions to maintain good governance and the promotion and protection of human rights.⁴⁶ UNIPSIL is currently in the process of preparing for its withdrawal and transition to an exclusive United Nations Country Team presence. Its mandate ends March 2014.⁴⁷

Nepal

Open conflict between the armed forces of Nepal and Maoist fighters lasted a decade, between 1996 to 2006. When violence escalated in 2001, the international community became increasingly concerned about the situation, sending former Secretary-General Kofi Annan to broker a solution. As of May 2005, an office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights was established, with a mandate to focus on violations of international humanitarian law and the protection of democratic rights.⁴⁸

The Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed between the Nepal government and the United Communist Party of Nepal (UCPN) on 21 November 2006. The Seven-Party Alliance (government) and the UCPN requested the UN Secretary General to assist the parties in navigating the peace process. On 23 January 2007, Security Council Resolution 1740 established the United Nations Mission in Nepal (UNMIN). The mandate of this DPA Special Political Mission was to monitor the arms and armed personnel of the Nepal army and Maoist combatants, in line with the provisions of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. The mission assisted the parties in monitoring the ceasefire arrangements through a Joint Monitoring Coordinating Committee. Additionally, UNMIN provided technical assistance to the Election Commission as it planned, prepared and conducted the election of a Constituent Assembly.⁴⁹

With its headquarters in Kathmandu, the mission also established five regional offices throughout the country. It maintained a 24-hour presence in the seven main Maoists cantonment sites and Chhauni barracks of the Nepal Army, and guarded arms caches. As of 1 April 2008, UNMIN consisted of 965 staff, including 167 arms monitors and 169

45 S/1620/2005; S/273/2005/Add.2.

46 S/1829/2008.

47 S/2097/2013.

48 See <http://nepal.ohchr.org/en/index.html>

49 S/RES/1740 (2007).

electoral staff.⁵⁰ In July 2008, the regional offices were closed as part of a gradual drawdown. The number of staff drew down to 209 in July 2009.

UNMIN faced many difficulties during the political crisis of 2009, when the UCPN withdrew from the government. On 13 September 2010, the Nepalese government and the UNCP-Maoist party were able to reach consensus, and pledged to take up the remaining tasks of the peace process. Upon this arrangement, the government asked for a completion of the mission. UNMIN's mandate was extended for a final four months to complete the integration and rehabilitation of the ex-Maoist combatants.⁵¹ UNMIN ceased operations on 15 January 2011, reducing the UN presence in Nepal to the UN Country Team, Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator's Office, and a small DPA Liaison Office.

50 See <http://un.org.np/unmin-archive/?d=about&p=mandate>.

51 Security Council Report No. 2 (14 September 2011).

Beyond Transitions: UNDP's role, before, during and after UN Mission withdrawal

UN Missions (peacekeeping and special political missions) inevitably reconfigure their presence in a country. Draw-downs or withdrawals of the missions lead to increased responsibilities and new roles for 'enduring actors', both remaining UN programme staff and national authorities alike. How such transitions are planned for and managed can be a determining factor in either the consolidation of progress or backsliding on stability gains after a UN mission has exited. This lessons learned study explores what kinds of preparation, foresight and analysis may critically contribute to the ability of enduring actors, and the UNDP in particular, to sustain progress and mitigate risks of regression after a mission has withdrawn. Within the broader context of the transition from peacekeeping to peacebuilding, there is both demand and opportunity to learn from some recent UN experiences. The report analyses both recurring and particular challenges and opportunities that UNDP field staff are exposed to over the various stages of a mission transition, from planning to post-mission programming. These field perspectives are necessary to appropriately inform an anticipated UNDP Guidance on Mission Transitions, and ensure its focus and advice remain relevant to and reflective of field practice.

About the author

Megan Price is a research fellow of the Conflict Research Unit of the Clingendael Institute. Lina Titulaer is a research fellow of the Conflict Research Unit of the Clingendael Institute.

Colophon

The Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael' is an independent institute for research, training and public information on international affairs. It publishes the results of its own research projects and the monthly *Internationale Spectator* and offers a broad range of courses and conferences covering a wide variety of international issues.



Clingendael

Netherlands Institute of International Relations