

This report is presented as received by IDRC from project recipient(s). It has not been subjected to peer review or other review processes.

This work is used with the permission of The North-South Institute.

© 2005, The North-South Institute.

Delivering on the Responsibility to Protect: A Policy Research Project on Canada and Africa's Emerging Regional Security Regime

**Final Technical Report for the International Development Research Centre
(IDRC) Grant # 102911
Submitted: December 16, 2005**

From: The North-South Institute, Ottawa, Canada

**For more information contact:
Ms. Kristiana Powell, Researcher
Dr. Stephen Baranyi, Principal Researcher
kpowell@nsi-ins.ca; sbaranyi@nsi-ins.ca
Tel: (613)-241-3535 x 247**

Contents:

Synthesis.....	2
Research Problem.....	4
Research Findings.....	6
Fulfillment of Objectives.....	9
Project Design and Implementation.....	13
Project Outputs and Dissemination.....	15
Capacity-building.....	17
Project Management.....	17
Impact.....	18
Overall Assessment.....	18
Recommendations.....	18

Synthesis:

This project was designed to enhance NSI and our African partners' capacity to provide research-based policy recommendations on the role the international community can play in developing a protection regime in Africa, focusing on "The Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) using the case studies of Darfur, Sudan and Burundi. It was also structured to enable NSI and African partners to develop a multi-year research project on operationalizing the Responsibility to Protect in Africa. The specific objectives of the project were to:

- to create a Canadian space for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue between Canadian government officials, African counterparts in Ottawa, and engaged Canadian and African civil society members on Canada's support for the African Union (AU).
- to develop a set of concrete policy recommendations conditioned by the perspectives of African civil society and key decision-makers on the role that Canada can play in supporting the AU's capacity to fulfill a protection mandate.
- to contribute modestly to improving coordination and policy coherence between FAC, CIDA and DND, and their respective contributions to the AU's peace and security objectives.
- to coordinate and launch an active civil society dialogue process on these policy and research issues.
- to strengthen NSI's action-research partnerships with African colleagues.
- to support the efforts of NSI and African research partners to develop jointly a multi-year policy research project on African regional security based on genuine partnership and a joint governance model.
- to embed African perspectives in debates surrounding the operationalization of the principles underpinning *The Responsibility to Protect*.
- to contribute to building the research and policy engagement capacity of African partners and to develop further Canadian expertise in this policy area.

The main outputs of the project include a working paper based on primary and secondary research, a policy roundtable and project development workshop, a roundtable report and policy brief, and a full proposal for follow-on research in partnership with African research centres.

The Working Paper entitled “The African Union’s Emerging Peace and Security Regime: Opportunities and Challenges for Delivering on The Responsibility to Protect” was published in spring 2005 and is based on an extensive secondary literature from academic, civil society, African Union and United Nations sources. It is also based on over 40 field interviews in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; Khartoum, Sudan; and Bujumbura, Burundi between February and March 2005.

This Working Paper served as a background document for a discussed at a **Policy Roundtable** co-hosted with Development Policy Management Forum (DPMF) based in Addis Ababa, Centre d’Alerte et de Prévention des Conflits (CENAP) based in Bujumbura, Burundi and the Institute for Security Studies (ISS) in South Africa. The Roundtable brought together over 30 officials from the Canadian government, as well as African, European and North American researchers. Drawing on the Working Paper and Roundtable discussions, NSI prepared a **Policy Brief** that developed more specific policy recommendations on how the Canadian government, the African Union and other members of the international community can help build a protection regime in Africa.

The working paper and the policy discussions concluded that there is a great deal of normative support in Africa for the principles underpinning The Responsibility to Protect; indeed, the principles underpinning the AU’s emerging peace and security regime resonate with elements of the prevention-reaction-rebuilding continuum articulated in *The Responsibility to Protect* framework. However, the African Union and other key peace and security actors in Africa face enormous resource and capacity constraints to delivering on their responsibility to protect along the prevention-reaction-rebuilding continuum. International donors are helping to strengthen the AU’s capacities in this regard, but need to strike a better balance between supporting crisis response and developing conflict prevention, management and resolution capabilities in Africa. Moreover, the United Nations, key member states and African regional organizations will need to devise a more effective division of labour for prevention, reaction and rebuilding on the continent.

These outputs, policy discussions and research findings have formed the basis of a multi-year policy research project developed in partnership with CENAP and in collaboration with DPMF with joint initiatives undertaken with the ISS and the UK’s Institute for Public Policy Research. This multi-year policy research project will explore the operational dimensions of bridging the responsibilities to react and to rebuild in Burundi and Sudan with particular attention given to the reform of the security sector. The research will consider how national, regional and international actors can best support the transfer of the responsibility to protect civilians in these contexts from external actors to national stakeholders in a way that serves the interests of the most vulnerable populations. The project will promote evidence-based policy dialogue between key

stakeholders from the North and South on these issues. It will also strengthen the capacity of partners to conduct high-quality research, to link research and policy dialogue, and to jointly implement a major collaborative project. Based on these findings, the project will develop policy recommendations on how multilateral organizations like the UN, EU and World Bank, regional organizations like the African Union, key donors and national stakeholders can deliver on their responsibility to react and rebuild in Africa. For more information see the project proposal entitled: “Delivering on the Responsibility to Protect in Africa Phase II: Reforming the Security Sector to Protect the Most Vulnerable” submitted to IDRC in December 2005.

Research problem:

In 2001, 53 African leaders created the African Union (AU), a continental organization to replace the Organization of African Unity. The AU calls for major changes to regional approaches to peace and security. The norms underpinning the AU’s emerging peace and security regime resonate closely with elements of the protection framework articulated *The Responsibility to Protect*. The AU, like *The Responsibility to Protect*, clearly lays out provisions for military intervention to protect vulnerable populations against war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide. These changes make the Act the first international treaty to recognize an international organization’s right to intervene for human protection purposes. The AU has the historic potential to bring Africa closer to a more inclusive peace that takes as its central referent the protection of vulnerable populations. However, when we were doing background research for this project, we it became clear that there is a lack of research on the opportunities and constraints for developing the African Union’s capacity to protect vulnerable populations in situations of armed conflict.

The project “Delivering on the Responsibility to Protect: A Policy Research Project on Canada and Africa’s Emerging Regional Security Regime” was designed to help fill some of these policy research gaps. NSI completed a working paper that includes initial case studies of the AU-led peacekeeping force in Burundi (AMIB) and the AU’s evolving response to the crisis in Darfur, Sudan to examine how the Union’s declared commitments to protecting vulnerable populations have been realized in practice. The paper formulates a number of key conclusions (discussed below) regarding the AU’s emerging capacity to contribute to a lasting peace on the continent that is centred on the protection of civilians.

The policy roundtable held in May 2005 served as an opportunity to discuss the working paper findings and to draft policy recommendations for the international community and particularly for Canada. Some of these findings will be discussed in detail below. We were surprised that roundtable participants – particularly our African colleagues – did not interrogate or challenge the principles underpinning R2P; on the contrary, there was a general agreement among all participants that states and the international community has an obligation to prevent and respond to egregious human rights violations and to rebuild war-torn societies. Colleagues were instead concerned with the dismal track record of the international community and African leaders in implementing R2P through the direct

protection of civilians on the ground. Our African colleagues called for future research to continue to focus on grounded analyses on the challenges and prospects for operationalizing R2P in specific contexts in Africa. They were less concerned with efforts to develop norms or build consensus in broad international fora.

The project has also supported the development of a new multi-year research project developed in partnership with CENAP and in collaboration with DPMF with joint initiatives undertaken with the ISS and the UK's Institute for Public Policy Research (ippr). The NSI-CENAP-DPMF proposal is being finalized and will be submitted to IDRC and other potential funders for funding this fiscal year. Foreign Affairs Canada has confirmed funding for joint work with ISS and ippr.¹ In its original proposal to IDRC, NSI had proposed that this multi-year project might explore the emerging capacity of African institutions and civil society to protect vulnerable populations from massive human rights abuses, and will consider how these immediate protection interventions interface with longer-term peacebuilding strategies. We also proposed that the research might examine international and regional mechanisms and non-state strategies, in the African context, to intervene along the prevention-reaction-rebuilding continuum.

Over the past year we have had the opportunity to meet several times in person with colleagues from CENAP and DPMF and have held two project development workshops. We have also engaged in extensive e-discussions. Throughout these meetings and discussions our African partners challenged us to focus our research. They made clear that there was an urgent need to consider what happens when intervening actors withdraw from failed or fragile states in Africa and the responsibility to protect needs to be transferred back to national actors. Project partners noted that sustainable and pro-poor human-rights based security sector reform is a central element of the responsibility to rebuild. Yet despite the recognition on the part of international, regional and national actors operating in an African context of the importance of sustainable and just security sector reform, there remain critical policy and analysis gaps in contexts like Burundi and Sudan. There is a lack of sophisticated research into how security sector reform agendas might best be designed, implemented and linked to other peacebuilding initiatives in Burundi and Sudan. In addition, existing policy research and dialogue on security sector reform in these and other African contexts often fail to document and privilege the security priorities of vulnerable groups like women, children and the poor. There is also a dearth of policy analysis on the contribution African regional institutions can and should make to SSR and broader sustainable peacebuilding agendas.

In light of these important policy research gaps, all project partners have decided to focus the second phase of our research on the responsibility to protect on how national, regional and international actors might best support the transfer of the responsibility to protect from external actors to national stakeholders in the area of SSR in a way that meets the needs of the most vulnerable. This project may link findings in Burundi and Sudan to similar research in Palestine, Sri Lanka and Afghanistan. For more information on this

¹ Please note that the disbursement of these funds has been delayed due to the outcome of the recent no-confidence vote.

emerging project see: “Delivering on the Responsibility to Protect in Africa Phase II: Reforming the Security Sector to Protect the Most Vulnerable.”

Research findings:

The research and policy dialogue process highlighted nine main conclusions that have contributed to generating policy-relevant knowledge. These conclusions include:

1. The transition from the Organization of African Unity (OAU) to the African Union (AU) ushered in far-reaching changes to the pan-African peace and security agenda, particularly with respect to the parameters of sovereignty and intervention for human protection purposes. The principles underpinning the AU’s emerging peace and security regime resonate with elements of the prevention-reaction-rebuilding continuum articulated in *The Responsibility to Protect* framework.
2. The AU’s emerging security architecture places the continental organization within a robust security system comprised of African regional arrangements and mechanisms, the United Nations (UN) and other key members of the international community. Yet there are a number of challenges confronting African regional organizations and their efforts to fulfill a peace and security mandate. These include questionable legitimacy, resource and capacity constraints and conflicting political agendas. Donor initiatives may further exacerbate these broad differences inasmuch as they focus on certain regions over others and support regional organizations with overlapping membership.
3. The UN will also provide a central building block in the AU’s emerging peace and security system. However, recent practice reveals tensions between the AU and the UN. On the one hand, the African Union and African leaders recognize that there is a need to develop African capacities to respond to crises when the UN is unwilling or unable to do so. On the other hand, the UN must be held to account for its responsibilities in Africa. The lessons from “re-hatting” in Burundi suggest that successful transitions from AU to UN command may require a more formalized relationship between these two organizations that draws on comparative advantages and common understandings of particular conflicts, clarifies respective roles in conflict management and resolution, and minimizes troop reductions and demotions.
4. Key external actors like the European Union (EU) and the G8 – including Canada - have helped shape Africa’s evolving peace and security regime. The EU’s African Peace Facility is providing critical support to the AU but funds for the Peace Facility are drawn from envelopes already earmarked for development. This raises important questions about how best to negotiate trade-offs between spending for stability and security with the allocation of resources to structural conflict prevention and longer-term development assistance. G8 initiatives in Africa may also make an important contribution to peace and security through regional organizations and the AU. However, the G8’s increasingly narrow focus on developing military capability over conflict prevention and resolution capacities in Africa risks contributing to the construction of a security architecture that is

only capable of mounting military responses to crises. There is a need for the G8 and other donors to also focus on helping the AU develop a range of operational and structural conflict prevention capacities.

5. Canada has been a central player in placing and keeping Africa on the G8's agenda and in developing a set of initiatives that respond to New Partnership for Africa's Development's (NEPAD) broad peace, security and development priorities. Canada is also one of the first donors to provide genuinely flexible funding to the AU. However, Canadian contributions to peace and security capacity building for the AU and regional organizations are minimal in comparison to resources provided to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the United Nations over the past five years. In addition, existing Canadian support for Africa's peace and security regime tends to favour developing West African capacities over funding for the AU. Furthermore, Canada - like other G8 nations - faces critical questions about how to reconcile the urgent need to build peace support operations capacity and support crisis response in Africa with the equally pressing need to develop a range of conflict prevention, management and resolution capacities in Africa.

6. An examination of the African Mission in Burundi (AMIB) and the African Mission in Sudan (AMIS) reveals that - at least in these cases - the AU possesses the political will to implement its normative commitments to peace and security, including the protection of vulnerable populations. These cases also demonstrate that the AU is filling critical gaps in Africa's peace and security agenda and architecture.

7. The AU has had some success in implementing its commitments to peace and security in Burundi and Darfur. In Burundi, AMIB helped stabilize parts of the country and create conditions conducive to UN deployment. In Darfur, AMIS has served to deter ceasefire violations and provide some security to civilians where it is present.

8. Yet the AU faces major obstacles to meeting its peace and security objectives, including its commitment to the protection of civilians. AMIB was tasked with a mandate it could not possibly fulfill and its resources were not aligned with its requirements. The mission also lacked the training and expertise to fulfill its mandate and to provide meaningful protection to civilians. AMIS does not have the planning capacity to deploy on schedule and faces command and control, and logistical constraints. It also has too few troops on the ground and a weak mandate. As a result it is not able to effectively monitor the ceasefire or provide meaningful protection to the most vulnerable civilians.

9. The experiences of AMIB and AMIS demonstrate that the AU requires extensive financial, logistical and political support from the international community in order to fulfill its commitments to peace and security, including to the protection of civilians. Ultimately, however, the AU and the rest of the international community will need to use a range of tools to deliver on the new peace and security agenda in Africa. Political initiatives to prevent, manage and resolve conflict need to be matched with strategies on the part of national, regional and international actors to address the social and political vulnerabilities at the root of conflict. Yet an examination of donor commitments to

development in Burundi and donor contributions to Sudan also raises critical questions of how to appropriately sequence immediate relief and recovery activities, and longer-term strategies to reduce poverty and build a sustainable peace. It also underscores the need for donors to devise strategies for effective engagement in conflict contexts or where the state is unwilling or unable to devise a viable development strategy.

These evidence-based research findings make several important contributions to developing Canadian and other donor policy and programming toward the African Union and the broader Responsibility to Protect agenda in Africa. Selective contributions include:

1. The research made clear that while the AU has adopted principles that resonate with the responsibility to protect agenda, there is a need to develop a common understanding and universal doctrine in the United Nations, the AU, the regional economic communities (RECs), other regional organizations and key states surrounding the “protection of civilians” and how protection tasks might be carried out in specific contexts.
2. The primary interview process and roundtable discussions underscored that African colleagues felt that African priorities were not being taken into serious consideration by northern stakeholders promoting the R2P agenda. They suggested that Canada and other governments that support The Responsibility to Protect should more consistently frame this evolving concept as a continuum of protection that links prevention, reaction and rebuilding priorities when advocating its endorsement in international fora. The formulation of R2P as a broad spectrum of responsibilities that bridge crisis response and transformative peacebuilding aligns more closely with African peace, security and development priorities. This framing, also rooted in the ICISS report, may help allay concerns in the South that R2P is merely a legitimizing doctrine for interventions based on narrow northern-driven agendas.
3. The data on Canadian and other donor support for the peace and security agendas of the AU and other regional organizations suggests that Canada and other governments need to strike a better balance between building African peace support operations and crisis response capacities, and providing sufficient resources to develop AU and other African institutions’ capabilities for conflict prevention, and post-conflict reconstruction including reconciliation.
4. An assessment of the international community’s engagement in Burundi suggests that ONUB should play a more robust role in providing meaningful protection to civilians under threat of physical violence and in actively deterring human rights violations, with particular attention to the rights of women and girls. In addition, donors need to start releasing their development pledges - particularly for poverty reduction - to Burundi, even in the context of continued fighting, electoral violence and delayed transitional processes. However, Canada and other donors need to strike the right balance between supporting minimalist reforms or “good enough governance” in fragile states like Burundi, with the pressing need to also address some of the most politically and socially

contentious issues (e.g. inequalities of power and wealth along ethnic, race, gender or class lines) that often lie at the root of violent conflict.

5. In Sudan, the international community, including Canada, will need to provide financial and other resources to help the AU expand its deployment in Darfur. In addition, the United Nations needs to coordinate more closely with AMIS. UNMIS, the UN force that will monitor the comprehensive peace agreement negotiated between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM, will need to find ways of sharing its resources and expertise with AMIS. Finally, to make an immediate contribution to peace in Darfur, Canada should support policy research that could illuminate options for immediate engagement and research to inform a long-term strategy for sustainable peacebuilding.

Fulfillment of objectives:

The specific objectives of this initiative were to:

1. To embed African perspectives in debates surrounding the operationalization of the principles underpinning *The Responsibility to Protect*.

Comment:

The project did help embed African perspectives in Canadian and possibly other international debates surrounding the operationalization of the principles underpinning *The Responsibility to Protect*. The policy roundtable, which NSI co-hosted with CENAP, DPMF and ISS, also profiled the perspective of African civil society leaders and academics. These perspectives were captured in the policy brief that was reviewed by core partners prior to publication. Unfortunately, the AU was not able to send any representatives to the policy roundtable in Ottawa.² However, despite this constraint, the Working Paper itself is based on over 40 interviews in Ethiopia, Burundi and Sudan thereby serving to document and share the voices of key stakeholders – including senior AU officials, western and African diplomats, academics and civil society actors, AMIS military and political officers based in Khartoum, senior AMIB officials, senior ONUB officials and a representative from the Transitional Government of Burundi.

2. To strengthen NSI's action-research partnerships with African colleagues.

Comment:

This project made an invaluable contribution to strengthening NSI's action-research partnerships with African colleagues. NSI (Baranyi) had the opportunity to travel to South Africa to begin discussions on a long-term partnership with ISS. This has led to a proposal for joint research and events with ISS and ippr. NSI's (Powell) research trip and

² Please see the "lessons learned" analysis we have embedded in the section on "project outputs and dissemination" for a more elaborate analysis of and possible solution to AU engagement in the next phase of the project.

interviews were largely organized and in some cases accompanied by CENAP in Burundi, DPMF in Ethiopia and ACORD-Sudan in Sudan. This provided NSI with extensive access to key stakeholders in each country and served to strengthen research and policy engagement partnerships with each institution. Moreover, DPMF, CENAP and ISS co-hosted the policy roundtable and, along with Clingendael from the Netherlands and ippr in the UK, attended a two-day project development workshop. All core project partners were also able to meet in Mozambique in November to finalize plans to work together over the next two years. These partnership-building opportunities and plans for future would not have been possible without IDRC's support for this project.

3. To support the efforts of NSI and African research partners to develop jointly a multi-year policy research project on African regional security based on genuine partnership and a joint governance model.

Comment:

The project created opportunities for NSI, CENAP, DPMF, ISS and ippr to forge solid working relationships and to develop proposals for follow-on work. These proposals have received positive reviews from funders. For example, Foreign Affairs Canada has agreed to fund joint research and a joint event co-hosted by ISS, ippr, NSI and CENAP – although disbursement of these funds have been unexpectedly delayed due to the recent no-confidence vote. Moreover, IDRC has positively reviewed the joint CENAP-DPMF-NSI proposal on phase II research and IDRC colleague, Njeri Karuru, attended a project development workshop to discuss and revise this proposal for final submission in December 2005.

4. To contribute to building the research and policy engagement capacity of African partners and to develop Canadian expertise in this policy area.

Comment:

The project may have made a modest contribution to building the research and policy engagement capacity of our African partners. For example, NSI's (Powell) research interviews were largely organized and in some cases accompanied by DPMF, CENAP and ACORD-Sudan, thereby facilitating networking opportunities, and knowledge sharing with key stakeholders. In addition, the project – particularly the policy roundtable - may have helped raise the profile in Canada of several of our African partners, particularly CENAP and DPMF. Moreover, the project did create invaluable opportunities for NSI and our African partners to develop personal relations based on transparency and trust and to develop a Phase II proposal. One of the central objectives of the Phase II project is to strengthen the institutional capacity of all partner institutions to carry out expert research and to contribute to policy change in genuine partnerships with each other.

The project has also helped build Canadian capacities on these issues by allowing NSI researchers, Kristiana Powell and Stephen Baranyi, to dedicate time and resources to conducting field research on these issues, to network with other colleagues in Africa, Europe and the United States working in this area and to translate research and roundtable discussion into viable policy options for a range of stakeholders. NSI continues to be consulted by civil society colleagues and Foreign Affairs Canada for views and recommendations on the implementation of a R2P agenda in Africa, on the African Union and on protection of civilian issues in Burundi and Darfur.

5. To create a Canadian space for multi-stakeholder policy dialogue between Canadian government officials, African counterparts in Ottawa, and engaged Canadian and African civil society members on Canada's support for the African Union (AU).

Comment:

The policy roundtable brought together over thirty experts from a range of institutions in Canada, the United States, Europe and Africa as well as key Canadian government officials from DND, FAC and CIDA. Unfortunately, we were not able to secure AU participation in this event.

6. To develop a set of concrete policy recommendations conditioned by the perspectives of African civil society and key decision-makers on the role that Canada can play in supporting the AU's capacity to fulfill a protection mandate.

Comment:

The research paper, policy roundtable and policy brief led to the development of over 20 concrete policy recommendations on how the African Union, other African regional organizations, Canada, other donors and the United Nations can help deliver on the responsibility to protect in Africa. The policy brief and working paper has been broadly disseminated in both print and electronic form as well as through NSI's website. In addition, the working paper was published as an ISS monograph and was disseminated through ISS's broad communications networks in Africa and Europe.

7. To contribute modestly to improving coordination and policy coherence between FAC, CIDA and DND, and their respective contributions to the AU's peace and security objectives.

Comment:

NSI received positive responses to the policy roundtable from Canadian government officials, particularly from FAC and CIDA's Policy Branch. We were advised in the future to ask participants to come fully prepared and to spend less time reviewing research results and more time discussing policy options, including options for

coherence. We also found it very difficult to meaningfully engage DND throughout this project, despite the fact that funding from DND's Security and Defence Forum helped facilitate initial stages of research. Moreover, DND did not send a senior-level representative to the roundtable despite repeated requests to do so. In addition, at the last minute, senior colleagues from the Canada Fund for Africa and the Pan-Africa Program were not able to attend the roundtable. It is thus unlikely that we have made a significant contribution to 3D policy coherence. However, it is important to note that FAC colleagues have also made clear that it has been difficult to engage DND and most CIDA colleagues on the R2P file. We hope we can modestly contribute to policy coherence in the area of security sector reform in phase II of the R2P project.

8. To coordinate and launch an active civil society dialogue process on these policy and research issues.

Comment:

The policy roundtable and project development workshops have clearly contributed to strengthening relations between key African and Canadian research institutions. However, it is not clear that these activities have contributed to facilitating a sustainable dialogue process. For example, while NSI has been contacted directly by FAC and NGO colleagues for our opinion on R2P in Africa and to facilitate contacts at the AU, we have not been asked to organize follow-on events with similar interlocutors. We hope our Phase II project will create a more sustainable Canadian space for multi-stakeholder dialogue on these issues.

Project design and implementation:

Calendar of Activities (January 1, 2005 to December 31, 2005)

Month	Activity
January 2005	Finalize fundraising for project phase I. Liaise with potential African partners. Conduct preparatory research. NSI Principal Researcher to travel to South Africa to meet with ISS. NSI Researcher to finalize plans for Africa field visit.
February 2005	Field visit to Africa to conduct primary research and meet partners face-to-face.
March 2005	Interpret research data and prepare first full draft of working paper. Start organizing policy roundtable and project development workshop.
April 2005	Complete second full draft of working paper and circulate to NSI peers and two outside readers. Continue preparations for policy roundtable and project development workshop.
May 2005	Publish Working Paper for discussion at Policy Roundtable. Host policy roundtable and project development workshop.
June 2005	Update Working Paper for publication as ISS Monograph. Draft and circulate draft roundtable report and policy brief for input from core partners.
July 2005	Finalize and publish roundtable report and policy brief. Draft, circulate and submit concept note for Phase II project to IDRC.
July to October 2005	Convert concept note into full proposal based on IDRC comments. Circulate for input to core partners and submit to IDRC.
November 2005	Host second policy development workshop in Mozambique with DPMF, CENAP and IDRC with some input from ISS and ippr.
December 2005	Re-submit finalized proposal for Phase II to IDRC and other potential funders.

Explanatory notes:

- The Phase I project proposal went through a number of iterations based on comments from Foreign Affairs Canada and IDRC on research, policy development and capacity-building priorities.
- The Working Paper draws on extensive secondary literature from academic, civil society, African Union and United Nations sources. Kristiana Powell also conducted over 40 field interviews in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; Khartoum, Sudan; and Bujumbura, Burundi between February and March 2005. In Addis Ababa, she interviewed senior AU officials, and western and African diplomats. Due to

political constraints, Kristiana was not able to travel to Darfur. Instead she interviewed Sudanese academics and civil society actors, including women's organizations, representatives of international humanitarian organizations, western diplomats, and AMIS military and political officers based in Khartoum. In Bujumbura, Kristiana met with Burundian civil society representatives, senior AMIB officials, senior ONUB officials and a representative from the Transitional Government of Burundi.

- Kristiana also interviewed a number of Canadian government officials in the Department of National Defence (DND), Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and Foreign Affairs Canada (FAC) between December 2004 and April 2005.
- The Working Paper was discussed at a **Policy Roundtable** co-hosted with CENAP, DPMF and South Africa's Institute for Security Studies (ISS) in Ottawa in May 2005. The Roundtable brought together officials from the Canadian government, as well as African, European and North American researchers. We decided to co-host this workshop in order to ensure that African perspectives were central to the event and the discussions, to raise the profile in Canada of our African partners and to set the groundwork for future collaboration.
- Drawing on the Working Paper and Roundtable discussions, NSI prepared a **Policy Brief** that developed more specific policy recommendations on how the Canadian government, the African Union and other members of the international community can help build a protection regime in Africa.
- At the **Project Development Workshop** attended by IDRC's Pamela Scholey and all core project partners we decided that these outputs will form the basis of multi-year policy research project developed in partnership with CENAP, DPMF and possibly a Sudanese research team with joint initiatives undertaken with the ISS and the UK Institute for Public Policy Research (ippr). We decided to work with ISS and ippr in order to avoid competing for funds for similar research, to draw on our comparative advantages and to enhance the impact of our research and policy engagement efforts.
- The Phase II proposal will be finalized in December 2005 based on a final round of face-to-face discussions in Mozambique in November 2005 and follow-on e-discussions. The full project proposal submitted in October 2005 original proposed research and policy engagement activities in both Burundi and Sudan. However, at the November 2005 project meeting in Mozambique, it became clear to all project partners and IDRC representatives that the Burundi element of the project is already well developed and needs to be fast tracked in order to take advantage of critical research and policy engagement opportunities. The Sudan and related regional elements constitute a critical policy research initiative but all project partners agree that we require an additional three to six months to identify appropriate Sudanese partners, to clarify our research questions and to identify key policy engagement moments in Sudan and regionally. Consequently, we have decided to temporarily de-link the Burundi and Sudan research elements with the intention of re-linking these initiatives in the future through comparative research agendas, joint events and possibly an integrated final publication.

- We are also exploring the option of linking both the Burundi- and the Sudan-focused research to an emerging cross-regional comparative study of SSR in Palestine, Sri Lanka and Afghanistan. This initiative would build on the partnerships NSI has forged through the “What Kind of Peace is Possible” project with the Palestinian Center for Policy and Survey Research, the Social Scientists’ Association in Sri Lanka as well as the International Peace Research Institute (PRIO) and the Chr. Michelsen Institute (CMI) in Norway.

Project outputs and dissemination:

Outputs:

1. Working Paper entitled “The African Union’s Peace and Security. This was published by NSI in May 2005 and was re-published by ISS as a Monograph in June 2005.

Self assessment: This was an innovative and well-written paper based on solid primary and secondary research. It was well-received by roundtable participants. In addition, a number of African security specialists have contacted the author directly to acknowledge its contribution to the field. However, NSI needs to develop a more timely and comprehensive dissemination strategy; indeed, the working paper reached a broad audience – particularly in Africa and Europe – only because it was published by ISS.

Lessons learned:

- 1) It may be very difficult to conduct primary research in Sudan due to obstacles imposed by the government. This experience has underscored the need to partner with appropriate Sudanese researchers.
- 2) In conducting primary research in Africa, it is critical for NSI to partner with African-based institutions in order to gain requisite access to key stakeholders and to navigate through unfamiliar research and interview environments.
- 3) The financial costs of doing research in the South are much higher than is generally assumed by Northern-based project partners. It became very clear to NSI that the costs facing our African research partners are higher than we had anticipated and that, in the future, NSI will need to ensure that our project budget and funding appeals adequately reflect this reality.

2. Policy Roundtable on Delivering on the Responsibility to Protect.

Self-assessment: This event was well-attended by African, European and North American civil society colleagues and Canadian government officials. However, we were disappointed that we were not able to secure AU participation or meaningful engagement from DND and some parts of CIDA.

Lessons learned:

- 1) Our CIDA commissioned work on gender equality and state fragility has provided us with a unique entry point into CIDA’s work on fragile states. We will need to continue to use and expand these opportunities for influence over the coming months and ensure that CIDA colleagues are aware of and interested in our

- emerging work on SSR in Africa. We may also need to piggy-back on FAC's efforts to engage DND on the R2P file in order to link our work to DND policy development in this area.
- 2) We need to find better ways of engaging the AU and securing buy-in early in the project research process. In our Phase II project we have asked DPMF to serve as the project's main anchor in Addis Ababa to ensure meaningful and consistent engagement with key AU officials. In addition, we plan to meet with AU officials early in the project process to discuss plans for the Burundi policy research and flag the emerging Sudan element of the project. We are also exploring the option of asking the AU to host or co-host the joint ippr/ISS/NSI/CENAP event on operationalizing The Responsibility to Protect.
 - 3) We have learned for future events to ask participants to come fully prepared (i.e. having read all draft papers and identified key issues) in order to focus most of our time and energy on policy discussion.

3. Project Development Workshop I, Ottawa

Self-assessment: This two-day workshop was extremely useful in charting out ways forward for collaborative work with ISS and ippr as well as a multi-year project between NSI-Clingendael-DPMF and CENAP. These two days provided an opportunity for partners to get to know each other, NSI and IDRC better and to begin to collectively design research that meets all partners' interests and comparative advantages.

Lessons learned: It is extremely helpful to have IDRC representatives participate in early stages of project development to provide intellectual guidance and help strengthen project partnerships.

4. Roundtable Report and Policy Brief

Self-assessment: The roundtable report captured the essence of the roundtable discussions and developed innovative policy recommendations. NSI is in the process of modestly tracking its impact. It is still unclear if the policy recommendations have had a meaningful impact on policy makers in Canada or at the African Union.

Lessons learned: In order to enhance the contribution of our policy research we need to involve policy-makers and practitioners at the national and regional level in developing the research and policy engagement plans early in the project development process. Phase II of the project tries to implement these findings by building in direct consultations with key stakeholders at early stages in the project development and research processes.

5. Phase II Project proposal development and project development workshop II in Mozambique.

Self-assessment: The proposal development process for Phase II of the project was conducted as transparently as possible while also allowing us to submit the proposal to IDRC and other funders in a timely and efficient manner. However, as became evident at

the Mozambique workshop there was some confusion/misunderstanding on the part of one partner of the direction of the research.

Lessons learned:

- 1) Collaborative proposal development is very time consuming. We need to be able to account for this when developing timelines for proposal development and submission to funders. Within these constraints, we need to try to get sign-off of the final version of the proposal from all project partners before submitting to funders.
- 2) Regular face-to-face meetings of all partners are invaluable, particularly at early stages in the project development process. This was also a key lesson from the WKOP project.

Capacity-building:

The project made a direct contribution to developing the research expertise and project management capacities of a junior researcher, (Kristiana Powell), and providing a principal researcher (Stephen Baranyi) with some (paid) time to accompany Kristiana and make invaluable intellectual contributions to the project design, key outputs and partnership building. The project has also established NSI as a key resource for research and policy on R2P in Africa.

The project may have also modestly contributed to building the research and policy engagement capacity of our African partners. For instance, the project may have facilitated networking and knowledge sharing opportunities for CENAP, DPMF and ACORD-Sudan. In addition, the project – particularly the policy roundtable - may have helped raise the profile in Canada of several of our African partners. Moreover, the project did enable NSI, CENAP and DPMF to develop a project proposal for Phase II research. One of the central objectives of the Phase II project is to strengthen the institutional capacity of all partner institutions to carry out expert research and to contribute to policy change in genuine partnerships with each other.

Project management:

The management of this project has run quite smoothly. This is due in part to the fact that NSI has a well functioning management and support structure and close to thirty years of experience in conducting and facilitating policy relevant research with southern partners. It is also due to the fact that the project funds were modest in comparison to other NSI projects. Moreover, the project itself was run principally by NSI with discrete tasks being undertaken by African partners. Phase II of the project will involve more significant funds and full partnership/joint governance with African partners. This is a more complex, albeit more rewarding and authentic, configuration. However, our WKOP project – a 1.2 million project involving 9 core partners – has helped sharpen our capacities to administer large quantities of resources and to manage relations with a

number of diverse partners in a fair and transparent manner. We feel we are well positioned to continue to operate this way throughout the life cycle of the phase II project.

Impact:

It may be too early to assess the impact of this project on policy-makers in Canada and Africa since the Working Paper and policy brief have only been in broad circulation for four months. NSI will continue to try to track these impacts in the coming months. However, it has been suggested by Foreign Affairs Canada that our recommendation to focus research on how R2P will actually be operationalized in an African context – particularly through the AU - has influenced the Human Security Program’s policy planning priorities for the next two years.

Overall assessment:

We feel strongly that this project has made a valuable contribution to advancing the R2P debate in Canada and Africa based on African priorities and to setting the groundwork for critical policy relevant research in Burundi and Sudan. With relatively limited resources (the total budget for the project was just over CAD 100,000) and a half-time commitment from NSI Researcher + partial time commitment on the part of NSI Principal Researcher we have managed over the past year:

- to strengthen relations or develop new relations with three key funders;
- to develop Canadian expertise on R2P in Africa;
- to produce and widely disseminate the only extensive assessment of the implementation of R2P in Burundi and Sudan;
- to conduct innovative primary research in these contexts;
- to produce policy recommendations for a range of stakeholders that privilege the voices of African stakeholders;
- to raise the profile of three African research centres in Canada;
- to build strong partnerships with three African research centres and one European research centre;
- to develop a project proposal for a multi-year follow-on research project in partnership with African research centres.

Recommendations:

We are particularly grateful to IDRC not only for their financial contribution to this project but also for their intellectual engagement throughout the project. Pamela Scholey provided helpful comments on a first draft of the project proposal and made invaluable contributions throughout the project life-cycle, including at the policy roundtable and at the two-day project development workshop held in June 2005. In addition both Pamela and Njeri Karuru of IDRC’s Nairobi office provided critical input throughout the Mozambique meetings and on several drafts of the SSR proposal. We have found this engagement extremely helpful and recommend that IDRC continue to provide this type of support for its funded projects.

