

**ENGAGING EFFECTIVELY
WITH INTEGRATED UN PRESENCES
A Technical Note for UNICEF Staff**

UNICEF EMOPS
Humanitarian Policy Section

December 2014

Executive Summary

The aim of this technical note is to support UNICEF Country Offices to engage effectively and strategically with integrated UN presences. Drawing on existing guidelines, policies, latest discussions/thinking and experiences, *it clarifies UNICEF's stance and approach in dealing with integrated presences, and provides practical pointers in identifying entry points, analysing risks and opportunities, putting in place mitigation measures, and determining the best options for UNICEF*. The technical note focuses on the issues and approaches relevant for UNICEF and should be used alongside the UN *Integrated Assessment and Planning Handbook*¹, which provides a step by step guide to implementation of IAP policy in general.

In 1997, the term 'integration', which refers to various efforts to achieve greater coherence across the UN system, formally entered the organization's priorities as part of the overall UN Reform agenda. It was also a main tenet of the so-called "Brahimi Report" (Report of the Panel on UN Peace Operations - 2000)² which aimed to improve the ability of the UN to deliver on its mandates according to the Charter as well as country specific mandates determined by the Security Council. In response to the "Brahimi Report", the UN undertook efforts to 'integrate' its military, development and humanitarian arms by establishing "integrated missions" in DRC and Haiti in 2004-2005. The "UNSG's Note of Guidance on Integrated Missions" was adopted and disseminated in February 2006, followed by a formal UN Policy on Integrated Missions, and Integrated Missions Planning Processes guidance (IMPP)³ in June 2006.

These initial steps were driven by a rigid notion of integration which was overly focussed on structures and on subsuming UN agencies⁴ into the authority structure of the peacekeeping mission. Because of this, the concept of UN integration was an uneasy one for agencies, in particular those with a humanitarian mandate who saw direct association of humanitarian agencies with peacekeeping missions, which are primarily political and military entities, as compromising humanitarian principles.

As a result of almost a decade of concrete experiences and lessons learned in implementing "integration" in diverse contexts (peacekeeping, political, peacebuilding and peace enforcement), the concept and approach has helpfully evolved towards a more flexible set of principles focusing on substance and strategic partnership to optimize the benefits of integration specifically for peace/state building aims while mitigating associated risks. A shift has also taken place in language to mark this: from a focus on "integrated UN missions" to the notion of "integrated UN presences." The focus is now on achieving a common strategic vision and investing – in a coordinated manner – the resources of the system towards its shared strategic aims. During the same period, an independent study was commissioned to consider the impact of "integration" for principled humanitarian action⁵. While there is recognition that UN Integration can present risks to humanitarian space, experience has shown that there are also positive effects of integration especially on the peace-building and development agenda, but also on humanitarian space⁶.

Accordingly, the 2008 Decision of the Secretary General on Integration and the 2013 Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning (IAP) define integration as a strategic partnership between the United Nations peacekeeping operation or special political mission/office and the United Nations Country Team based on a shared vision and common strategic objectives among all UN actors of the UN presence in a country. They reaffirm the principle of integration as a guiding principle in all applicable situations⁷ but give a central consideration to the risks associated with integration for the humanitarian community.

UNICEF's position is that it *fully supports strategic integration in all applicable contexts*. UNICEF agrees that there are *benefits stemming from strategic integration in terms of leveraging the UN's resources, fostering coherence between the various mandates of the organization*. It also recognizes that integration *provides significant opportunities to advocate on behalf of children, for the protection and promotion of their rights*.

Concerning structural integration, following the adoption of the new policy *UNICEF's approach to structural integration has been to analyse the country context and the mandate (or proposed mandate) of the mission, assess the*

¹ United Nations. 2013. *Integrated Assessment and Planning Handbook*.

² The report identified the absence of integrated planning for peacekeeping operations as a major vulnerability in the system.

³ Integrated Mission Planning Processes (IMPP, 2006) was superseded by Integrated Assessment and Planning (IAP) policy of 2013.

⁴ For the purpose of this document, UN agencies refers to United Nations Agencies, Funds and Programmes.

⁵ Metcalfe, Giffen and Elhawary, *UN Integration and Humanitarian Space*, Overseas Development Institute and Stimson Centre 2011. Integration Steering Group commissioned study. 2012.

⁶ Ibid.

⁷ The Secretary General's decision on Integration of 2008 specifies that the integration is the guiding principle in all situations where a multi-dimensional peacekeeping operation or a special political mission is deployed (or considered) alongside the United Nations Country Team (UNCT).

risks and weigh pros and cons of each option, before determining whether structural integration makes sense on a case by case basis. UNICEF will continue to advocate for a thorough risk analysis, as per IAP policy, to assess the risk posed by UN integration and structural integration. UNICEF advocates for mitigation measures to be put in place to protect humanitarian space.

To engage effectively with integrated presences in order to achieve results for children, UNICEF has identified key entry points both in terms of processes and thematic areas of work. This requires close coordination across CO/RO and HQ. UNICEF maintains expertise on working with integrated presences in its Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS) in New York and constantly documents lessons from engaging with integrated presences which it feeds back to COs. Given that many of the integration related processes are HQ-focussed, EMOPS (or PPD as appropriate depending on the country), represents UNICEF in country-specific discussions and ensures that CO-RO-HQ contribute to developing the organization's positions and information is circulated effectively. UNICEF Representatives, Programme and Operations Staff from COs, and colleagues from ROs and HQ Divisions are trained to participate in IAP processes both to represent the organization but also to speak on behalf of children's needs and rights, and to advocate for the preservation of humanitarian space and the achievement of key peacebuilding objectives.

A. UN Integration – background and policy framework

In recent years, peacekeeping operations have grown increasingly complex. While traditional peacekeeping involved primarily military functions of observing ceasefires and force separations following inter-state wars, modern 'multidimensional' peacekeeping missions often include substantial civilian components and tasks beyond traditional peacekeeping, such as facilitating the political process, 'good offices', protection of civilians, assisting in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, support in the organization of elections, protection and promotion of human rights and assisting in restoring the rule of law. This, at least partly, contributed to increasing calls for greater coherence across the UN system.

In 1997, the term 'integration', which refers to various efforts to achieve greater coherence across the UN system, formally entered the organization's priorities as part of the overall UN Reform agenda. It was also a main tenet of the so-called "Brahimi Report" (Report of the Panel on UN Peace Operations - 2000)⁸ which aimed to improve the ability of the UN to deliver on its mandates according to the Charter as well as country specific mandates determined by the Security Council. In response to the "Brahimi Report", the UN undertook efforts to 'integrate' its military, development and humanitarian arms by establishing "integrated missions" in DRC and Haiti in 2004-2005. The "UNSG's Note of Guidance on Integrated Missions" was adopted and disseminated in February 2006, followed by a formal UN Policy on Integrated Missions, and Integrated Missions Planning Processes guidance (IMPP)⁹ in June 2006.

The concept has evolved into a *formal policy aimed at "maximis[ing] the individual and collective impact of the UN's response, concentrating on those activities required to consolidate peace"* (SG's Decision 2008/24), and is applicable to all conflict and post-conflict settings where the UN has a Country Team and a multi-dimensional peacekeeping operation or political mission/office.

The SG's 2008 decision¹⁰ marked a significant shift from the previous notion of 'integration' and clarified a point which had been ambiguous thus far, namely the fact that *the focus is to be placed on strategic integration, whereas various structural integration arrangements may be put in place in a given context based on the "form follows function" approach.* It sets out minimum standards for integration, in order to achieve an effective strategic partnership between the mission and the UNCT. These include the development of shared objectives, closely aligned planning and results, and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation, typically referred to as 'strategic integration.'

Further, in 2013 the Secretary General approved the UN Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning (IAP), to guide overall planning processes for Integrated UN Presences. The policy builds on the 2008 decision and underlines *the importance of risk analysis, in particular the impact of UN integration on humanitarian space, in determining the structure of UN presence.*

B. Defining UN Integration and UN Integrated Presence¹¹

⁸ The report identified the absence of integrated planning for peacekeeping operations as a major vulnerability in the system.

⁹ Integrated Mission Planning Processes (IMPP, 2006) was superseded by Integrated Assessment and Planning (IAP) policy of 2013.

¹⁰ The policy was informed by setbacks in the early application of "integration", including the case of Somalia in 2006-2007 when efforts to impose "structural integration" were met with resistance by humanitarian actors who felt that this would undermine the affected population's ability to receive assistance as needed, and the cases of Haiti and Sudan where it was felt that the system over-invested in setting up structurally integrated units to the detriment of effectiveness in achieving results.

¹¹ Definitions are based on IAP Policy of 2013 unless otherwise stated.

The SG's 2008 decision defines **integration** as a *strategic partnership between the United Nations peacekeeping operation or special political mission/office and the United Nations Country Team based on a shared vision and common strategic objectives among all UN actors of the UN presence in a country*. An integrated presence entails the following key elements:

- a shared vision of the UN's strategic objectives;
- closely aligned or integrated planning;
- a set of agreed results, timelines and responsibilities for the delivery of tasks critical to consolidating peace; and
- agreed mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation.

Integrated UN presence is a term that refers to the configuration of the UN system in all conflict and post-conflict situations where the UN has a country team and a multi-dimensional peacekeeping operation¹² or special political mission/office¹³. An integrated UN Presence is led by a Head of Mission, typically designated as the Special Representative of the Secretary-General (SRSG)¹⁴, the most senior UN official in the country.

While mandatory in all applicable settings, the principle of integration *does not imply any specific structure or form but merely means a strategic partnership between the mission and the UNCT in a given country. The depth and form of the integration should be determined based on the risk assessment and specific context of each country/area.*

The 2013 *Integrated Assessment and Planning Policy (IAP)* explicitly states that “the structural configuration of the UN integrated presence should reflect specific requirements, circumstances, and mandates, and can therefore take different forms. [...] Decisions on modalities for working together in integrated settings, which may include integrated or joint structures [...] should be based on criteria of expected impact, transaction costs, and assessment of risks”.¹⁵

‘Structural’ integration refers to instances where the senior leader of the UNCT, the Resident Coordinator and/or Humanitarian Coordinator, is also designated as the Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary General (DSRSG) and is directly placed within the mission. This configuration is also referred to as “triple (or double)-hatting”.^{16, 17} While other ‘integration’ arrangements are possible, including an integrated office, a joint technical cell (ex. DDR), or co-location, the so called double (DSRSG/RC)/ triple (DSRSG/RC/HC) hatting is the only element that denotes ‘structural’ integration as a commonly accepted definition.

Structural integration is by no means the rule, and may be avoided where the risk for humanitarian space is considered to be high. It is important to note that further options of integrated arrangements, which are optional and can be determined at the country level, can also have significant impact especially on humanitarian operations. Arrangements such as co-location, use of UN logo, mission assets, military escorts, joint communication, may be more visible, thus affecting perception on the ground, and have more implications for humanitarian action, than a triple hatted DSRSG/RC/HC him/herself, and need to be determined based on careful risk assessment.

C. Integration and Humanitarian Space

The 2008 SG's Decision sought to address concerns about the potential impact of integration on humanitarian space, specifying that structural arrangements “should take full account of recognized humanitarian principles, allow for the protection of humanitarian space, and facilitate effective humanitarian coordination with all humanitarian actors”, while at the same time acknowledging that “integration can also yield significant benefits for humanitarian operations”. In other words, the policy recognizes that tensions can emerge between the UN's responsibilities in humanitarian action and its support to peacekeeping and peacebuilding, and that these tensions need to be managed. Accordingly, the decision emphasised *the need for flexibility in country-level structural arrangements, according to the principle of ‘form follows function’*.

¹² A *multi-dimensional peacekeeping operation* is a peacekeeping mission comprising a mix of military, police and substantive civilian components working together to implement a mandate from the Security Council (IAP Policy 2013).

¹³ Special Political Mission (SPM) is defined as a “political mission or office implementing a mandate from the Security Council or General Assembly.” For the purpose of this policy, SPMs do not include non-resident envoys and advisers; panels, monitoring groups and similar expert bodies; or regional offices (SPMs with regional mandates covering multiple countries).

¹⁴ Less frequently, Heads of Mission may be called Executive Representative of the Secretary-General (ERSG) or Special Coordinator.

¹⁵ Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning, endorsed by the Secretary-General 9 April 2013.

¹⁶ In cases where the Resident Coordinator is appointed as the Head of Mission, s/he becomes Executive Representative of the Secretary-General (ERSG) and heads both the mission and Country Team.

¹⁷ First defined in UN Integrated Missions Planning Processes (IMPP) of 2009, and commonly accepted now.

In 2011, the Integration Steering Group commissioned a study on the impact of integration on humanitarian space. The study found that integration has had both positive and negative effects on humanitarian space, and that greater efforts were needed to ensure that the context determines the design of integration arrangements. The study recommended that a comprehensive and inclusive risk analysis inform decisions around structure, with integration being avoided in “high-risk environments”.

In line with these recommendations, the 2013 revision of the integrated mission planning process policy (now called the Integrated Assessment and Planning policy - IAP) explicitly states that “*the structural configuration of the UN integrated presence should reflect specific requirements, circumstances, and mandates, and can therefore take different forms. ... Decisions on modalities for working together in integrated settings, which may include integrated or joint structures ... should be based on criteria of expected impact, transaction costs, and assessment of risks*”.¹⁸

Although the ISG-commissioned study did not define “high-risk environments”, it is generally understood that the greatest risks are posed in contexts where (a) the UN or another international force is engaged in or supporting active combat operations, or is otherwise at risk of being perceived as a party to the conflict, and (b) where the UN’s credibility and neutrality are seriously questioned by important stakeholders. While this definition has been discussed in particular in the context of the IASC, it is not a matter of policy and is not contained in the IAP. In the IAP, the notion of “high-risk environments” is maintained, with a recognition that in such settings additional efforts must be made to assess risks to humanitarian space stemming from integration.

In more permissive environments, however, structural integration can help leverage the considerable resources of a mission for the benefit of children. Objectives such as post conflict state-building, peacebuilding and the UN’s development agenda are widely understood to have been well-served both by strategic and structural integration¹⁹. There have been of course debates on roles and responsibilities and accountabilities across the system, but a unified strategy and decision-making structure when it comes to engaging with transitional or nascent authorities on post-conflict reconstruction has been seen as beneficial in terms of UN system effectiveness and coherence. This was one of the main findings of the 2009 SG’s Report on Peacebuilding in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict.

While each integrated presence setup requires its own assessment, in general special political missions, also referred to as peacebuilding missions (as compared to peacekeeping missions), that are deployed in relatively stable countries without military components are less likely to present challenges for humanitarian agencies in regard to (perceived) neutrality of humanitarian actors and humanitarian space.²⁰

D. UNICEF’s Approach to Structural Integration

Integration applies to the whole UN system and *UNICEF fully supports strategic integration in all applicable contexts.* UNICEF agrees that there are *benefits stemming from strategic integration in terms of leveraging the UN’s resources, fostering coherence between the various mandates of the organization.* It also recognizes that integration provides *significant opportunities to advocate on behalf of children, for the protection and promotion of their rights.*

Concerning structural integration, following the adoption of the new policy which gives central consideration to the risks posed to humanitarian space by integration yet recognizes the benefits of integration of state and peacebuilding aims, *UNICEF’s approach to structural integration has been to analyse the country context and the mandate (or proposed mandate) of the mission, assess the risks and weight pros and cons of each option, before determining whether structural integration makes sense.* UNICEF will continue to advocate for a thorough risk analysis, as per IAP policy, to assess the risk posed by UN integration and structural integration. While carefully examining the benefits and risks of structural integration, it is equally crucial to consider and put in place mitigation measures to protect humanitarian space. UNICEF expresses its position on structural integration in a given context and advocates for it in consultation with other Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) members.

Potential *benefits* of structural integration include:

¹⁸ Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning, endorsed by the Secretary-General 9 April 2013.

¹⁹ HPG, 2011. UN Integration and Humanitarian Space-An Independent Study Commissioned by UN Integrated Steering Group.

²⁰ The main difference between these two broad types of missions involves the role of a UN military or police force: while peacekeeping missions involve a significant security component, political missions rely heavily, if not exclusively, on civilian components. The former is usually directed by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) of the Secretariat, while the latter by the Department of Political Affairs (DPA).

- Advocacy. Designating the RC/HC as Deputy SRSG provides preferential access to the SRSG, allowing better leveraging of this function to advocate with high-level counterparts on a variety of development, humanitarian, and human rights issues.
- Influence. Having the RC/HC embedded within the senior management of the mission provides an opportunity to influence decision-making, in particular with senior government officials, including on political and security questions that have a direct impact on the UNCT. It can also allow UNICEF to position children's issues more strategically.
- Access. The humanitarian space study found that in several countries, the DSRSG/RC/HC function was crucial in facilitating access of UN agencies and NGO partners to mission logistical and air assets, thereby improving access to populations in need.
- Coherence. Situating certain mission portfolios under the management of the DSRSG/RC/HC, such as child protection, sexual violence, and civil affairs, can facilitate coordination and coherence between the mission and agencies working in these areas.
- Information flow. Having an integrated office with both mission and UNCT staff can facilitate information flow between the mission and the UNCT, allowing for better coordination.

Potential *risks* associated with structural integration include:

- Security and Access. In certain environments, highly visible integration arrangements may compound perceptions that UN humanitarian actors are aligned with the political or peacekeeping mission, which can increase security risks and restrict humanitarian access.
- Advocacy. Maintaining a distinct humanitarian voice within an integrated UN presence can be challenging, particularly where the HC is also Deputy SRSG.
- Balancing the RC/HC function with the DSRSG function. The RC, HC, and Deputy SRSG functions each represent large and important portfolios, which can be cumbersome for a single individual to manage effectively. In some contexts, it is felt that one or more of these portfolios suffers from reduced attention – typically the RC or HC function.
- Politicization of aid. Should tensions arise between the humanitarian and development objectives of the UNCT and the political and security objectives of the mission, an RC/HC who reports directly to the SRSG may find it more difficult to champion humanitarian and development issues. In such cases, there is a risk that decisions around humanitarian and development assistance are taken according to political imperatives rather than on the basis of needs and rights.
- Relations with NGOs. Many humanitarian NGOs are suspicious of structural integration, particularly in highly politicised contexts (e.g. Somalia, Afghanistan). In these contexts, the DSRSG/RC/HC may not be perceived as sufficiently neutral to credibly lead the wider humanitarian community, weakening humanitarian coordination.

In cases where a structurally integrated mission has already been established, as well as in instances where a new mission is being set up and the decision is to go with structural integration, there are a number of *mitigation measures* UNICEF can suggest to help safeguard humanitarian space. These include:

- Advocating for candidates for DSRSG/RC/HC to have a strong humanitarian background.
- Advocating for separate support structures for the different hats assumed by the DSRSG/RC/HC rather than an Integrated Office.
- Developing coordinated strategies with the mission around access, protection, and advocacy (the latter to include space for separate advocacy by the humanitarian community).
- Encouraging strong dialogue between the mission and humanitarian actors.
- Engaging the local population to explain the distinct mandate of humanitarian assistance, and reinforce humanitarian principles.

- Agreeing within the HCT on a set of principles governing the use of mission assets, shared premises, and other common services.
- Developing agreed protocols for humanitarian engagement with non-state entities.
- Adhering to humanitarian principles in the delivery of assistance, and promoting UNICEF's image as a principled humanitarian actor.
- Making sure that UNICEF programmes are conflict-sensitive and 'do no harm', including in political and security terms.

E. Entry points and key considerations for UNICEF engagement

Integrated Assessment and Planning (IAP) Processes

The IAP offers several fora and mechanisms that are designed to reflect the views of all UN entities concerned, including UNICEF, on planning for integrated presences. The Office of Emergency Programmes (EMOPS) in New York has in-house expertise on integration and takes part in system wide development of tools and policies in this area. It constantly documents lessons from engaging with integrated presences which it feeds back to COs. Given that many of the integration related processes are HQ-focussed, EMOPS (or PPD as appropriate depending on the country), represents UNICEF in country-specific discussions and ensures that CO-RO-HQ contribute to developing organization positions and information is circulated effectively. In particular, *engagements are critical in:*

- Integration Working Group and Integration Steering Group. The Integration Working Group develops policies in relation to integration issues and supports implementation from a technical level. UNICEF is a member (EMOPS/HPS)
- Integrated Task Force (ITF). The ITF is the HQ-level inter-agency/inter-departmental coordination body responsible for overseeing implementation of IAP in a specific country with an integrated UN presence. UNICEF is a member (EMOPS/FSS/Desk Officer).
- Integrated Strategic Assessment. Bringing UN political, security, development, humanitarian and human rights entities together, it aims to develop a shared understanding of a conflict or post-conflict situation and core peace consolidation priorities.

The analysis and recommendations of the Strategic Assessment form a basis of recommendations on the nature and (re) configuration of UN engagement for the consideration of the SG and Security Council when required. UNICEF engagement/participation at HQ and country level are crucial, to ensure humanitarian, protection and other concerns are reflected.

- The Directives to the SRSG, RC and HC. This document is developed by the lead department via the ITF to ensure shared understanding and application of the Security Council mandate.
- Mission Concept and Mission Structure. These are mission internal documents/processes. However, they are usually developed in consultation with the ITF and UNICEF/UN Agencies' engagement is crucial to maximize the impact of the mandate areas relevant to UNICEF/UNCT, including decisions on placement/configuration of Human Rights/Protection capacity, as well as the DSRSG/RC/HC's purview.
- Integrated Strategic Framework (ISF). Country level framework on agreed strategic priorities for shared peacebuilding/peace consolidation priorities.

Other Engagement Opportunities

- SG's country specific reports. SG reports may also inform Security Council Resolutions and are an important opportunity to reflect UNICEF/UNCT positions to influence Security Council decisions on key issues such

as humanitarian space, security, PoC, Child Protection, and mission transition. UNICEF has an opportunity as part of the UNCT and Integrated Task Forces (through EMOPS/HFSS) to input text on humanitarian, child protection and other issues and recommendations in the SG's report.

- Annual Reports of the SG on Protection of Civilians.²¹ UNICEF (EMOPS/HPS) is a member of the headquarters inter-agency working group on POC, which reviews the report.
- Security Council Resolutions. UNICEF is able to advocate directly with Member States for the inclusion of certain child protection provisions within Security Council Resolutions. It is important to note that resolutions are also informed by SG reports and their recommendations and the briefing for the informal experts group on POC.
- Security Council Informal Expert Group on Protection of Civilians. The informal expert group is an opportunity for the UN system to brief the Security Council prior to the renewal of mission mandates. As a member of the inter-agency working group on POC, UNICEF contributes to the preparation of the briefing paper, which is consolidated and presented by OCHA. The process for submitting information to the briefing is often done in country, frequently through the protection cluster, and through the inter-agency working group. UNICEF also attends the POC briefings to answer questions raised by Member States.
- Strategy for Protection of Civilians. SCR 1894 requires all UN peacekeeping missions to develop, in collaboration with the UNCT and relevant humanitarian actors, a **strategy for Protection of Civilians**. UNICEF CO should participate in the elaboration of these strategies with support from HQ as/if required, and ensure that child protection concerns are fully taken into account.

Programmatic Entry Points

Areas of strategic collaboration between UNICEF and a peacekeeping or political mission must be defined based on country context. It is crucial for UNICEF at the country level to understand the mission's mandate and assess the challenges and opportunities it presents. These challenges and opportunities are likely to be significantly different in conflict and post-conflict environments, primarily (though not exclusively) due to the importance of preserving humanitarian space in volatile conflict environments. UNICEF should assess how, through strategic engagement, the additional resources and technical expertise of a mission can support the agenda for children.

Several components within the mission also present potential entry points to advance programmatic goals for children and to possibly collaborate in the pursuit of common objectives: child protection, the Mission's Code of Conduct (sexual exploitation and abuse), UN Police or Rule of Law (juvenile justice), Human Rights (juvenile/transitional justice), Demobilisation, Disarmament and Reintegration (DDR) (reintegration of children associated with armed forces and groups), Civil Affairs (peace education and reconciliation initiatives) and Restoration of State Authorities (delivery of essential services). In areas where there is a particularly close linkage between UNICEF and the mission (e.g. child protection), it is important to clarify roles and responsibilities at the outset, including through instruments described above, such as the ISF.

F. Recognizing and Resolving Tension Points

There are a number of areas where tensions exist (or are increasing) between the UNCT/HCT and the mission, which need to be addressed. Some of them directly or indirectly pose threats to the humanitarian space in integration settings. Others are caused by an insufficient understanding of delineation of the roles between humanitarian and military/political actors. This is particularly pronounced in complex humanitarian settings. Below are some areas where tensions have been experienced (and addressed) recently:

²¹ Non-Paper on Protecting Human Rights in Armed Conflict – UNICEF Engagement with the Protection of Civilians Agenda (January 2014) provides detailed UNICEF position on PoC engagement, including in relation to the mission.

- Increasingly robust mandates²² of peacekeeping missions in recent years (notably the Force Intervention Brigade²³ of MONUSCO in DRC).
- UN peacekeeping missions' support to the government perceived as taking sides (the recent South Sudan example).
- The increasing Protection of Civilians mandate²⁴ given to UN peacekeeping missions. While this can be an opportunity for closer work on POC, it is important to understand a specific mission's mandate, and the fact that having a PoC mandate does not put the mission in the lead or mean that it should be active on all aspects of PoC.
- Increasing use (and authorization) of military actions by missions in relation to PoC mandates.
- Increasing role of the mission in support of humanitarian action – while missions are increasingly given mandates to support humanitarian actions, it is crucial to remember that the mission remains a political and military actor, with a role to facilitate delivery of humanitarian aid when needed (mainly logistics and security) but by no means becoming a humanitarian actor²⁵. Use of military/mission assets (including 'good offices') for humanitarian action should be considered only as the last resort, and on a request basis where all other efforts fail²⁶.

UNICEF's priorities are not always fully aligned with those of the mission, and in some cases may even come into friction with mission priorities, particularly in a highly politicized environment. Potential areas of friction include the handling of the release of children from armed forces and groups, humanitarian negotiations with non-state actors, the use of military escorts, humanitarian advocacy, humanitarian space, as well as the division of labour between UNICEF and mission sections.

Integration is a partnership. *Ongoing engagement and dialogue with the mission will always be the most effective means of overcoming challenges.* Some differences can be resolved by simply promoting a better understanding within the mission of UNICEF's mandate, operating culture, and the situation of children. UNICEF, working with the rest of the UNCT, should utilize the Strategic Policy Group, where it exists, to raise difficult issues.

Issues that prove to be too controversial and sensitive to resolve at the country level should be referred to Headquarters. Peacekeeping and political missions remain highly centralized management structures, and major decisions relevant to integration are made at HQ level. UNICEF at HQ level can advocate for country office positions both informally and formally through the ITF and, if necessary, the Secretary-General's Policy Committee. EMOPS is the focal point for support on integration issues.

For further information on Integrated Presences contact EMOPS/Humanitarian Policy Section:

Genevieve Boutin, Chief Humanitarian Policy Section
gboutin@unicef.org

Naoko Akiyama, Humanitarian Policy Specialist
nakiyama@unicef.org

²² "Robust" mandates refers to authorization by the Security Council for peacekeeping operations to proactively use force in defense of their mandates (examples of missions in DRC, Mali and South Sudan), rather than passive use in self-defense.

²³ Established by SC Res.2098 in March 2013, the force intervention brigade is authorized to carry out offensive operation to "neutralise armed groups" that pose threat to state authority and civilian security, the first such UN entity in half a century.

²⁴ For detailed discussion on Protection of Civilians, see "Non-Paper on Protecting Human Rights in Armed Conflicts – UNICEF engagement with the protection of civilians' agenda", January 2014.

²⁵ For the same reason, missions' QIPS (Quick Impact Projects), while may appear similar, is aimed at facilitating implementation of missions' mandate, thus fundamentally differ from humanitarian assistance based on humanitarian principles. DPKO's Policy on QIPS (2013) clearly states that QIPS should be designed in consultation with humanitarian and development actors in a manner that it does *not to duplicate or interfere with humanitarian or development interventions.*

²⁶ For details see Guidelines on the Use of Military and Civil Defense Assets to Support United Nations Humanitarian Activities in Complex Emergencies. March 2003; IASC Non-Binding Guidelines on the Use of Armed Escorts for Humanitarian Convoys. February 2013.

ANNEX A Glossary of Terms

Integrated Mission: The term that was used for UN configuration in countries/areas where a multi-dimensional peacekeeping mission or special political mission coexisted with a UNCT. The term has fallen out of favour. Since 2008, the term has been replaced by Integrated Presence in all policies/guidelines.

Integrated UN Presence: Integrated UN presence is a generic term for any situation in which a multi-dimensional peacekeeping or special political mission exists alongside a UNCT. The term does not imply any specific structure. An integrated UN presence is usually led by the Special Representative of the Secretary General, who is also the head of the mission in the country/geographic area.

Structurally integrated UN Presence: A structurally integrated presence is a peacekeeping or political mission that is structurally joined to the UNCT through a triple-hatted DSRSG/RC/HC. This term is now used instead of the less precise term ‘integrated mission’.

Integrated Missions Planning Process (IMPP): The policy framework which governed the planning of peacekeeping or political missions. Replaced by the Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning (2013).

Integrated Strategic Framework (ISF): A planning tool endorsed by the ISG that is meant to tie together existing UNCT and mission planning frameworks such as UNDAF, Mission Implementation Plan, etc. ISFs should build upon Strategic Assessments.

Integration Working Group: Formerly IMPP working group. Overseen by ISG, responsible for developing policies on integration. UNICEF is a member of the working group.

Integration Steering Group (ISG): USG/ASG level body established at the end of 2008 to oversee integration policy. UNICEF is a member and represented at DED level.

Integrated (Mission) Task Force (ITF/IMTF): The inter-agency/inter-departmental body coordinating the planning process of an integrated presence in a given country/geographical area. An ITF is established for every integrated UN presence. UNICEF is a member. Led by DPKO (for peacekeeping missions) or DPA (for special political missions). Previously, depending on the lead department, the task force was called either IMTF for peacekeeping missions led by Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) or ITF for peacebuilding/special political missions led by Department of Political Affairs (DPA). New policy standardized the task force name to ITF.

The **Mission Concept** is developed on the basis of the Security Council mandate and provides political and operational direction, timelines and activities for the mission. It is developed by the lead department (DPKO or DPA) in consultation with the ITF. Individual mission components (police, judiciary, etc.) also produce their own concepts of operation (CONOPS). Unlike Directives or the ISF, the mission concept is a mission’s internal document. However, it should be in line with the ISF and Directives of the SG, and in practice it has been consulted with the ITF. Mission concepts can be relevant to UNICEF insofar as they involve areas of mutual concern (e.g. rule of law, DDR).

The **Results Based Budget** is developed by the lead department in collaboration with the Department of Field Support (DFS). The budget should reflect how mission and UNCT resources complement each other and/or can jointly support interventions. UNICEF should be involved in discussions on the budget both at HQ and field levels to promote transparency and coordination between mission budgets and UNCT programmes.

Robust Mandate/Chapter VII: Often used in conjunction or inter-changeably in relation to a peacekeeping mission’s mandate. May have significant implications for perception of UN neutrality and thereby for humanitarian operations.

“**Robust**” mandates refers to authorization by the Security Council to “use all necessary means” to deter forceful attempts to disrupt the political process, protect civilians under imminent threat of physical attack, and/or assist the national authorities in maintaining law and order (examples are missions in DRC, Mali and more recently in South Sudan.)

Chapter VII refers to section of the UN Charter on “Action with Respect to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression” that gives the basis for the Security Council to authorise use of force, either by a UN peacekeeping operation or by member states. The Security Council has adopted the practice of invoking Chapter VII of the Charter when authorizing the deployment of United Nations peacekeeping operations with robust mandates into volatile post-conflict settings where the State is unable to maintain security and public order.

Strategic Assessment (SA): A new assessment tool endorsed by the ISG to analyse a crisis and propose strategic objectives for the entire UN system in a given country. Strategic Assessments are led by HQ-based integrated task forces (see above). A strategic assessment consists of a conflict analysis, a mapping of existing capacities in the UN system to address conflict factors, and a set of shared strategic objectives for consolidating peace in a country. Strategic Assessments, once finalized, are endorsed by the Policy Committee. Only two have been done so far (Somalia and CAR). Strategic Assessments should feed into ISFs (see below).

Technical Assessment Mission (TAM): Similar to a Strategic Assessment, but generally pitched at a more operational level. TAMs are also conducted by HQ integrated task forces. TAM recommendations are often, though not always, endorsed by the Policy Committee.

ANNEX B

Selected Guidelines and References

Decision No. 2008/24 – Integration. Decision of the Secretary-General-25 June Meeting of the Policy Committee.

The decision marked the shift in thinking about “integrated” presences, taking into consideration concerns of and implications of UN integration for humanitarian action.

Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning (IAP). Approved by the Secretary-General on 9 April 2013.

IAP policy guides all assessment and planning processes of integrated UN presences. IAP supersedes the Guidelines on the Integrated Mission Planning Process (IMPP).

Integrated Assessment and Planning Handbook (December 2013)

Inter-agency technical guidelines for implementation of the Policy on Integrated Assessment and Planning.

Policy on UN Transitions in the Context of Mission Drawdown or Withdrawal. Endorsed by the Secretary-General on 4 February 2013 following endorsement by Integration Steering Group.

Raises key issues in mission withdrawal/transition such as remaining capacities and resources, and calls for forward looking planning which should include exit/transition strategies and consideration for capacity building for the government and UNCT as/if required.

Limited guidance on UNCT strategic decision-making on priorities and what to take on, in order to manage assumptions that UNCT is responsible for taking over (if resources are available).

DPKO. Policy - Mainstreaming the protection, rights and well-being of children affected by armed conflict within UN Peacekeeping (June 2009).

DPKO policy on engagement on children and armed conflict. Spells out missions’ role in MRM, the role of Child Protection Advisers etc. UNICEF child protection staff should be familiar with the policy.

Human Rights Due Diligence Policy on UN Support to non-UN security forces (HRDDP)

Spells out UN due diligence policy in engaging (or not engaging) with non-UN security forces that do not comply with international humanitarian, human rights and refugee laws, restricting support to such entities. The policy exempts from its provisions activities such as training/sensitization and standard setting/capacity support to implement and promote compliance with humanitarian, human rights and refugee laws as well as negotiations for humanitarian access and relief operations (in other words typical child protection and humanitarian activities in which UNICEF engages with such entities).

Non-paper on Protecting Human Rights in Armed Conflict – UNICEF Engagement with the Protection of Civilians Agenda (January 2014)

Discusses UNICEF engagement in the Protection of Civilians agenda for the benefit of children, including some of the critical issues relevant to integrated UN presences.

UN integration and humanitarian space: building a framework for flexibility. IASC Paper (2013)

Summarises IASC position and issues on UN integration and humanitarian space.

UN integration and humanitarian space – An Independent Study Commissioned by the UN Integration Steering Group. December 2011. Victoria Metcalf et al. (Humanitarian Policy Group and STIMSON).

The review summarizes issues of implementation of UN integration policy on the ground – many stemming from insufficient understanding of the policy designed to accommodate humanitarian concerns. Although it was done before the IAP was adopted, most observations remain valid today.