**Letter By Executive Board**

Welcome to the United Nations Security Council being simulated at AVK Model United Nations conference 2021, where we shall be discussing the agenda ‘Improving effectiveness in Peacekeeping Missions’.

The success of the United Nations Security Council as a committee will depend on each delegate. A council is defined by its delegates more than by its executive board. It is you, the participating delegates, which shape the outcome. You must therefore be prepared to participate in a truly rewarding experience. Apart from the research on the agenda, Delegates should be aware of their country’s historical background and current situation in global politics and international relations. Delegates should come into the committee with a clear foreign policy and the representatives of the governments of their countries.

We are unaware of your credentials/experience with Model United Nations however, no matter what that may amount to, it is a given that there can be no productive simulation in the absence of substantial research. There are multiple approaches to preparing for a simulation such as this and we shall not dictate to you which of these you must adopt, that is upon you to decide, however, we can assert with confidence that the commonality among all these approaches is that research constitutes their first step.

So once the research process is initiated it needs to be coupled with proactive attempts to understand. Application of the information acquired through research always requires understanding. There is no particular point at which research concludes and analysis thereof begins, these are two intermittent processes that may continue till the last minute of the simulation.

Besides research, both on the agenda and the mandate of the committee the participants are required to have a firm grasp on diplomatic conduct. Diplomatic conduct can be general and country-specific, what constitutes general diplomatic conduct (which includes language, gestures, and any other kind of expression) can be gauged from the definition of the term diplomacy. There is no precise definition of the term but an appraisal of various definitions shall help formulate a reasonably accurate notion thereof.

Country-specific diplomatic conduct can be determined by a study of past actions of your country (country allotted which a participant is called the delegate of) in the international fora. Speeches, statements, voting records, instances of walk-outs, boycotting of meetings et cetera can contribute to building an understanding of the same, apart from these sources, video graphic recordings of these sessions and meetings can greatly help this understanding. It is expected of all participants to conduct themselves impeccably, the concept of MUN’s wasn't created simply to get to students to talk about things diplomats would usually talk about, but to also hone their conduct, their reasoning, logic, negotiation, and lobbying skills, all of which can be referred to as ‘soft skills. Diplomatic conduct harmoniously links speech and body language, it is a bridge between verbal and nonverbal communication thereby making it an important criterion for us to assess your performance and effectiveness. Manipulation of procedure of the committee to gain extra floor time or to stall the statement/ comment/speech of another delegate or to cause disruption therein shall not be tolerated. To ensure that procedure is not misused, delegates must be aware of the procedure of the UNSC.

Having stated the above, it is now prudent to explain the purpose and nature of the background guide summarily. The background guide is a preliminary research brief about the committee and the agenda. It is NOT meant to provide participants with exhaustive information. The primary purpose of a background guide is to ensure that all participants are at a level playing field, thus it ensures that every participant possesses a modicum of information from which further information can be drawn. It serves as a base upon which the research is built. Nothing in the background guide has any evidentiary value, it can never be used as conclusive proof in the committee. Delegates must dig deeper from where the background guide leaves them.

Research may commence well before the background guide is released, delegates are free to read up on the agenda which has been made public and formulate a structure of research. Your structure doesn’t have to matchper cent the one that the background guide presents as long as you have a solid understanding of what you are going to be discussing in the committee.

That being said, we wish you the best of preparations and hope that this simulation shall mutually benefit all those involved in it. We hope we can learn from you and impart our knowledge to you in the process. For any doubts that you may have, you may contact any member of the executive board. The email address of your committee president will be given in this guide.

Looking forward to seeing you all.

Regards

**Sourish Bhardwaj**

**President**

[**sharmadev988@gmail.com**](mailto:sharmadev988@gmail.com) **+91 9773914381**

**1.Effectiveness of Peacekeeping Operations**

**FOR**

● Peacekeeping has been one of the main conflict management tools used by the international community to restore or safeguard peace and security. Since 1948, the United Nations has established 70 peace operations and has substantially evolved, adopting approaches to peace that extend beyond purely military concerns. Indeed, the promises of peacekeeping as an effective instrument of conflict reduction may, to some extent, explain the evolution toward multidimensional missions and the unprecedented number of peacekeepers deployed in the last decade. As consequence, the growing importance of peacekeeping effectiveness has sparked a new wave of research that empirically investigates whether and under which conditions UN peacekeeping works.

● Peacekeepers are mostly deployed in conflict or post-conflict environments where violence is either ongoing or lingering. Thus, violence remains a priority for peace missions. Consequently, peacekeeping is deemed successful or effective according to whether it curbs conflict in several dimensions. Effective missions are those responsible for decreasing the intensity of battle violence, protecting civilians, and containing conflict diffusion and recurrence in the postwar phase. Each mission, however, is deployed in different contexts and operates under variable conditions that affect the operation’s capacity to influence conflict. Concerning mission features, peacekeeping success is more likely when large contingents are deployed under robust mandates. Mission type, size, and composition signal credible commitment from the international community and empower peacekeepers to halt violence while guaranteeing the implementation of peace agreements. These nuanced understandings of peacekeeping stem from the availability of new data on both conflict and peace operations at the national and subnational levels of analysis. Moreover, the empirical study of the effectiveness of peace operations has recently been flanked by simulation-based forecasting, field experiments, and surveys investigating local-level outcomes of peace missions.

**AGAINST**

● Unsurprisingly, the focus on violence and conflict outcomes as indicators of success is debatable. First, in dealing with violence, peacekeeping operations produce spillover effects that are largely neglected, such as refugee flows and terrorist violence. Second, given the wide range of functions performed by UN peacekeepers, including electoral assistance, economic reconstruction, and state-building, it is reasonable to include these aspects when defining effectiveness. Third, and relatedly, no assessment of short- versus long-term implications of peacekeeping for political, social, and economic development in the host country has been forthcoming. While reducing infant mortality, inequality, and crime are not necessarily tasks for peacekeepers, it is vital to study whether and how UN missions may have shaped the quality of peace in host countries.

● Former UN under-secretary-general Jean-Marie Guéhenno points out that UN operations don’t have the level of integration or command structure to function as armed forces capable of counterinsurgency operations. Instead, peacekeepers are too often sitting ducks in ferocious, unwinnable civil wars. The organization’s largest peacekeeping operation in the Congo has hardly accomplished anything, as observers regularly unearth mass graves without any real ability to stop the perpetrators. The “tourists on helicopters” have been repeatedly unresponsive to calls for help from distressed villagers, even when peacekeepers were only a few miles away.

● In the Congo, hundreds of civilians have documented sexual abuse complaints against the UN force entrusted to protect them. Fourteen-year-old girls in UN-guarded camps should not have to fear being violated by “peacekeepers.” And Congo is hardly the only place that’s been victimized by predators in blue helmets: there have been thousands of complaints worldwide over the last decade alone. The UN’s habit of barring host countries from participating in abuse investigations only furthers the perception of a corrupt, unresponsive organization.

**2.Sex Crimes**

● The UN says it has a zero-tolerance policy on sexual exploitation and abuse, but survivors, activists, lawyers, and human rights organizations say such crimes have been allowed to continue with impunity.

● Case Study of the Sexual Assault in Cambodia by Peacekeepers

● Case Study of the Ugandan People’s Defence Force

● Case Study of Somalia

Between 2004 and 2016, the UN received almost 2,000 allegations of sexual abuse and exploitation, including 300 involving minors, as was uncovered by an Associated Press investigation, by its peacekeepers from Bangladesh, Brazil, Jordan, Nigeria, Pakistan, Uruguay, and Sri Lanka, among others.

In the International Organization journal article Peacekeeping, Compliance with International Norms, and Transactional Sex in Monrovia, published in late 2016, researchers found that more than 50 percent of women surveyed in the Liberian capital, Monrovia, had engaged in transactional sex. "A large majority - 75 per centmatch per- with UN peacekeeping," the report found.

**3.SAFETY AND SECURITY CHALLENGES IN UN**

**PEACEKEEPING OPERATIONS**

UN peacekeeping has undergone significant evolution, moving from unarmed interpositional ceasefire monitoring forces to integrated multidimensional missions, which now carry out a spectrum of activities and are mandated to use force. Peacekeepers often operate in volatile environments and with a mandate to protect civilians. Likewise, alongside peacekeeping operations, special political missions have increasingly complex mandates and are being deployed into ever more dangerous situations. Fragile government structures and intractable political disputes have created instability and environments where threats proliferate. The nature of the threats continues to evolve, with targeted and asymmetric hostile acts against UN personnel becoming a more regular feature of many missions.

The safety and security framework within the UN is complex and disaggregated. Separate frameworks are in place for civilians and individually deployed military and police personnel on the one hand, and military and police contingents on the other. Security management for peacekeeping operations is funded separately from that covering the rest of the UN’s operations, which results in awkward organizational and management structures. The operational models in place for the provision of security in peacekeeping and special political missions are multifarious, and the crisis response arrangements lack predictability and robustness. There are numerous contentious issues, including the use of information-gathering capabilities such as unmanned aerial vehicles, the engagement of private security companies, and the reimbursement rates of troops, particularly those operating in high-threat environments. The responsibilities accruing from international legal protections are often unclear, despite the conclusion of the status of forces agreements (SOFAs) or status of mission agreements (SOMAs). The essential imperatives are to ensure that the organization’s duty of care is met and that operations can be effective. There is, however, a broader confluence of interests surrounding the improvement of safety and security in UN peace operations. Troop-contributing countries (TCCs) and police-contributing countries (PCCs) have an interest in ensuring that their personnel return from UN peacekeeping deployments safely and well. Security Council members have an interest in ensuring the effective implementation of mission mandates, including a continued willingness of countries to deploy. Host states, which carry the primary responsibility for the safety and security of UN personnel, have an interest in ensuring that the UN takes on part of that responsibility. Furthermore, the broader international community has an interest in the continued effectiveness and evolution of UN peace operations as a critical tool for the maintenance of international peace and security. For these reasons, it is time to take stock of the safety and security of personnel in UN peace operations. A focus on these issues will help ensure that the Security Council selects tools that

are appropriate for the job it is trying to accomplish, that the General Assembly’s Administrative and Budgetary Committee (Fifth Committee) approves adequate resources, that the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C34) considers and makes recommendations on issues of concern, that TCCs and PCCs are enabled and incentivized, that the Secretariat is empowered to proactively plan and manage security issues, that mission leadership is supported, and that all personnel serving in UN peace operations can do so with the confidence that the UN values their service and will effectively execute its duty of care. As covid-19 is a new problem ahead of the whole world, could it be a problem for the security of peacekeepers or not? That will be the biggest question for all the authorities.

**REFORMING PEACEKEEPING**

**In the more than seventy years of its existence, UN Peacekeeping has evolved significantly as a tool of international crisis response.**

UN Peacekeeping has proven to be an essential instrument for global peace and security over the years. Our fourteen peacekeeping operations around the world today illustrate the wide range of mechanisms, strategies, and resources that the United Nations marshals in support of peace and security.

In recent years, however, our missions have been deployed to increasingly difficult and complex environments, even as demand for peacekeeping has increased. Our core business processes have not kept up with these demands. Mandate implementation is hindered by slow, unresponsive service delivery, micro-management by governing bodies, a trust deficit with the Member States and with staff, inadequate resourcing of and ineffective implementation of mandates, and a lack of transparency and accountability.

**Action for Peacekeeping (A4P)**

Peacekeeping is one of the most effective tools available to the United Nations in the promotion and maintenance of international peace and security. Yet peacekeeping faces several challenges that undermine its ability to deliver on its mandates. Political solutions are often absent, and missions seem to have mandates that lack focus and clear priorities. Complex threats in several environments are causing a rise in fatalities and injuries of peacekeepers, and missions have sometimes lacked the personnel and equipment to meet these threats. Peacekeeping operations have also faced challenges in delivering on protection mandates and in contributing to long-term, sustainable peace, and in achieving coherence with other actors operating in the same contexts.

To respond to these challenges, the Secretary-General launched Action for Peacekeeping (A4P) to renew mutual political commitment to peacekeeping operations. The Secretary-General has called on the Member States to join him in developing a set of mutually agreed principles and commitments to create peacekeeping operations fit for the future, intending to reach a formal agreement by the end of 2018.

**Reform in 2017**

Secretary-General António Guterres has proposed reforms in the United Nations peace and security architecture, in the UN’s management system and structures, as well as in the UN development system.

His vision of the reform of peace operations places politics at the centre of our work. It has the overall objective of reducing fragmentation for better delivery, to make the peace and security pillar more coherent, nimble, and effective by prioritizing prevention, sustaining peace, and delivery on Agenda 2030.

A series of strategic reviews of major peacekeeping operations have also been initiated which will focus on assessing the presence of conditions for successful mandate implementation to recommend adjustments to the Security Council. Parameters of assessment for the reviews will include the relevance and pertinence of mandates, the political environment and will of key parties, our operations’ comparative advantage vis-à-vis regional, UN, and other partners, and the configuration of support for the mission.

These reviews will identify ideas for new, enhanced peacekeeping approaches and will strengthen our cooperation for prevention through early action, as opposed to merely reacting to outbreaks of violence.

**High-Level Independent Panel on UN Peace Operations**

Former Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon established a High-level Independent Panel on UN Peace Operations on 31 October 2014, to make a comprehensive assessment of the state of UN peace operations today, and the emerging needs of the future. Announcing the decision, the Secretary-General said that “the world is changing and UN peace operations must change with it if they are to remain an indispensable and effective tool in promoting international peace and security.” With the 15th anniversary of the Brahimi report approaching, the Secretary-General felt that it was necessary to again take stock of evolving expectations of UN peacekeeping and how the Organization can work toward a shared view of the way forward.

The 16-member panel was chaired by Mr Jose Ramos-Horta (Timor-Leste) with Msfulfil Ameerah Haq (Bangladesh) as Vice-Chair. It drew together a wide range of experience and expertise.

The Panel considered a broad range of issues facing peace operations, including the changing nature of conflict, evolving mandates, good offices and peacebuilding challenges, managerial and administrative arrangements, planning, partnerships, human rights, and protection of civilians. The review encompasses both UN peacekeeping operations as well as special political missions, which are referred to collectively as “UN peace operations.

The Secretary-General received the Panel's report on 16 June 2015. The Secretary will study the recommendations of the report carefully and transmit them to the General Assembly and the Security Council.

**New Horizon**

The New Horizon process was initiated in 2009 to:

● Assess the major policy and strategy dilemmas facing UN Peacekeeping today and over the coming years; and

● Reinvigorate the ongoing dialogue with stakeholders on possible solutions to better calibrate UN Peacekeeping to meet current and future requirements.

A New Partnership Agenda: Charting a New Horizon for UN Peacekeeping is an internal document prepared as part of the “New Horizon” process of developing a forward agenda for UN Peacekeeping. It reflects both the perspectives of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the Department of Field Support (DFS).

The paper, which was released to the Member States and peacekeeping partners in July 2009, supported a reinvigorated dialogue to forge a peacekeeping policy agenda that reflects the perspectives of all stakeholders in the global peacekeeping partnership. Building on previous peacekeeping reform efforts, the paper highlighted achievements in improving the peacekeeping tool and identified outstanding, as well as new, dilemmas that require the attention of the peacekeeping partnership.

Key elements of the paper were taken up by the Secretary-General in his report to the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations [A/64/573]. These have informed formal and informal deliberations among members of the peacekeeping partnership to help crystallize a common vision of the requirements to bolster peacekeeping to more effectively fulfill its role in support of international peace and security.

**New Horizon Initiative: Progress Reports**

Since the issuance of the New Horizon document, DPKO and DFS have issued periodic progress reports summarizing the principal outcomes of the peacekeeping dialogue and implementation efforts in the context of the New Horizon process.

The most recent progress report, The New Horizon Initiative: Progress Report No. 2 was issued in December 2011. It outlines progress on implementation of reform priorities since the issuance of The New Horizon Initiative: Progress Report No. 1 in October 2010 and highlights ongoing efforts to improve the effectiveness of UN Peacekeeping.

**Brahimi Report**

In March 2000, the Secretary-General appointed the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations to assess the shortcomings of the then existing system and to make specific and realistic recommendations for change. The panel was composed of individuals experienced in conflict prevention, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding.

The result, known as the Brahimi Report after Lakhdar Brahimi, the Chair of the Panel, called for:

● Renewed political commitment on the part of Member States;

● Significant institutional change;

● Increased financial support.

The Panel noted that to be effective, UN peacekeeping operations must be properly resourced and equipped, and operate under clear, credible, and achievable mandates.

**Peacekeeping Policy and strategy reform**

Following the Brahimi report, the UN Member States and the UN Secretariat continued major reform efforts, including through:

● Capstone Doctrine (2008), outlining the most important principles and guidelines for UN peacekeepers in the field;

● Peace Operations 2010 (2006), containing the reform strategy of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO);

● 2005 World Summit [A/RES/60/1], establishing the Peacebuilding Commission;

● High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change [A/59/565], setting out a broad framework for collective security for the new century.

**Standards of conduct and training**

The UN expects that all peacekeeping personnel adhere to the highest standards of behaviour and conduct themselves in a professional and disciplined manner at all times.

Special training is required to ensure that UN personnel are equipped with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes required to perform these diverse duties and to be prepared for particularly challenging situations. There are several types of required training from pre-deployment which covers basic UN principles, guidelines, and policies to more targeted pieces of training related to specific issues such as sexual abuse and exploitation. These required pieces of the cent matchdefencetraining set standards for UN peacekeeping and guide personnel as they carry out critical tasks to assist the countries within which they work.

**SECURITY SECTOR REFORM**

**Security means different things to each of us. Transforming security institutions to prevent and respond to violence requires giving women and men a voice in articulating security needs, and ultimately fosters popular trust in state services and sustainable development.**

The security landscape in every country is a reflection of history, culture, political, socio-economic conditions, and experiences. The United Nations assists the Member States to undertake security sector reform to achieve effective and accountable security for the State and its citizens, without discrimination and with full respect for human rights and the rule of law. The United Nations pursues a coordinated and comprehensive approach to security sector reform, anchored in principles endorsed by the Member States, across the spectrum of peacekeeping, peacebuilding, and development settings.

**Security sector reform: the vision of Member States**

In its first thematic resolution on security sector reform 2151(2014), the United Nations Security Council reiterates the centrality of national ownership for security sector reform processes. It encourages states to define “an inclusive national vision”, informed by the needs of their populations and developed through inclusive national political processes. The resolution calls for the integration of security sector reform into broader national political processes, notes the importance of strengthening support to sector-wide initiatives that enhance the governance and performance of the security sector, and calls for improved monitoring and evaluation of security sector reform.

The resolution is indicative of the broad political support for security sector reform. Member States are committed to improving the contributions and relevance of security sector reform to the wider development agenda. Created in 2007, the Group of Friends of Security Sector Reform serves as a platform for the Member States to deliberate on what collective actions need to be undertaken to shape and advance the United Nations security sector reform agenda. The Group is currently co-chaired by Slovakia and South Africa.

**Preventing conflict, sustaining peace, fostering development: why security sector reform matters**

Security sector reform is an integral element of the United Nations sustaining peace and prevention agendas. Where security sector reform has the necessary political traction and national ownership, it can serve as an entry point for sensitive rule of law reform efforts, helping to fight impunity and thus restoring the social contract on which stability depends.

Support for security sector governance and reform is both a preventive measure and a long-term development goal. The United Nations supports security sector reform not only in peace operations, but also in non-mission settings, in response to national requests, and in transition settings, where peace operations are withdrawing but where ongoing security sector assistance is needed. In societies emerging from conflict, security sector reform is a determining factor for the exit of a peacekeeping operation, early recovery, sustainable

peacebuilding and longer-term development. Security sector reform is a sine qua non for sustainable economic and political development.

The security-development nexus is widely acknowledged. The reform of the security sector, particularly in conflict-affected societies, creates an environment conducive to political and socio-economic growth. The joint United Nations-World Bank study, Pathways for Peace: Inclusive Approaches to Preventing Violent Conflict, notes that “security and justice institutions that operate fairly and in alignment with the rule of law are essential to preventing violence and sustaining peace”.

**Security sector reform at work**

The Security Sector Reform Service, located within the Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions of DPKO serves as the United Nations system-wide focal point on security sector reform. Specifically, the Unit (i) assists field operations and presences with mandates to support national security sector reform efforts, (ii) develop normative documents and guidance, provides training to other practitioners, and organizes events on themes at the forefront of the security sector reform debate; and (iii) provides advisory support to senior United Nations leaders, thus streamlining the implementation of a system-wide approach to security sector reform.

Through the Security Sector Reform Service, the United Nations provides significant support to national efforts on security sector reform. The complexity and scope of security sector reform mandates have also evolved beyond “training and equipping” security providers to include interventions that address strategic governance and management of the sector as a whole, but also specific components, such as defense sector reform.

Our work is organized around core themes set forth during the High-Level Roundtable on SSR and Sustaining Peace convened by the United Nations Group of Friends of Security Sector Reform, notably strengthening national ownership, regional engagement, gender-responsive security sector reform, sustainable financing as well as coherence and cooperation.

The Security Council has issued security sector reform mandates that include a range of complex undertakings, including the promotion of national dialogue, enhancing civilian oversight and public financial management (Libya, Guinea-Bissau, Somalia), security sector governance, police reform, prison reform, defence sector reform (Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Libya), capacity building, the establishment of national security coordination mechanisms (the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Libya, Mali, Somalia) to more context-specific areas such as border management (Mali) or maritime security (Somalia) as well as cross-cutting issues, such as gender mainstreaming in the security sector.

Peace operations with a security sector reform mandate include:

● United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA)

● United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA)

● United Nations Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO)

● United Nations Integrated Peace-building Office in Guinea-Bissau (UNIOGBIS)

● United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS)

● United Nations Support Mission in Libya (UNSMIL)

● United Nations Office for West Africa and the Sahel (UNOWAS)

● United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia (UNSOM)

The Security Sector Reform Unit is capitalizing on the partnership with the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) to provide - via the International Security Sector Advisory Team (ISSAT) - more effective and predictable responses to the needs of peacekeeping and political missions in security sector reform and ensure overall coherence throughout the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 2151(2014).

**Complementarity and integration: United Nations inter-agency coordination**

As part of broader efforts to foster system-wide coherence, the Secretary-General established an Inter-Agency Security Sector Reform Task Force in 2007 to promote an integrated, holistic United Nations approach to security sector reform. Its core functions are: developing sector-wide guidance; leading regional partnerships for security sector reform; maintaining policy dialogue and consultations with the Member States and maintaining a United Nations roster of security sector reform experts.

The Inter-Agency SSR Task Force is co-chaired by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the United Nations Development Programme and consists of 14 UN entities addressing different dimensions of security sector reform processes in a complementary manner. Achievements of the Task Force include the Integrated Technical Guidance Notes to assist security sector reform practitioners and promote a better understanding of security sector reform; conducting assessments and programs as One UN and the establishment of the roster of experts.

**Building coalitions: the regional dimension of security sector reform**

The United Nations has an important role to play in ensuring security sector reform processes are nationally-led and adequately coordinated. However, the United Nations is neither the sole provider of assistance nor the most equipped actor in terms of capabilities. The legitimacy and effectiveness of the United Nations approach to security sector reform depend on the extent to which it is informed by and responsive to regional approaches. Transnational security threats, such as terrorism, organized crime, and trafficking of arms, drugs, and people, are better addressed through regional cooperation. The United Nations is partnering with the African Union, the European Union, the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, and sub-regional organizations to harmonize approaches and improve joint delivery of security sector reform assistance.

**MILITARY**

**United Nations military personnel are the Blue Helmets on the ground. Today, they consist of over 90,000 military personnel contributed by national armies from across the globe.**

We work alongside UN Police and civilian colleagues to promote stability, security, and peace processes; we protect personnel and property; we work with local communities, and security forces promote lasting peace.

In many missions, the protection of civilians is at the heart of our mandate. Blue Helmets are protecting populations against threats and contributing to a secure environment.

We must increase the representation of the female military in UN peacekeeping operations.

**Global contribution for global peace**

All military personnel working under the Blue Helmet are first and foremost members of their national armies and are then seconded to work under the command and control of the UN.

We have more than 100,000 UN uniformed personnel coming from over 120 countries. They come from nations large and small, rich and poor. They bring different cultures and experiences to the job, but they are united in their determination to foster peace. Currently, the majority of troops come from African and Asian countries, while the contribution of western countries is increasing.

**What UN military personnel do**

The UN has been deploying military personnel for service in peace operations since 1948 when the Security Council authorized the deployment of UN military observers to the Middle East to monitor the Armistice Agreement between Israel and its Arab neighbours.

UN military personnel can be called upon to:

● Protect civilians and UN personnel;

● Monitor a disputed border;

● Monitor and observe peace processes in post-conflict areas

● Provide security across a conflict zone;

● Provide security during elections;

● Assist in-country military personnel with training and support

● Assist ex-combatants in implementing the peace agreements; they may have signed.

One of the biggest changes UN Peacekeeping has seen over the 70 years of its existence has been the increasingly multi-dimensional nature of UN peacekeeping operations. UN military peacekeepers are often deployed in inhospitable, remote, and dangerous environments where they face an unprecedented scale of challenges, especially when protecting civilians, under asymmetric threats. Read more about how UN Peacekeeping is evolving to handle these modern-day challenges here.

**Impact of Covid-19 on UN Peacekeeping**

The World Health Organization(WHO) is working closely with global experts, governments, and partners to rapidly expand scientific knowledge on this new virus, to track the spread and virulence, and to provide advice to countries and individuals on measures to protect health and prevent the spread of this outbreak.

The Department of Peace Operations and the Department of Operational Support, including the Division of Healthcare Management and Occupational Safety and Health, are carefully reviewing all troop and police rotations. Some countries have been asked to delay rotations to maintain operational strength and execute their mandated tasks.

In the meantime, peacekeeping missions are putting in place a series of mitigation measures to promote the safety, security, and health of all UN personnel while maintaining continuity of operations. Leadership is in regular contact with troop- and police-contributing countries and working closely with the Department of Operational Support, the Office of Military Affairs, and the Police Division to monitor the situation and advise governments according to the latest developments. Secondly, many countries offer to vaccinate many UN peacekeepers but the problem lies when the world faces many kinds of strains and shortages of vaccine doses in some countries. Would it be possible to handle the peacekeeping camps without any health concerns or there could be problems coming from the UN peacekeeping missions?

**Links For further Search**

<https://www.un.org/press/en/2021/gaab4366.doc.htm>

<https://www.un.org/africarenewal/news/fresh-allegations-sexual-abuse-made-against-un-peacekeepers-central-african-republic>

<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/troop-and-police-contributors>

<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/what-we-do>

<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/data-troop-and-police-contributions>

<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/child-protection>

<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/conflict-related-sexual-violence>

<https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/action-for-peacekeeping-a4p>

**Questions to think upon**

What could be the new reforms for better working of UN peacekeeping missions?

The relevance of the UN peacekeeping budget this year?

UN peacekeeping forces, really a unified method of dealing with international issues, or is it unjustified?

What could be the ways to stop the constant decline of numbers of UN peacekeepers worldwide?

Why Covid-19 offer a chance to transform UN peacekeeping?

Why Covid-19 could be a problem for all the UN peacekeepers?
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