

REVIEW OF THE GLOBAL FOCAL POINT FOR POLICE, JUSTICE, AND CORRECTIONS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
August 2018



Ministry of Foreign Affairs

NYU | CENTER ON
INTERNATIONAL
COOPERATION



NPI Norwegian Institute
of International
Affairs

REVIEW OF THE **GLOBAL FOCAL POINT FOR POLICE, JUSTICE, AND CORRECTIONS**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
August 2018

Authors:

Paige Arthur (lead author), Center on International Cooperation

Christian Ahlund, Folke Bernadotte Academy

Maaïke de Langen, independent consultant

Kari Osland, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Additional review team members and advisors:

Sarah Cliffe, Center on International Cooperation

Cedric de Coning, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Bård Drange, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Ryan Rappa, Center on International Cooperation

Natasja Rupesinghe, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2012, recognizing that the United Nations (UN) system was at a crossroads with respect to its fragmented, sometimes duplicative, and often competitive efforts on rule of law assistance in post-conflict countries, the Secretary-General took steps to incentivize cooperation and collaboration across a highly siloed structure. **The Global Focal Point for Police, Justice, and Corrections Areas in the Rule of Law in Post-Conflict and Other Crisis Situations** (the GFP) was thus born.

The Policy Committee decision that established it makes the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) accountable for delivering on operational responsibilities with respect to the UN's police, justice, and corrections work, with a focus on responding to country-level requests for assistance. DPKO and UNDP were to co-locate relevant staff and to link up with other UN entities in the Secretariat, as well as agencies, funds, and programs, that provide specialized police, justice, and corrections assistance. Current partners are the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), UN Women, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the Executive Office of the Secretary-General (EOSG).

As the length and complexity of the GFP's name suggest, its establishment was contested internally, with differing views on its scope and composition. The approach was fairly minimalist, drawing together the largest parts of the UN's expertise without changing mandates, functions, or reporting lines, and within a framework that was intended to be cost-neutral. But the meaning involved for the professionals housed within it is simple: it signals a clear ex-

pectation that people work together and do not duplicate efforts or compete.

This review evaluates how the GFP has contributed to joint working arrangements that have produced real outcomes on the ground in post-conflict and crisis situations. It also considers the barriers that these efforts have faced and the need for adaptation going forward. This is timely as the Secretary General has emphasized the critical need for more system-wide collaboration to address challenging conflict dynamics, highlighting the GFP as a model in significant reports such as the recent Report on Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace (A/72/707-S/2018/43). **The clear conclusion of the review is that a "GFP 2.0" is needed if the UN is to deliver. The GFP has improved the UN's coherence in the areas of police, justice and corrections but has now reached the limits of the initial model.** The review lays out a number of recommendations that UN leadership could consider to enable a GFP 2.0.

Outcomes of GFP collaboration to support the field

Overall, the review found that the GFP has helped to leverage comparative advantage, position the UN to avoid setbacks during peace operation transitions, reduce duplication, and create efficiencies in the field:

- In Central African Republic, the joint program on impunity re-established functioning courts in Bangui and a handful of other cities, allowing the resumption of basic justice services including the first criminal hearings since 2010. In January 2018, the Bangui Central Court rendered its first conviction

for conflict-related crimes, sentencing an anti-Balaka warlord to life in prison.

- In Somalia, the joint program has built capacity in the justice chain, helped establish Ministries of Justice in the South Central States, provided scholarships for future legal professionals, and created a Policing Model that has received political buy-in and is now being developed by state organizations.
- In Haiti, joint work has made possible the continued training of police cadres (or mid-level management), as well as digitization of police systems, bringing the police force into the twenty-first century with databases, servers, and more.

These outcomes have been made possible through a great deal of detailed work to support joint arrangements and programs in the field (see box). These field-based innovations, of which this is only one or many, foreshadow some of the more systematic recommendations in this review.

Constraints

While there have been positive results, it is notable in the country cases reviewed that the outcomes (and GFP supporting activities) have often not moved to a scale sufficient to address country-level

challenges. Specific constraints that emerged in reviewing the country cases include:

- *Limited variety of (and lack of clarity about) GFP assistance.* While the focus on missions to support joint programming is understandable—the absence of joint UN programs was a criticism that spurred the formation of the GFP—this has limits. Field entities wanted more varied types of practical assistance and evidenced a need for more strategic approaches. They also wanted to understand better what the GFP has to offer.
- *Insufficient capacity to develop broader knowledge and partnerships, both within and outside the UN system.* For the managers and staff within the GFP at headquarters (HQ), the experience of the last six years has been that cooperation has real value, but it takes time: there is too little dedicated staff time available to make it happen.
- *Inefficiencies due to continuing siloed approaches.* While joint approaches have improved, especially at HQ, these efforts face challenges: joint work in many instances is stitched together rather than genuinely integrated; resource mobilization still can push entities apart; thematic elements like gender and human rights sometimes do not get their due; and entities are still working with reference to different plans, timelines, and analyses. In some countries, these contributed to an imbalance in UN approaches to police, justice, and corrections, where

BOX 1: Reducing duplication and filling gaps in Mali

In Mali, MINUSMA (inclusive of UNPOL), OHCHR, UNDP, UNODC, UNMAS, and UN Women came together in 2015, supported by a GFP expert deployment from HQ, to create a joint program, “Addressing Root Causes of Conflict through Rule of Law,” for the period 2016–20. The program was created due to the recognition that both MINUSMA and UN agencies were implementing similar activities without much coordination, which had resulted in gaps in assistance along with some duplication and conflict of interventions. The program seeks to primarily

address conflict drivers (with a focus on the north). From the joint program, three further projects have been developed, including “Reinforcing the Rule of Law for Peacebuilding in Northern Mali,” “Strengthening Mali’s Penal Chain” (also known as the Mandela Prison Project), and the operationalization of the Specialized Judiciary Unit. Some of the activities in the latter project have been implemented using programmatic funding from the MINUSMA budget, while others have received donor contributions from Germany and the Netherlands.

The Mali GFP started convening their first monthly strategic meetings, with all Heads of Agency and Division, hosted at MINUSMA HQ. In 2017, UNDP and MINUSMA decided on the need for a joint homepage to ensure that all GFP documents are easily available and accessible. The platform seeks to contribute to fostering a common understanding about the GFP. It also functions as a tool to institutionalize information sharing and transparency by requiring partners to upload key GFP documents, including financial records.

corrections and/or justice took a backseat to police in the justice chain. Additionally, at HQ, partners are not sufficiently integrated into the GFP's work and vision, also creating imbalances in approach.

→ *Co-location not achieved.* Managers and staff still report that significant efforts are needed to overcome dispersed locations (even within HQ) and reporting lines of staff working on similar issues. At HQ, this was originally intended to be overcome by co-location. But co location (even of DPKO and UNDP) was not properly executed in the wake of the original 2012 Policy Decision. A surprise in the review was the strong sentiment of staff around co-location: 84 percent of HQ staff surveyed agreed that “co-location at HQ is important for the GFP to work,” with 45 percent strongly agreeing. In addition to helping to bridge the DPKO-UNDP divide, the co-location of UN Women and OHCHR was seen as useful, although it has been discontinued for both.

Main messages

T The review has developed eight main clusters of recommendation—four strategic and four for managerial action.

Strategic recommendations

1. VARY SERVICES, PRODUCTS, AND EXPERTISE TO BE BOTH MORE STRATEGIC AND MORE FOCUSED ON UNBLOCKING PRACTICAL AND PROCEDURAL CONSTRAINTS.

As noted above, while joint programs are valued as a way to increase results and prevent duplication and competition, they are not the only tool needed in the toolbox. In country cases reviewed there was a need for two types of additional service. One is strategic, sometimes high-level engagement to support more integrated and innovative field-driven solutions. Improving integration of GFP missions (and

deployments) is an important method for HQ to contribute to better integration in the field; including senior staff, such as former Special Representatives of the Secretary-General (SRSG), in missions can also facilitate high-level discussion both within the UN and with national counterparts. The GFP could also have a larger role in providing substantive support both in areas where UN policies exist, such as on human rights and gender, or where approaches are developing, such as on sustaining peace and prevention, people-centered rule of law support, and the Sustainable Development Goals. Recommendations in this area include establishing a roster of senior individuals (such as former SRSGs, Deputy SRSGs, and Resident Coordinators) to take part in some missions and advise on approaches; identifying the five highest priority interoperability challenges for the field and working to unblock them; and establishing a principle of open, shared information among UN entities working on the rule of law.

2. CONSIDER FIELD STAFF AS PART OF THE GFP AND BETTER INTEGRATE PARTNERS.

While the background to the Policy Committee decision was the strategic need to bring together the UN's expertise on rule of law to improve results in the field, the GFP itself has come to be understood as an HQ entity. At HQ, it has placed UNDP and DPKO at the center, leaving other partners unclear about their role and the benefits of engaging in the GFP. In the field, responsibility for rule of law coherence is put in the hands of senior field leaders—and this is as it should be. However, it misses an opportunity to maximize the input from the field (not just services to the field). The review recommends steps to better integrate these actors. It suggests adding a rotating managers seat for one of the GFP partners, so that they might be formally included in decision making. It also recommends mapping all staff with expertise in rule of law as part of the GFP, not as their primary reporting line but as a community of practice who can share experiences. This also offers some important gains in recognizing and crediting staff in the field for

the expertise they bring; at a practical level, it should encourage cross-country exchanges. Additional recommendations include continuing and strengthening the training and retreats that the GFP has provided for field staff, and the appointment of a community of practice coordinator who can facilitate an exchange on the latest research and operational innovations between field, regional, and HQ staff.

3. EXPAND GFP TO INCLUDE SECURITY SECTOR REFORM (SSR) UNDER THE THEME OF RULE OF LAW OR SECURITY AND JUSTICE; INCLUDE OTHER THEMATIC PARTNERS AS RELEVANT.

Thematically, the GFP is currently defined around three functional areas—police, justice, and corrections—as “areas in the rule of law.” This focus on the justice chain can be useful in organizing work, but it has limitations. In particular, it does not address the close connection between police reform and strengthening other security services (police and military reforms, for example, are almost always closely linked). While unintended, the name may also limit attention to links with informal systems, broader access to justice/legal and judicial reform programs, and non-discrimination/equality before the law. Last, it does not translate well to partners such as international financial institutions (IFI) and regional organizations, which do not organize specifically around police, justice, and corrections. The review recommends bringing the existing SSR unit of the Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions (OROLSI), as well as UNDP staff working on SSR, into the GFP. Other rule of law related issues, such as counter-terrorism and disarmament, demobilization, and reintegration (DDR), should be included on a country-specific basis. Finally, to solidify the link with the prevention and sustaining peace agendas, renewing dormant links with the Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) and the Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) should be prioritized. Without disturbing the GFP name and identity, into which considerable effort has been invested, the review recommends considering whether the GFP should rename “point” as “partnership” and substitute either “security and justice” or “rule of law” for “police, justice, and corrections.”

4. BASED ON THESE CHANGES AND LESSONS LEARNED, THE GFP SHOULD RENEW ITS MISSION STATEMENT AND VALUE PROPOSITION.

This was already a recommendation of the 2014 review: the context has evolved subsequently in a way that increases its importance (the Sustainable Development Goals, the current UN reform processes, the prevention and sustaining peace agendas). Elements we suggest leadership to consider include:

- Aiming initially to become a resource for practice on rule of law or security and justice institution building (through development of a community of practice and documentation of operational innovation in the field); over time, aiming to become a center of excellence, including on research and evidence generation
- Drawing together strategic approaches to rule of law, security, and justice, as well as specialized expertise and the ability to unblock operational bottlenecks
- Being a single point of entry for external partners on global rule of law issues

Managerial actions

1. ENGAGE SENIOR LEADERSHIP.

The original Policy Committee decision envisaged high-level leadership involvement, from the Assistant Secretaries-General (ASG) of the entities making up the GFP right up to the Deputy Secretary-General (DSG), as chair of the Rule of Law Coordination Group. This has fallen off in recent years, and top UN leadership are little involved in substantively setting direction, ensuring coherence, and mobilizing new partnerships for police, justice, and corrections or rule of law. The review recommends that the ASGs for OROLSI and the Bureau for Policy and Programme Support (BPPS) agree that they will chair a meeting with counterparts at the same level in the field for all country situa-

tions where there are significant challenges or new opportunities, ahead of investing scarce resources in field missions and joint program development. We recommend that a rotating chair from other partners involved in the GFP (e.g. OHCHR, UNODC, UN Women, UNHCR, EOSG) be added depending on the issues of most concern in each country. We also recommend that the DSG chair an annual meeting of Under-Secretaries-General (USG) on rule of law, supported by the GFP through the EOSG rule of law adviser, potentially focusing on the Secretary-General's reports on country situations of concern or on rule of law.

2. TAKE ADVANTAGE OF CURRENT REFORMS TO CO-LOCATE STAFF.

As noted above, staff interviewed felt strongly that co-location was important to building shared thinking and action. There is currently a new opportunity to do this because of the office movements that will result from implementation of the Secretary-General's peace and security reforms. The main recommendation is that the HQ staff involved from DPKO and UNDP, along with other staff whose entities are prepared to co-locate them based on the renewed value proposition, be moved into mixed teams when the larger reorganization is performed. A subsidiary recommendation is that this team be located next to the PBSO to foster the significant links that exist between strengthening security and justice institutions and broader peacebuilding. If co-location is adopted, a senior leadership figure such as the Chef de Cabinet or USG for the Department of Management could be tasked with ensuring that internal failure to solve interoperability and other practical problems does not again contribute to derailing the decision, as was the case after the Policy Committee decision of 2012.

3. DEDICATE ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE RESOURCES TO THE GFP.

Staff and managers still report that the GFP

is run in addition to their day jobs, which are based primarily on delivering within their home entity, not collectively across entities. The review saw three possible solutions to this. The first is a major reform to draw together the relevant functions and staff into one office, as was done with UN Women, with associated formal resource requests. This was not seen as viable at this point, when the General Assembly and EOSG already have three complex reforms in front of them and have little space to take on another. The team considered two other options for strengthening the GFP. While similar, one option places weight on a strengthened core team with dedicated, sustained resources from UNDP and OROLSI's budgets, while another places weight on co-location working mainly through proximity and informal networks, relying on voluntary contributions and secondments to support the core team. The recommendation here combines the two: in addition to co-location, there should be dedicated resources from new DPKO assessed and UNDP budgets to support existing and additional core team staff. Moreover, there should be new terms of reference (TOR) for all GFP-related staff managers and partners, as well as strengthened delegations of authority for the core team; GFP partners should be asked to contribute human resources and/or symbolic financial amount to support to the core team; and the GFP should develop an analysis of the pros and cons of creating a multi-partner trust fund. In relation to the field, it is recommended that DPKO encourage use of peacekeeping funds for a dedicated post whose TOR would include rule of law coordination. This post would be charged with helping the SRSG/Deputy SRSG (DSRSG) convene the UN system and providing direct support to both operational and strategic coherence.

4. HOLD A NEW EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE DISCUSSION AND DECISION ON THE GFP.

Last, we also suggest that the Executive Committee have a new discussion and decision on the GFP, to give the highest possible level of endorsement to the recommendations in this report that are sponsored by UN management.



Table of priority recommendations

Main message	Summary recommendations	Responsible
Vary GFP services, products and expertise to be both more strategic and more focused on unblocking practical and procedural constraints	→ Roster of senior leadership available for missions	GFP core team
	→ Establish a principle of access to information, and develop a platform for global information sharing	GFP core team
	→ Short, user friendly options and lessons learned notes for staff, including on thematic issues and approaches	GFP core team
	→ Identify the five highest priority interoperability problems in the field and engage senior leadership to fix them	GFP core team
	→ Develop a joint study with external partners (e.g., IFIs or regional organizations) on rule of law/security and justice	GFP managers, core team
Consider field staff as part of the GFP and better integrate GFP partners	→ Map staff and appoint community of practice coordinator	GFP managers, core team
	→ Rotating seat in management team for GFP partners	ASGs
	→ Continue and strengthen training and joint retreats	GFP managers, core team
Expand the scope of the GFP to include SSR under the theme of security and justice/rule of law	→ Bring SSR unit/staff into GFP	ASGs
	→ Strengthen links with DDR, CTED, PBSO, and other relevant thematic actors	ASGs, managers, managing partners, other partners
	→ Consider renaming the GFP as “partners” for “rule of law” or “security and justice”	ASGs, managers
Renew the GFP’s mission statement and value proposition	→ Create and communicate a value proposition for the GFP’s role in bringing together strategic, specialized, and operational/procedural practice and expertise; and as a single entry point for partnerships	GFP managers, managing partners
Engage senior leadership	→ ASGs chairing field meetings with DSRSGs	ASGs
	→ Rotating chair for meetings among partners (e.g., OHCHR, UNODC)	GFP managers, managing partners
	→ DSG chairing annual meeting	EOSG, ASGs
Take advantage of current reforms to co-locate staff	→ Co-locate mixed GFP teams during peace and security relocation	ASGs
	→ Aim for close location to PBSO	CdC, DM, PBSO
Dedicate additional financial and administrative resources	→ New TORs for all GFP-related staff, managers and GFP partners; strengthened authority for core team	ASGs, managers
	→ Increase dedicated resources to enhance GFP core team and enable GFP to deliver on its new mission/value proposition from core, assessed, and/or voluntary funding	ASGs, managers, managing partners, and donors
	→ Explore options to adapt Global Program for Rule of Law into multi-partner trust fund	GFP core team
	→ Use peacekeeping budgets to fund a post whose TORs include rule of law coordination across the UN system in country	DPKO ASGs
Hold new EC discussion and decision on the GFP	→ Explore options for a new Executive Committee decision to get senior leadership endorsements for the GFP’s mission, functions, and structure and to support addressing co-location and interoperability challenges, new partnerships, and resources	EOSG, ASGs

Published by the Center on International Cooperation,
Folke Bernadotte Academy, and the Norwegian Institute
of International Affairs.

Copyright © 2018

Center on International Cooperation – New York University
cic.nyu.edu

Folke Bernadotte Academy
fba.se

Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
nupi.no

Acknowledgments: The review team is grateful for the generous support of Folke Bernadotte Academy, the Foreign & Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway. The review team is also deeply appreciative of the efforts made by staff at United Nations headquarters and in the field for making this review possible, with special recognition to Jennifer Schmidt and Clément Hamon.