Accountability System for the Protection of Civilians

Comprehensive Planning and Performance Assessment System

1 SUMMARY

The Comprehensive Planning and Performance Assessment System (CPAS) was designed to be an integrated performance-assessment tool for peacekeeping missions. It aims at ensuring that regular, evidence-based assessments of a mission's impact inform decision making for all components, ultimately enhancing overall mandate implementation.

The CPAS emphasizes context analysis, whole-of-mission planning, and regular assessment of the mission's objectives and results. It is used to inform decision making through evidence-based data that is anchored in and responsive to the local context. In this framework, a mission is expected to develop a performance-assessment framework on the basis of its mandate and context mapping, to regularly collect information to assess its impact, and to routinely adjust and improve its activities. While results-based budgeting focuses on inputs, activities, and outputs, the CPAS focuses on outputs, outcomes, and impact.[1]

The CPAS responds to a need within UN peacekeeping operations to provide a more flexible and integrated approach to planning and performance assessment. It was established in response to a request from the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations to establish an integrated performance policy framework.[2] It also aligns with the commitment made in the framework of the Action for Peacekeeping initiative to improve performance in peacekeeping operations. The development of the system was informed by a report from the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs that proposed a methodology for reorganizing performance-monitoring tools into a single, overarching, comprehensive planning, reporting, and performance-assessment framework.[3]

The UN began rolling out the pilot phase of the CPAS in 2018, beginning with the UN Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in the Central African Republic (MINUSCA), UN Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), and UN Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). These were followed in 2019 by the UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), UN Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO), UN Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali (MINUSMA), UN

---

[1] As described by a UN Department of Peace Operations (DPO) official, the CPAS is meant to go beyond activities such as the number of workshops or reports being produced by the mission. Interview with DPO official, New York, November 2018.

[2] UN General Assembly, *Report of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations*, UN Doc. A/72/19, March 15, 2018. The request was welcomed by the Security Council. See: UN Security Council, *Statement by the President of the Security Council*, UN Doc. S/PRST/2018/10, May 14, 2018; and UN Security Council Resolution 2436 (September 21, 2018), UN Doc. S/RES/2436.

[3] Cedric de Coning and Emery Brusset, "Towards a Comprehensive Results-based Reporting and Performance Assessment Framework for UN Peacekeeping Operations," Norwegian Institute of International Affairs, April 2018.

Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), and UN Mission for the Referendum in Western Sahara (MINURSO). It is expected to be rolled out in most peacekeeping missions by 2021.[4] The CPAS is designed to support and inform planning and reporting through performance assessment.

2 RELEVANCE TO THE PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS

Each mission has a CPAS results framework, which is aligned with the mission's mandate and intended impact. As established by the POC handbook,

> In missions where POC is a priority mandate, priority objectives related to POC, which are informed by the POC strategy, should be included in the CPAS. Doing so will help determine and define POC success across the mission. All relevant mission components will then be expected to develop their workplans and objectives to make progress towards these goals. Mission POC advisers and focal points should be included in the context mapping exercises as well as in the development of the CPAS results framework, in particular the development of POC indicators, to ensure that CPAS accurately captures the mission's impact on POC. The results captured by CPAS should in turn inform reviews and revisions of the POC strategy.[5]

In missions mandated to protect civilians, the CPAS results framework can include the improved protection of civilians as a priority objective, including a reduction in the threat of violence and loss of life as an intended impact. POC-related intended impact indicators are articulated in the results framework so that performance can be assessed to understand whether a mission is achieving its desired impact. The following missions have identified POC-relevant intended impact indicators:

- **MINUSCA**: Number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and refugees who voluntarily return (source of data to be coordinated with UN country teams).

- **UNMISS**: Number of people prosecuted for serious human rights violations, disaggregated by affiliated groups (government, armed group, etc.) and court type.

- **MINUSMA**: Number of incidents of direct violence or threats of direct violence against civilians.

An excerpt from a mission's performance assessment related to POC noted the following as a success: "Decrease in conflict-related civilian deaths, due in part to a decrease in armed clashes which could be the result of increased deployment of national troops, and increased presence of security committees, and strengthened early warning mechanisms."

---

[4] The African Union–UN Hybrid Operation in Darfur (UNAMID) and the newly mandated UN Integrated Transition Assistance Mission in Sudan (UNITAMS) have been requested to implement the CPAS as well. The completion of the rollout, initially planned for the end of 2020, has been delayed due to the COVID-19 pandemic. See: United Nations Peacekeeping, "CPAS: The Comprehensive Performance Assessment System," available at https://peacekeeping.un.org/en/cpas .
[5] UN DPO, "The Protection of Civilians in United Nations Peacekeeping: Handbook," 2020.

Governing rules

The CPAS was initiated in 2018 by the Department of Peace Operations' (DPO) Division of Policy, Evaluation and Training, and it is currently being piloted and rolled out in several missions. Official guidance is being developed to formalize the system. The Secretariat is seeking to identify best practices and to implement incremental improvements as it rolls out the system before formalizing these in a formal policy.

Process and functioning

The CPAS supports missions' efforts to plan (by defining priority objectives, mapping the context, and building the results framework), perform, assess their impact, and adjust activities.

The system is based on three main elements: (1) context mapping; (2) comprehensive results framework; and (3) performance assessment.

1) A context mapping identifies *drivers* of change, which are defined as trends or events that are the most influential triggers of positive or negative change that enable or block the achievement of the mission's priority objectives and that the mission has the ability and mandate to influence. This mapping also identifies key stakeholders that can enable or hinder these drivers and the characteristics of these actors, including their knowledge, attitude, positions, or behaviors.

2) This context mapping serves as the foundation for mission components, working together, to build a comprehensive results framework. The results framework identifies the intended impacts and outcomes of the mission to make progress toward its priority objectives and the outputs the mission needs to deliver to bring this change about.[6] The mission collects data against indicators (at the impact and outcome levels) to support analysis and reporting.[7] Data is entered into the CPAS information technology platform, analyzed, and visualized using an

---

[6] A mission's priority objectives are the main objectives mission leaders wish to focus on, within the mission's mandate. Priority objectives support the mission's overarching strategic objectives, as defined by the relevant Security Council resolution, but take into account prioritization and sequencing. Missions generally identify three to five drivers of change with corresponding intended impacts. Examples of drivers of change and corresponding intended impacts include: (1) implementation of the peace agreement (driver) and the peace agreement and the nationally led strategy for peace are progressing (intended impact); (2) instability (driver) and improved protection of civilians, including a reduction in the threat of violence and loss of life (intended impact); (3) lack of state authority (driver) and restoration of state authorities capable of performing basic state civil functions (intended impact); and (4) lack of accountability (driver) and progress in the fight against impunity (intended impact). For each area, the mission defines the context, the type of change required and how the mission can contribute to achieving it, and the indicators needed to demonstrate change through the collection of data, all of which inform the performance assessment. Missions are expected to plan, perform, assess, and adjust their approach on the basis of data demonstrating the level of impact for each performance area.

[7] CPAS results frameworks as of May 2020 from three large multidimensional missions with POC mandates had a total of 203 POC indicators at the intended impact (33) and intended outcome (170) levels.

interactive dashboard that allows mission leadership and managers to gauge progress. The dashboard also helps mission leaders and managers see trends, both in the context and in the mission's performance over time.

3) The performance assessment is based on an analysis of the relationships between the outputs and the impact of the mission. The performance assessment is carried out at all level of the results framework (output, intended outcome, and intended impact). An important objective is to assess the extent to which missions' outputs are effectively contributing to an intended outcome and then to assess progress toward that intended outcome and, in turn, progress toward the intended impact. Recommendations are provided to mission leaders, allowing them to make strategic decisions and identify activities that they need to continue, end, adapt, or expand, while taking into account changes in the context. Decisions are then communicated to managers, with timelines for implementation.

Three elements are taken into account to appreciate the quality of outputs delivered by the mission and their relationship with the intended outcomes and impact: relevance, extent, and duration (RED analysis).[8]

- **Relevance** refers to the degree to which an output is appropriately designed and able to effectively influence the target population to bring about an intended outcome. The mission evaluates whether the output is the best way to influence and bring about the desired change in the target group identified in the intended outcome or whether something else would be more effective. For example, a mission may submit recommendations to a government for implementation through monthly papers that are not being read by government officials; the mission could recommend that the output be changed to in-person briefings by the special representative of the secretary-general to ensure the content reaches and is able to shape the positions of senior government officials.

- **Extent** refers to whether an output is effectively reaching enough of, and the right members of, a target population to bring about the intended outcome. The mission evaluates whether it is targeting the right people and enough of them, with consideration of gender, geographic location, level of influence, and other dimensions. For example, a mission may be reaching fifty civil servants through a workshop, but this might not be not enough to bring about change, or the mission might better achieve its objectives by targeting one minister instead of fifty civil servants.

- **Duration** refers to whether an output is delivered to a target population efficiently and for an adequate amount of time to sustainably achieve the intended outcome. The mission evaluations whether the intended outcome will continue once the mission stops delivering the output, as well as the timing, frequency, and sustainability of the effect. For example, a mission may be constructing police infrastructure through quick-impact projects but find that the buildings fall into

---

[8] Each metric is given a score from 1 to 4. Each output therefore receives a total score between 3 and 12. Scores are provided along with a short, written assessment of the output's relevance and effectiveness, explaining why the score was given.

disrepair due to lack of maintenance by local authorities and are unusable once transferred to the government, preventing the projects from having a sustainable impact on the provision of security in the area. A recommendation could be that the mission work with a partner organization or identify a government revenue stream to secure longer-term funding to maintain the buildings.

The system is iterative and enables missions to continuously assess their performance and adapt accordingly. If any major changes occur in the country, they can revisit the assumptions identified during the first phase of the cycle. They can also revise indicators on a regular basis. One of the objectives of the CPAS is to instill a dynamic culture of performance monitoring and to help missions "stop being taken by surprise."[9] Due to time and resource constraints, however, missions may not want to review all intended impacts during each assessment and may wish to focus on the highest priority or most dynamic impacts in a given performance assessment.

The CPAS is designed to be interoperable with other systems related to planning, such as the results-based budget and peacekeeping-wide data systems like SAGE, Umoja Extension 2 (UE2), and Unite Aware.

At the working level, two key groups participate in the governance and implementation of the CPAS, depending on the size and structure of the mission:

1. The technical work is done by CPAS working groups, which are responsible for analyzing data and undertaking the first part of the performance assessment (namely the output-outcome assessment referred to as the "RED analysis") and produces recommendations on ways to improve operations. The working groups are composed of members of relevant offices with subject-matter expertise and should conduct the performance assessment for each intended impact under its purview.
2. The CPAS implementation group oversees the CPAS cycle and validates and approves the work done by CPAS working groups. The implementation group, which should comprise representatives from missions' civilian and uniformed components, is responsible for the integrity of the process, ensures quality-control measures are in place, and finalizes the dashboards for presentation to senior mission leadership.

The senior mission leadership then makes decisions.

Missions manage the CPAS process to meet their own needs in a way that ensures effective mandate implementation and full integration of all mission components. They are nonetheless encouraged to engage the UN country team and relevant local and national stakeholders, as they deem appropriate, in mapping the context and analyzing the data in the CPAS implementation group and working groups.

---

[9] Interview with DPO official, New York, 2018.

The CPAS enables regular performance monitoring for all peacekeeping missions. Although its main purpose is to track the whole mission's performance, it can help identify best practices and systemic issues. While the CPAS allows mission to review the activities and impact of all components, it does not seek to determine responsibility for underperformance or to sanction underperformance.

Timing

The CPAS enables continuous performance monitoring of the mission. The iterative nature of the system allows missions to regularly revise and update their implementation plans based on their assessment of changes in the local context and of the effectiveness of their actions. Based on this information, missions can generate dashboards at any time to inform decision making. The exact timing of a full CPAS cycle depends on the size and resources of each mission. There is no strict timetable, and missions may vary the length of the cycle in the lead-up to key reports or events. In general, it is recommended that large multidimensional missions complete three to four cycles and that traditional missions complete two to three cycles per year.

Regular process	X	The CPAS establishes a cycle for continuous performance assessment and allows missions to assess their performance on an ad hoc basis outside of the regular cycle.
Extraordinary measure after incident		Although the CPAS is not meant to be activated after a specific incident, it does allow missions to revise their context mapping after a major event such as violent conflict or mandate renewal to adapt the intended impact and results framework to the new context.

The CPAS seeks to continually assess the performance of a mission's civilian, police, and military components. It provides mission leadership with evidence-based analysis to inform decision making.

Held accountable by		Individuals	Unit			Mission	Secre-tariat	Contri-buting countries	Security Council/ 5th Com-mittee	Member states	Population	Other
			Military	Police	Civilian							
Individuals												
Unit/ section/ component	Military					X						
	Police					X						
	Civilian					X						
Mission						X						
Secretariat												
Contributing countries												
Member states												
Security Council/ 5th Committee												

The CPAS is primarily meant to track regular performance and can help identify good practices and structural issues that need to be adjusted. While it is not a fact-finding tool, it can shed light on facts and circumstances, particularly during the context-mapping stage, which identifies the factors driving or influencing the conflict.

The results framework clearly defines the sections or components responsible for each output and for the collection and input of data for each indicator. However, it is not meant to determine specific or individual responsibility for underperformance. The whole-of-mission methodology established by CPAS supports a coordinated and unified approach to planning and performance assessment. The CPAS provides evidence-based analysis to support decision making that will allow the mission to improve its response or actions to enhance its overall impact.

Collect best practices and lessons learned	X	The CPAS helps identify best practices and lessons learned, from outputs to impact. It is recommended that the best practices officer participate in the implementation group.
Track performance	X	CPAS tracks collective performance, not the performance of individuals or units.
Establish facts and circumstances		In the framework of the CPAS, the mission collects data against specific indicators to develop evidence-based analysis to support decision making. However, the CPAS is not a fact-finding exercise.
Establish responsibility		The CPAS enables the mission to identify the units and components responsible for each output but does not determine responsibility for underperformance.
Identify structural and systemic issues	X	The CPAS can assist in identifying structural and systemic issues that are impacting performance and provide solutions to address them.

Type of accountability

The CPAS is an organizational tool, offering a form of performance accountability.

Outcome

Learn	**Disseminate and integrate internally**	X	The CPAS provides opportunities for all components to discuss performance and produces data that is accessible by mission personnel.
	Account for publicly		The CPAS is an internal tool. However, at the discretion of the mission, some information can be shared publicly as needed.
Correct	**Improve internal processes**	X	The CPAS provides evidence-based analysis related to the strategic vision of the mission and offers recommendations to enhance internal processes and inform the design and prioritization of tasks.

	Inform selection of personnel		
	Recommend sanctions		
Sanction	Establish incentives		

The CPAS is an internal tool designed by the Secretariat for peacekeeping missions. The implementation of the CPAS is the responsibility of each mission. It is a self-assessment tool based on collaboration among all mission components to facilitate critical discussion and assessment. The methodology encourages missions to take multiple perspectives into consideration.

Inclusivity

The CPAS is built on an inclusive and integrated process where the impact of the mission as a whole is being assessed in order for senior leadership to make decisions and adjust activities for all components. It draws on all components to collectively plan, perform, monitor, assess, and adjust activities to determine the prioritization and sequencing of specific outputs to enhance performance. It also provides senior leadership with the evidence necessary to enhance the delivery of mandates and the impact of activities.

The CPAS has generally been well received by military components, which have been eager to develop better tools for joint planning with civilian components. The CPAS was also reported to have instigated frank conversations among units and components on the activities that are worth investing in and to have shifted the conversation from inputs and outputs toward impact.

As of early 2020, however, the level of engagement of senior mission leadership teams in the management of the CPAS has been limited. The implementation of the CPAS has been led by strategic planning units or, in certain missions, focal points from political affairs divisions or best practices units.[10]

At the discretion of the mission, the CPAS can include external partners or stakeholders such as civil society representatives in parts of the exercise, such as the context analysis.

Transparency

Each mission is responsible for collecting and inputting data. Once the data is entered into the system, a dashboard is generated through the information technology platform.

---

[10] The CPAS is coordinated by the best practice officer in Lebanon and by a political affairs officer in Western Sahara and Kosovo.

A dashboard can be generated at any point once the data has been entered into the system. Each mission decides whether information is confidential or can be put in the public domain. It is recommended that missions be as transparent as possible.

Follow-up mechanisms		
Possible follow-up mechanisms	X	The CPAS is its own follow-up mechanism, as it operates continuously. In each performance-assessment cycle, the mission can see the extent to which decisions have been implemented and their impact.
Available enforcement measures	X	Senior mission leaders decide whether or not to approve the recommendations of the CPAS and have the authority to enforce them.
Transmissibility to other mechanisms	X	The CPAS information technology platform has been designed to allow it to share data with other systems and to work with other UN technology systems such as Unite Aware and UE2. The CPAS generates data and analysis that feeds into relevant reporting, including code cables, situation reports, secretary-general reports, results-based budgeting performance reports, and Security Council briefings.