



# Accountability System for the Protection of Civilians

## Police Evaluations

1

### SUMMARY

In 2012, the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Department of Field Support issued a policy on the evaluation and inspection of UN police by the Police Division's standards compliance and audit officer or by the internal evaluation units of police components in peace operations. The policy applies to all headquarters and field personnel, particularly UN police officers and other personnel working in UN peace operations on issues pertaining to the rule of law.<sup>1</sup>

Furthermore, the Department of Peace Operations (DPO) carries out assessments and evaluations of UN formed police units (FPUs) to "ensure the performance of FPUs operating in peace operations maintain the required standard or above."<sup>2</sup> The evaluation applies to all FPU-contingent personnel serving in UN field missions, who play a critical role in carrying out protection of civilians (POC) tasks.

2

### RELEVANCE TO THE PROTECTION OF CIVILIANS

The FPU evaluation contains questions related to an FPU's ability to carry out and implement POC mandates. In the POC section, the questions are as follows:<sup>3</sup>

1. "To what extent has the unit engaged regularly with the local population and other relevant actors in its area of operations to understand the threats faced by civilians, including the specific threats faced by women and children?"
2. "To what extent has the unit taken appropriate and proactive measure to prevent and deter potential threats to civilians?"
3. "To what extent does the unit respond quickly and appropriately to threats of violence against civilians which have or are likely to occur in its area of operation?"

Each question contains several sub-questions. For example, for question one, it is recommended that evaluators take into account the ability of the unit to demonstrate an understanding of local civilian populations and the potential threats posed to them, the frequency of inclusive meetings with the community, the number of patrols that engage civilians, and engagement with civilians by the military and civilian components of the mission. For question two, it is recommended that evaluators ask questions on the police's posture and engagement with key protection actors and potential perpetrators

<sup>1</sup> UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and Department for Field Support (DFS), "Policy on Internal Evaluations and Inspections of UN Police," 2012.

<sup>2</sup> UN DPO and Office of the Rule of Law and Security Institutions-Police Division, "Standard Operating Procedure: Assessment and Evaluation of Formed Police Unit Performance (Operational)," May 3, 2019.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

and on whether protective measures have been taken. For question three, it is recommended that the evaluator take into account whether the unit has prepared and rehearsed contingency plans, has responded appropriately to credible alerts of threats, and has demonstrated a proactive posture.

It appears that the evaluation comprehensively evaluates the extent to which FPU's carry out POC efforts, in addition to other elements relevant to protection, such as operational readiness, capability, and training.

3

## RULES, GUIDELINES, AND METHODOLOGY

### Governing rules

All missions must operationalize the strategic guidance framework that was developed to ensure consistent standards and principles for international policing, as well as the related guidance for UN police structures, command and control, training, and recruitment, among other topics. In 2017, the Police Division also issued guidelines on the role of UN police in the protection of civilians.<sup>4</sup> The policy on the internal evaluation and inspection of UN police, in particular, allows the head of the police component (HoPC) or any member of the police component's senior management team to initiate an internal evaluation of UN police personnel. More specifically, a new standard operating procedure on the assessment and evaluation of an FPU's performance was finalized in July 2019, and indicators and benchmarks were identified for eleven performance areas. The standard operating procedure on the assessment of mission service for individual police officers is also being revised.

FPU internal assessments aim at measuring the capability, effectiveness, performance, and conduct of FPU's. The FPU evaluation is measured against the "required standard," which is based on the mission-specific statement of unit requirements (SUR), mission-mandated tasks, and compliance with all UN requirements. A formal memorandum of understanding signed between the UN and the police-contributing country (PCC) is based on the SUR. The evaluations and assessments, which are undertaken on a quarterly basis during a contingent's twelve-month deployment, are conducted on the behalf of the HoPC, by the FPU Coordination Office, or by UN headquarters, if necessary.

The Police Division also publishes monthly reports online on the performance of all FPU's.

### Process and functioning

The FPU evaluation follows a strict process, with several assessments throughout the duration of a contingent's deployment, which typically lasts twelve months. An assessment of operational capability is conducted pre-deployment and serves as the initial evaluation. Following the initial evaluation, an assessment is conducted every quarter, culminating in the end-of-mission final evaluation, the purpose of which is to provide "continuous improvement to both addressing any issues for FPU's coming to the

---

<sup>4</sup> UN DPKO and DFS, "Guidelines: The Role of United Nations Police in Protection of Civilians," August 1, 2017.

mission in the next rotation as well as to improve overall service delivery.”<sup>5</sup> Overall performance is measured across ten areas (see “scope and objective” below). A contingent is ranked on a scale of 1–4, with 1 representing “unsatisfactory,” 2 representing “needs improvement,” 3 representing “satisfactory,” and 4 representing “excellent.” If an FPU receives a score of 2 in any of the areas, a performance improvement plan is created.

It is the responsibility of the HoPC to introduce and describe the evaluation process to FPU commanders. The HoPC needs to give their consent to all inspection teams and must be consulted before the final submission of the report.

This evaluation may be conducted in coordination or synchronization with the contingent-owned-equipment quarterly verification inspection.

**4 ANALYSIS**

The FPU evaluation and assessment allow the mission and the UN Secretariat to evaluate the performance of a police contingent's ability to carry out mandated tasks at various stages of its deployment. As such, it provides an opportunity for a contingent to be assessed and to improve throughout the duration of its deployment. The performance improvement plan provides concrete steps for a contingent to take corrective action. Questions asked and used to evaluate the contingent cover a wide array of issues and demonstrate the comprehensive approach of the evaluation.


**Timing**

|   |          |   |
|---|----------|---|
| <b>Regular process</b>                      | <b>X</b> | Evaluations are conducted on a quarterly basis. |
| <b>Extraordinary measure after incident</b> |          |   |

<sup>5</sup> Department of Peace Operations, “Standard Operating Procedure on the Assessment and Evaluation of Formed Police Unit Performance (Operational),” May 2019.

## Actors and answerability structure

Evaluations of the police component provide a tool for the Secretariat and mission to monitor and evaluate the component's performance. FPU evaluations provide a direct assessment by the mission and the Secretariat of the ability of a contributing country's police contingent to carry out mandated tasks, including POC.

|  <b>Held accountable by</b> | Individuals     | Unit     |        |          | Mission | Secretariat | Contributing countries | Security Council/<br>5 <sup>th</sup> Committee | Member states | Population | Other |
|--|-----------------|----------|--------|----------|---------|-------------|------------------------|--|---------------|------------|-------|
|  |                 | Military | Police | Civilian |         |             |                        |  |               |            |       |
| <b>Individuals</b>   |                 |          |        |          |         |             |                        |  |               |            |       |
| <b>Unit/<br/>section/<br/>component</b>  | <b>Military</b> |          |        |          |         |             |                        |  |               |            |       |
|  | <b>Police</b>   |          |        |          | X       | X           |                        |  |               |            |       |
|  | <b>Civilian</b> |          |        |          |         |             |                        |  |               |            |       |
| <b>Mission</b>   |                 |          |        |          |         |             |                        |  |               |            |       |
| <b>Secretariat</b>   |                 |          |        |          |         |             |                        |  |               |            |       |
| <b>Contributing countries</b>  |                 |          |        |          | X       | X           |                        |  |               |            |       |
| <b>Member states</b>   |                 |          |        |          |         |             |                        |  |               |            |       |
| <b>Security Council/<br/>5<sup>th</sup> Committee</b>  |                 |          |        |          |         |             |                        |  |               |            |       |

## Scope and objective

FPU evaluations assess the overall performance of a police contingent across ten areas: (1) comprehension and support of the mission mandate; (2) command and control; (3) protection of civilians; (4) operational readiness capability; (5) administration; (6) sustainment, logistics, and memorandum of understanding compliance; (7) training aspects; (8) conduct and discipline; (9) health and welfare; and (10) other pertinent issues.

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>Collect best practices and lessons learned</b> | X | Inadvertently, an evaluation may shed light on best practices, lessons learned, and improvements that police contingents can make.  |
| <b>Track performance</b>                          | X | Each assessment is conducted quarterly and tracks the performance of a police contingent in carrying out mandated tasks, including POC.   |
| <b>Establish facts and circumstances</b>          |   |   |
| <b>Establish responsibility</b>                   | X | By evaluating whether a contingent is carrying out mandated tasks properly, the evaluation contributes to establishing responsibility for potential shortcomings. When a performance-improvement plan is activated, it also establishes who is responsible for carrying out performance improvements. |
| <b>Identify structural and systemic issues</b>    | X | While this may not be the main goal of the evaluation, a performance improvement plan provides an assessment of what the next rotation might need to endure.  |

## Type of accountability

Evaluations can be classified as a form of performance accountability, as they seek to assess a police unit's performance and ability to carry out mandated tasks. Furthermore, evaluations can be classified as a form of organizational accountability as they allow the organization to develop a stronger grasp of where performance could be improved.

## Outcome

The final end-of-rotation report for an FPU encompasses its overall performance during the duration of its deployment. It is supposed to note significant improvements and declines in performance.

Although sanctions can be imposed in cases of failure to improve performance, they remain rare due to political sensitivities between PCCs and the Secretariat. Decisions to impose sanctions, such as the repatriation of an FPU under exceptional circumstances, are usually made at the level of the UN secretary-general.

|                 |   |          |   |
|-----------------|---|----------|---|
| <b>Learn</b>    | <b>Disseminate and integrate internally</b> | <b>X</b> | FPU evaluations are disseminated internally to key members within the mission, with the intent of understanding lessons learned, improvements, and declines in performance.   |
|                 | <b>Account for publicly</b>                 |          |   |
| <b>Correct</b>  | <b>Improve internal processes</b>           | <b>X</b> | As per the 2012 policy, the main section of the report of an internal evaluation or inspection contains subsections on the areas evaluated or inspected. Each subsection consists of strengths and areas of improvement. Recommendations must have proposed timeframes and persons responsible for action.<br><br>The FPU evaluation, through the performance improvement plan, provides an avenue for improvements in performance, with a designated individual responsible for corrective action and an appropriate timeline. The final report details whether a performance improvement plan was activated and whether improvements were made. |
|                 | <b>Inform selection of personnel</b>        |          | The extent to which these assessments do inform the selection of PCCs and specific units remains unclear.   |
| <b>Sanction</b> | <b>Recommend sanctions</b>                  | <b>X</b> | If FPUs demonstrate significant performance failures and operational deficiencies, they can face sanctions, at least in theory.   |
|                 | <b>Establish incentives</b>                 |          |   |

**Independence and impartiality**

The team for FPU evaluations consists of the Police Division's evaluators, with the HoPC holding ultimate authority. The evaluation team leader is chosen and two other officers are nominated by the HoPC. It is advised that the evaluation team avoids selecting members from the same country as the FPU being assessed.

## Inclusivity

Specific procedures for evaluating FPUs demonstrate that contingents are also evaluated on their performance. It appears that the content of the evaluation is broad, as it takes into consideration that the police must interact with various mission components in order to carry out mandated tasks. It does not appear that individuals from different mission components can be part of the evaluation team.

## Transparency

Evaluations and assessments are not public. According to the 2012 policy, the compliance officer briefs the police adviser or HoPC, and a report is prepared within two weeks. The police adviser then decides on further distribution. The policy states that best practices, lessons learned, or similar knowledge may be shared with the appropriate parties.

For the FPU evaluation, once the HoPC has signed off on the report, it is disseminated to the special representative of the secretary-general, the deputy special representative of the secretary-general, the police chief of staff, the deputy chief of operations, the overall FPU commander, the FPU unit commander, the Police Division of the Department of Peace Operations at UN headquarters, and the member state via its permanent mission.

## Follow-up mechanisms

If a unit fails according to one or more criteria, the report has to come up with a performance improvement plan. After the first inspection, time is given to improve shortcomings. Recommendations are also shared with permanent missions so that the PCC can address issues such as pre-deployment gaps or corrective measures needed for the next rotation. Most of the gaps identified relate to equipment.

Videoconference consultations are organized to follow up on the implementation of the evaluation's recommendations with field missions.

The Police Division also recommends that the PCC integrate lessons learned in the training for future contingent deployments. In conjunction with the UN Integrated Training Service, the Police Division is currently considering facilitating such post-deployment learning.

|   |          |   |
|---|----------|---|
| <b>Possible follow-up mechanisms</b>        | <b>X</b> | <p>After the report is released, the compliance officer is supposed to follow up on recommendations no later than three months after the evaluation took place. This includes a follow-up internal evaluation or written feedback. Follow-up actions are supposed to be documented.</p> <p>For FPU evaluations, if the FPU fails according to one or more criteria, a performance improvement plan is activated, which makes up part of the following quarter's assessment. This plan identifies what the issue is, the remedial action necessary, whose responsibility it is to deliver this action, what resources need to be utilized, an appropriate timeline, risks or challenges, and what reassessment would entail.</p> |
| <b>Available enforcement measures</b>       | <b>X</b> | <p>If there are "significant operational deficiencies, performance failure or operational caveats to resist orders, or if the terms and conditions of a PIP are not met, the HoPC will consult with the Police Division in regard to additional actions required to ensure performance improvement. This may include (but not limited to) punitive measures including withholding the reimbursement or repatriation of responsible personnel or the unit."<sup>6</sup></p>  |
| <b>Transmissibility to other mechanisms</b> | <b>X</b> | <p>Best practices and lessons learned may be shared with relevant parties. FPU evaluations are disseminated to a select few individuals, including concerned member states to inform them of their contingent's performance.</p>  |

---

<sup>6</sup> Department of Peace Operations, "Standard Operating Procedure on the Assessment and Evaluation of Formed Police Unit Performance (Operational)," May 2019.