Issue Brief
UN Peacekeeping Transitions: Perspectives from Member States

Introduction

Peacekeeping transitions are inherent in the temporary nature of peace operations and inevitable as the UN presence adapts to broader national political and socioeconomic transition processes at play in host countries. Broadly defined as significant changes in a United Nations Security Council–mandated peacekeeping presence, such transitions include the start-up, reconfiguration, drawdown, or withdrawal of missions, which can be planned as part of the normal lifetime of a UN mission or induced by a host government. But the nature and timing of these transitions can, in some instances, destabilize the situation on the ground and unwittingly jeopardize efforts by host governments and societies to sustain peacekeeping and peacebuilding gains.

Although the challenges posed by peacekeeping transitions are not new, the topic has recently re-emerged in member states' discussions, as several UN missions are currently undergoing or planning for transitions. Meanwhile, the UN is seeking to improve the way it plans for and manages these transitions, and it has been developing a common UN policy, in order to ensure that a changing UN presence does not destabilize the host country.

These discussions on peacekeeping transitions are also taking place in a changing geopolitical environment and at a time of global financial crisis. On one side, some host-country governments have become increasingly cognizant of the limits of large UN peacekeeping forces when it comes to supporting their own objectives, while continuing to expect a lot from peacekeeping missions. On the other side, major financial contributors to UN peacekeeping and the Security Council itself are starting to tighten the purse strings. These two elements are partly responsible for the increasingly ambitious timelines for drawing down large peacekeeping missions and a tendency toward lighter UN footprints for new missions.

Early Discussions on Peacekeeping Transitions

The issue of peacekeeping transitions is not new. In an open debate in November 2000, the United Nations Security Council addressed the mechan-isms and processes by which it decides on the closure or reconfiguration of peacekeeping missions. This debate concluded in a Security Council request to the United Nations Secretary-General to submit a report on the issue, taking

into account the responsibilities of different organs of the United Nations system.[1]

The subsequent Secretary-General's report, "No Exit Without Strategy," of 2001 examined factors the Security Council should assess in deciding to launch, close, or significantly alter a United Nations peacekeeping operation.[2] Three circumstances were identified that can prompt the closing or reconfiguration of a mission: successful completion of the mandate, failure, or partial success. The report recognized the existence of several key objectives that, when fulfilled, often brought about successful peacebuilding: (1) consolidating internal and external security, (2) strengthening political institutions and good governance, and (3) promoting economic and social rehabilitation and transformation.

Finally, the report suggested that as a mandate approaches its expiration date or if there are calls for the operation to be closed, it is especially useful for the Security Council to engage in a thorough and frank discussion with its members and with troop contributing countries, addressing the rationale for leaving, staying, or altering the mandate. It further noted that Security Council field visits can be useful in such contexts.

Re-Emergence of the Issue of Transitions in the Security Council (2010–2012)

Peacekeeping transitions re-emerged as an issue in the Security Council in 2010, after the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Chad requested the departure of UN peacekeepers in November 2009 (MONUC) and January 2010 (MINURCAT), respectively. Similar scenarios in which host-government consent was withdrawn had already taken place in Burundi (ONUB, 2005) and Eritrea (UNMEE, 2008). The need to re-engage the debate over transitions was also motivated by the prospect of upcoming transitions of UN missions in Timor-Leste (UNMIT) and Liberia (UNMIL), as well as likely mission reconfigurations in Côte d'Ivoire (UNOCI) and Haiti (MINUSTAH).[3]

During France's presidency of the Security Council in February 2010, the Permanent Mission of France to the United Nations prepared and circulated a background concept paper[4] and chaired a Security Council debate on February 12th entitled "United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Transition and Exit Strategies." The latter led to a Security Council Presidential Statement (PRST) in which the Security Council committed itself to "improving its strategies for ending or reconfiguring peacekeeping missions, or for their transition to other kinds of United Nations presences."[5]

In 2010 the Security Council also held four thematic peacekeeping consultations, three of which related to transitions. The first was on February 17th, when the then heads of the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the Department of Field Support briefed council members following the February 12th peacekeeping debate on transition and exit strategies. A wide range of topics were covered at this briefing. Following requests for a more focused discussion, council members were asked to provide questions to the UN Secretariat ahead of the next briefing on May 27, 2010, including questions on the extension of peacekeeping missions. The fourth peacekeeping consultation in 2010 took place on November 24th under the UK presidency and included discussions on peacekeeping and peacebuilding, how to write better mandates, and how to include peacebuilding tasks in those mandates.

In 2012, transitions were again discussed under the United Kingdom's presidency as part of a Security Council peacekeeping thematic debate on March 26th on the role of peacekeepers in peacebuilding and sustaining early peacebuilding gains throughout transitions. Under-Secretary-General for Peacekeeping Operations Hervé Ladsous and Under-Secretary-General for Field

---

1 UN Security Council, *Letter Dated 30 November 2000 from the President of the Security Council to the Secretary-General*, UN Doc. S/2000/1141, November 30, 2000.

2 United Nations Secretary-General, *No Exit Without Strategy: Security Council Decision-Making and the Closure or Transition of United Nations Peacekeeping Operations*, UN Doc. S/2001/394, April 20, 2001.

3 Ian Johnstone called this "peacekeeping's transitional moment" in his article of the same title included in the *Annual Review of Global Peace Operations 2011* (New York: Center on International Cooperation, 2011).

4 "United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Debate on Transition and Exit Strategies. Concept Paper," in UN Security Council, *Letter Dated 3 February 2010 from the Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations to the Secretary-General*, UN Doc. S/2010/67, February 3, 2010, Annex.

5 UN Security Council, *Statement by the President of the Security Council*, UN Doc. S/PRST/2010/2, February 12, 2010.

Support Susana Malcorra briefed the council on recent UN Secretariat work on transitions, including work on the issue of peacekeepers as early peacebuilders and a concept note entitled "UN Transitions: Mission Drawdown or Withdrawal" approved by the UN Integration Steering Group in November 2011.

From 2010–2012, other Security Council discussions on peacebuilding, consent, and benchmarking have also referred to the issue of transitions. One such discussion was the 2011 Security Council interactive informal consultation on peacekeeping operations, which focused on the Security Council's role in mandating peacekeepers to support peacebuilding objectives.[6] Another was the Security Council debate on February 17, 2011, under the Brazilian presidency, which addressed a range of issues related to managing the consent of host countries that have peacekeeping missions, including the legal, political, and operational implications of qualified consent by host nations.[7]

In addition to the Security Council itself, the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations (SCWG) has also addressed the issue of peacekeeping transitions throughout the last three years and under three consecutive chairmanships.[8] Japan chose "transitional strategies" as its theme on October 22, 2010, and invited members of the UN Secretariat to brief on the UN mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT) as an example of a mission in a transition phase. On June 13, 2011, Nigeria took over as chair of the working group, and the SCWG held a meeting on "Peacekeeping Transitions and Peacebuilding." The various DPKO initiatives in this area were presented and discussed, including lessons learned (from the Division for Policy, Evaluation and Training), the Early Peacebuilding Strategy (from the Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions), and the development of guidance on transitions for missions. In early 2012, Morocco took over as chair of the working group, and the SCWG again held a meeting on transitions from peacekeeping to peacebuilding on March 23, 2012.

Scope of Security Council Discussions and Positions of Member States

France led one of the first attempts by a Security Council member to frame the issue of transitions in the background concept paper it circulated on February 3, 2010. As noted above, this paper informed the Security Council debate of February 12th, and it invited participants in this debate to examine the obstacles that hinder exit and transition strategies. It further suggested that participants make recommendations regarding the following topics:

- drafting of mandates (with a clear mention of transition and exit strategies);
- planning (including desired objective, key tasks, and phased completion of the mission);
- capacities and resources (in particular for security-sector reform);
- coordination of international action in the field;
- political support for peace processes (within the council and elsewhere); and
- processes (benchmarks, modalities for reporting to the council on progress, and evaluation).

The resulting statement by the president of the Security Council put peacebuilding at the center of the discussions on transitions. It stated that the overarching objective of peacekeeping missions should be to achieve success by creating the conditions for sustainable peace on the ground, thereby allowing for reconfiguration or withdrawal. It noted an advanced peace process as an important factor in this context. The statement also reiterated the urgency of improving UN peacebuilding efforts and achieving a coordinated United Nations approach in-country as well as the importance of national ownership, constructive dialogue, and partnership between national authorities and the international community in helping to address priority peacebuilding needs and the underlying

---

6   This discussion was based on questions derived from the November 2011 meeting of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations.

7   Brazil, as council president, had earlier circulated a concept note on this issue.

8   The Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations is a forum initially created in 2001, in which the relevant council member personnel can informally discuss a variety of issues related to peacekeeping. Although constituted by the Security Council, the working group is allowed—and makes it a habit—to invite any other relevant participants to its meetings. In recent years, these have included more than thirty countries and organizations, including troop- and police-contributing countries, members of the Bureau of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34), representatives of regional organizations, financial contributors, host countries, and field-based UN officials.

causes of recurring instability.

Member states made a number of suggestions for improving transitions during three of the most important discussions on the topic—the Security Council debates on February 12 and November 3, 2010, and the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping's discussion on June 13, 2011. In brief, council members called for five key elements to ensure successful transitions.

- **Clear mandates**

  Council members called for clear and situation-specific peacekeeping mandates that articulate a desired outcome and benchmarks based on progress that can be easily monitored by the council (PRST). This reflects the need to create favorable conditions for sustainable peace prior to withdrawal (Austria, Japan, and Uganda). A shared vision of what constitutes success and what should be the end state of a mission was considered essential; security should not be the only benchmark of peace and stability (Turkey).

- **Early peacebuilding**

  A need to ensure peacebuilding tasks are implemented as early as possible in a peacekeeping operation was expressed by council members (Russia, Turkey, Uganda, and UK) and some members of the SCWG (Brazil and Morocco). In addition, it was suggested that some socioeconomic dimensions of conflict should be considered from the onset. However, member states seemed to differ on who should be responsible for different kinds of peacebuilding. While some argued peacebuilding should be the objective from the outset of the peacekeeping mission (Turkey and UK), others argued peacekeepers should only be given initial recovery duties, while UN specialized agencies, regional and subregional organizations, and the donor community should be more actively involved in peacebuilding processes and interventions of a purely socioeconomic nature (Russia). Related to this debate is the need to address the issue of timelines (African Union).

- **A focus on national capacity**

  Strengthening of national capacities, on which a successful exit strategy depends, does not receive sufficient and sustained support (China and Nigeria). This links to discussions on the importance of local and national ownership of

peacebuilding (European Union) and transition processes to ensure that national actors have the capacity to take over security responsibilities (Nigeria).

- **Strengthened partnerships**

  Council members further called for UN actors to strengthen partnerships with regional and subregional organizations (Austria and Uganda).

- **An integrated approach**

  UN integration can facilitate transitions, and peacekeeping exit strategies must be coordinated with the wider United Nations presence on the ground in a coherent manner (Brazil). There is a need to further look at lessons learned from transitions from peacekeeping to integrated peacebuilding offices (PRST). The SCWG also suggested a stronger involvement of the Peacebuilding Commission in the council's deliberation and highlighted the need for greater coherence among peacebuilding actors (Brazil, Canada, Egypt, Morocco, and Pakistan).

Conclusion

In light of the various peacekeeping missions in Côte d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Haiti, and Liberia that are expected to draw down or to reconfigure in the near future, transitions are likely to remain high on the agenda of the Security Council. The issue will also likely continue to be discussed in the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations, which Morocco will chair through 2013, having previously co-chaired the General Assembly's Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations (C-34) with Canada. Although France initiated the peacekeeping debate on transition and exit strategies in 2010, it chose to address the protection of civilians during the first quarterly meeting of the Security Council under its 2011 presidency. As a consequence, transitions were only discussed in the SCWG and not in the Security Council in 2011. Under the UK presidency, however, transitions were again discussed during the council's thematic debate on peacekeeping on March 26, 2012.

With Pakistan and Morocco joining India and South Africa as elected members of the council in 2012, the views and concerns of both troop-contributing countries and the Non-Aligned

Movement (NAM) will continue to be heard in peacekeeping debates. Common among these elected members is a desire for more realistic mandates, well-resourced missions, and better consultation with troop- and police-contributing countries (TCCs/PCCs). The issue of the cost of peacekeeping has been exacerbated by the global financial crisis and the continued high demand for peacekeepers. The tension between financial contributors wanting to reduce overall peacekeeping budgets and troop-contributing countries advocating for higher troop reimbursement rates is likely to continue throughout 2012 and beyond.[9]

There is a risk that debates on peacekeeping transitions end up being contaminated by the bitter financial divide, as was the work of the C-34 in February 2012. The establishment of a Senior Advisory Group on Peacekeeping Operations by the UN Secretary-General could, however, help in this matter, as it was specifically tasked to look at the issue of troop reimbursements.[10] If peacekeeping is to lay the groundwork for peacebuilding, debates on transitions will need to focus on where and when peacekeeping is the appropriate tool, and where and when other tools may be more appropriate, instead of focusing on benchmarks and the cost implications of drawdowns. Based on such an assessment, peacekeeping missions should then be financed accordingly.

Another risk is that thematic debates addressing peacekeeping transitions become increasingly disconnected from the practice of the Security Council (for an overview of council decisions on a variety of transition cases, see the annex below). However, the issue of peacekeeping transitions has increasingly been folded into discussions on the linkages between peacekeeping and peacebuilding. And this is of particular relevance to council decisions since the peacebuilding tasks needed to create the conditions for sustainable peace also allow for the successful reconfiguration or withdrawal of UN peacekeeping missions.

Finally, discussions on transitions present the opportunity to address the growing mismatch between ambitious mandates given by the Security Council, limited financial resources, and high expectations of UN missions on the part of host-country governments and societies. Such discussions would further gain from including host countries and addressing key issues around transitions, such as what will be expected from the UN presence and what will be expected from other actors, including host-country authorities, donors and regional organizations. These discussions would ideally start early on in the life of a UN mission rather than at its dusk, as they would help build partnerships, manage expectations, and monitor the consent of the host country, while also developing transition sustainability plans that are developed and owned by all those involved.

---

9   Security Council Report, "Monthly Forecast: March 2012," February 29, 2012.
10   The release of the Senior Advisory Group's report has now been delayed until fall 2012.

Annex

Overview of Security Council Decisions
in Past Transition Cases

Burundi

FROM PEACEKEEPING OPERATION TO PEACE CONSOLIDATON

In November 2005, following a seventeen-month peacekeeping mission under the United Nations Operation in Burundi (ONUB), the democratically elected government of Burundi requested that the United Nations draw down the peacekeeping component from its ONUB operation. The observation section of the Secretary-General's March 2006 report noted that "the plan to withdraw ONUB from Burundi by 31 December 2006…has been developed in consultation with the Government" and that "the initial tasks of ONUB have been completed, and priorities for support should now start shifting as the peace process moves forward."[11]

In March 2006, DPKO tasked ONUB with sounding out the views of the UN country team in Burundi on the nature of the United Nations presence additional to the country team that would be required to consolidate the gains and maintain the momentum of peacebuilding in Burundi after January 1, 2007. A strong consensus emerged concerning the need for a follow-on structure that could sustain an adequate level of delivery in the areas of human rights, transitional justice, security-sector reform, and peace and governance.

The Secretary-General recommended the establishment of an integrated office to the Security Council. The new United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi, or BINUB, would serve as a mechanism for bringing a coherent and coordinated UN response to peace consolidation priorities identified together with the government of Burundi for 2007–2008.[12] This interim arrangement allowed for a smooth transition from peacekeeping to a more development-focused engagement by the UN. BINUB ultimately lasted until December 2010, at which time it was replaced by a small political office, the United Nations Office in Burundi (BNUB).

Chad

WITHDRAWAL OF MINURCAT

The UN mission in Chad, known as MINURCAT, was first authorized by the Security Council against the recommendation of the UN Secretariat and DPKO in particular, according to two assessment missions conducted in 2007.[13] It was also authorized "in the framework of tenuous host-Government consent."[14] When, in January 2010, the government of Chad asked to discuss the modalities of the withdrawal of the mission, the benchmarks proposed by the Secretary-General and endorsed by the Security Council in Resolution 1861 for the exit of MINURCAT had not been met. A new set of benchmarks were set out in Security Council Resolution 1923 to measure the government's ability to meet its "protection of civilians" commitments.[15] Similarly, when presented with the negotiated aide-mémoire aimed at a progressive transfer of protection of civilians responsibilities to the Chadian government over a longer period of time, the Security Council did not approve the phased withdrawal over a year (through May 2011), but instead decided to close the mission by December 31, 2010.[6] Although this prevented further discussion of a post-MINURCAT UN

---

11 United Nations Secretary-General, *Sixth Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Operation in Burundi*, UN Doc. S/2006/163, March 14, 2006.

12 Ženja Bašagic, "UN Integration in Burundi in the Context of the Peacebuilding Office BINUB: Taking Stock and Lessons Learned from June 2006 to November 2007," BINUB, February 2008.

13 United Nations Secretary-General, *Report of the Secretary-General on Chad and the Central African Republic*, UN Doc. S/2006/1019, December 22, 2006, and *Report of the Secretary-General on Chad and the Central African Republic*, UN Doc. S/2007/97, February 23, 2007.

14 See the "lessons learned" section of *Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad*, UN Doc. S/2010/611, December 1, 2010.

15 Ian Johnstone, "Peacekeeping's Transitional Moment," in *Annual Review of Global Peace Operations 2011* (New York: Center on International Cooperation, 2011).

16 UN Security Council Resolution 1923 (May 25, 2010), UN Doc. S/RES/1923.

peacebuilding presence, MINURCAT was able to transfer most of its activities to the UN country team in Chad, including the operation of the UN trust fund in support of the security force known as the Détachement Intégré de Sécurité (DIS). This was then taken over by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), and it continued to receive some donor funding as the government progressively took ownership of this special Chadian gendarmerie unit created with the support of MINURCAT.[17]

Democratic Republic of the Congo

FROM PEACEKEEPING MISSION TO STABILIZATION MISSION

In November 2009, President Joseph Kabila of the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) publicly called for the UN peacekeepers to start withdrawing ahead of the DRC's fiftieth anniversary of independence in June 2010. He argued that the stability of the DRC had largely improved since most former rebels had integrated into the national army and Kinshasa and Kigali had agreed to dismantle the remaining militias in the Kivu area. The UN Security Council resisted the call to close down the peacekeeping mission on the basis that more than 1.5 million people were still displaced because of insecurity in eastern DRC.

An agreement was eventually reached to keep the UN mission in the DRC. The United Nations Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, MONUC,[18] would now become the United Nations stabilization mission, MONUSCO. Under a completely reworked mandate, benchmarks were set to determine whether conditions on the ground are favorable to further draw down the UN mission. Security Council Resolution 1925 also envisages that the Congolese authorities and the UN jointly assess these conditions, including the ambitious benchmarks of "the completion of the ongoing military operations in the Kivus and Orientale

Province" and "an improved capacity of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to effectively protect the population through the establishment of sustainable security forces with a view to progressively take over MONUSCO's security role."[19]

Ethiopia and Eritrea

TERMINATION OF UNMEE

On July 30, 2008, the Security Council terminated the mandate of the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE), not because the mandate had been fully implemented, but because it was judged too difficult to implement. Eritrea withdrew its consent after key parts of the independent Eritrea-Ethiopia Boundary Commission (EEBC) ruling were rejected by Ethiopia, but in reality Eritrea saw the UN as incapable of upholding the EEBC ruling.

UNMEE is a historic case in that although the Security Council itself did not engage with Eritrea, the authority of the Security Council Working Group on Peacekeeping Operations with regard to peacekeeping issues provided the justification for Japan's permanent representative to the United Nations to engage in diplomatic efforts to calm a tense situation. Although in the long run these efforts could not produce a sustainable resolution of the situation, the episode did highlight the working group's potential to act as an "advanced guard" for the council as a whole.[20]

Liberia

GRADUAL DRAWDOWN OF UNMIL

In September 2011 the Security Council extended the mandate of the United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) by one year, calling on the government of Liberia and UNMIL to "continue to make progress in the transition planning process, particularly in addressing critical gaps that need to be filled in order to facilitate a successful transition."[21] A UN technical assessment mission

---

17 Alexandra Novosseloff and Richard Gowan "Security Council Working Methods and UN Peace Operations: The Case of Chad and the Central African Republic, 2006-2010," New York: Center on International Cooperation, April 2012.

18 The UN peacekeeping mission in the DRC (MONUC) was first authorized on February 24, 2000, in UN Security Council Resolution 1291, UN Doc. S/RES/1291.

19 UN Security Council Resolution 1925 (May 28, 2010), UN Doc. S/RES/1925, points 6 and 7.

20 Richard Gowan with Teresa Whitfield, "Security Council Working Methods and UN Peace Operations: The Case of UNMEE," New York: Center on International Cooperation, January 2011.

21 UN Security Council Resolution 2008 (September 16, 2011), UN Doc. S/RES/2008.

deployed to Liberia in February 2012 led to the Secretary-General recommending "a gradual reduction of UNMIL by approximately 4,200 troops in three phases between 2012 and 2015, leaving thereafter a residual presence of approximately 3,750 troops."[22]

Security Council Resolution 1938 of September 2010 had already encouraged UNMIL and the government of Liberia to continue to plan the transition until the completion of the mission and to draw up a plan for the transfer of responsibility for internal security to national authorities. While the government of Liberia has been reluctant to see the mission depart, and many council members feel that progress could be compromised unless there is a gradual and carefully executed exit strategy based on Liberia's needs rather than a set timeline, some members have expressed concern that Liberia could become overly dependent on UNMIL. In that context, the Peacebuilding Commission is also in the process of identifying its role and ways to best contribute to a transition to peacebuilding and an eventual withdrawal of the peacekeeping mission by developing a statement of mutual commitments on peacebuilding in Liberia.[23] Particular emphasis is likely to be placed on assistance to security-sector reform as a critical element for a future handover of security responsibilities from peacekeepers to national security institutions.

Timor-Leste

FROM UN TRANSITIONAL AUTHORITY TO NATIONAL LEADERSHIP

In 1999, following the Timorese vote for independence, the Security Council mandated the UN Transitional Authority in East Timor (UNTAET) to administer the state pending the creation of sustainable Timorese institutions to which authority could be transferred. UNTAET's mandate ended in May 2002 with the handover of executive authority to the Timorese government following presidential and parliamentary elections. The more modest UN Mission in Support of East Timor (UNMISET) took over. UNMISET was mandated

to provide assistance to Timor-Leste pending full devolution of operational responsibilities to the Timorese authorities. Three years after its establishment, UNMISET departed in May 2005, handing over to the UN Office in Timor-Leste (UNOTIL), a considerably smaller political mission.

The closure of the UNMISET was motivated in part by the Security Council's desire to focus resources elsewhere and in part by pressure from the Timorese leadership to allow national leaders to take over the reins of their country. In retrospect, the UN departed before the institutions and capacities were in place for an effective Timorese takeover, as evidenced in April and May 2006 when unresolved tensions within and between Timorese security institutions triggered a crisis that threatened the peace and stability of Timor-Leste. At the government's request, UN police and peacekeepers under the Australian-led International Stabilization Force deployed to Timor in June 2006 to reinstate security.[24]

REINSTATING SECURITY WITH UNMIT AND PLANNING FOR TRANSITION

The United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT)—a multidimensional, integrated UN peacekeeping operation—was established by Security Council Resolution 1704 of August 25, 2006, in the wake of the April–May 2006 crisis. It was mandated to support the government in "consolidating stability, enhancing a culture of democratic governance, and facilitating political dialogue among Timorese stakeholders."[25] The UN mission was authorized to include up to 1,608 police personnel but no military troops (the Australian-led International Stabilization Force provides security assistance).

Determined to avoid a repeat of the violence in 2006, and with the February 2008 assault on President Ramos-Horta and Prime Minister Gusmão in mind, national and international stakeholders in Timor-Leste have engaged in transition planning, guided by the four key areas outlined in the 2009 Medium Term Strategy:

1. review and reform of the security sector (the

22 United Nations Secretary-General, *Special Report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations Mission in Liberia*, UN Doc. S/2012/230, April 16, 2012.
23 Peacebuilding Commission, "Draft Statement of Mutual Commitments on Peacebuilding in Liberia," UN Doc. PBC/4/LBR/L.1, October 29, 2010.
24 Yoshino Funaki, "The UN and Security Sector Reform in Timor-Leste: A Widening Credibility Gap," New York: Center on International Cooperation, May 2009.
25 UN Security Council Resolution 1704 (August, 25 2006), UN Doc. S/RES/1704.

progressive handover of all policing responsi-
bilities to Timorese police by March 2011 was
perceived as a key driver in the pace of transi-
tion),

2. rule of law,

3. democratic governance, and

4. economic and social development.

In 2010, UNMIT and the government of Timor-
Leste established the joint High-Level Committee
on Transition, which in turn established seven joint
technical working groups to focus on key transition
activities. The government and UNMIT then
developed a joint transition plan that provides a
roadmap for the drawdown of UNMIT activities by
the end of 2012.[26]

---

26 Center on International Cooperation, "Transition Planning in Haiti: Reflections from Timor-Leste," meeting report following a half-day workshop on transition planning in New York on June 17, 2011.

The **INTERNATIONAL PEACE INSTITUTE (IPI)** is an independent, international not-for-profit think tank with a staff representing more than twenty nationalities, with offices in New York, facing United Nations headquarters, and in Vienna. IPI is dedicated to promoting the prevention and settlement of conflicts between and within states by strengthening international peace and security institutions. To achieve its purpose, IPI employs a mix of policy research, convening, publishing, and outreach.

IPI

**INTERNATIONAL
PEACE
INSTITUTE**