

**Deutscher Bundestag**

Ausschuss f. Menschenrechte u.  
humanitäre Hilfe  
Ausschussdrucksache

17(17)173

**The Committee for Human Rights and Humanitarian Aid of the German Bundestag Public Hearing on “UN Peacekeeping Missions” held on 24 October 2012 in Berlin.**

**Statement by Richard Bennett, Independent Expert, Director of the Human Rights Division, United Nations Mission in South Sudan and Representative of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in South Sudan.**

**Introduction**

This statement addresses in a global fashion a number of the questions posed in advance by members of the Committee. However, it is not exhaustive and the writer is willing to elaborate in person and to address other questions as requested by Committee members.

In general, the statement reviews the incorporation of human rights responsibilities in Security Council mandates, developments in implementation within multi-dimensional peace operations, as well as suggestions for improvements, including with integration of human rights in these missions. It also addresses some of the conflicts and dilemmas faced in peace operations while promoting and protecting human rights.

In a nutshell, the statement concludes that Security Council mandates have become more detailed and robust on human rights matters and that the OHCHR-DPKO-DPA-DFS<sup>1</sup> Policy on Human Rights in Peace Operations and Political Missions is a valuable tool for their implementation. However, an increase in political will, senior mission leaders’ accountability and resources will be necessary if the human rights approach to peacekeeping is to reach its potential which would have benefits for sustainable peace and security with justice and economic development.

The views expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the position of UNMISS or the United Nations.

**The Evolution of Human Rights Mandates for UN Peace Operations**

Over time, the mandates of peacekeeping operations have become both more detailed and more robust. Human rights elements of the mandates have exemplified this trend by developing from a general area of work within peacekeeping operations to a series of specific functions. At the

---

<sup>1</sup> Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights-Department of Peacekeeping Operations-Department of Political Affairs-Department of Field Support.

same time, human rights has become a cross-cutting theme throughout the mandate of a peacekeeping operation and is not relegated to a specific component or narrow set of tasks. The concept of human rights is now regularly extended to areas such as protection of civilians, women's and children's rights, and conflict-related sexual violence which are deemed priorities by the Security Council. Across all peacekeeping operations active today, the promotion and protection of human rights is the most prevalent mandate component. In my experience in peacekeeping operations, from Sierra Leone in 1999-2001, to Afghanistan in 2003-07, to South Sudan from 2011 to the present,<sup>2</sup> I have witnessed the strengthening of human rights mandates and mainstreaming of human rights promotion and protection as the UN has increasingly recognized that gross human rights violations are both a contributor to conflict and a consequence of it, and that sustainable peace requires a commitment to justice and human rights. I will briefly review this trajectory through the mandates of the above peacekeeping operations.

Established in 1999, the mandate of the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) was one of the first to include a human rights element. At the time it was considered progressive but by today's standards it was fairly limited. The only explicitly human rights-related task of the mission was to "support the operations of United Nations . . . human rights officers" (SCR 1270, OP 8(h)). To this end, the mandate noted the importance of personnel with appropriate human rights training and expertise (OP 15). The mandate also "stress[ed] the urgent need . . . to foster accountability and respect for human rights in Sierra Leone" (OP 17) and called on all parties to "respect strictly the relevant provisions of international humanitarian and human rights law" (OP 22). The renewal of the UNAMSIL mandate in 2000 reiterated the need to foster accountability and respect for human rights (SCR 1289, OP 17) while noting with concern the continuing human rights violations against civilians (OP 5) and, as a result, including a more explicit protection of civilians mandate for UNAMSIL (OP 10). In my time with UNAMSIL, however, the human rights mandate was not explicitly expansive or cross-cutting.

The United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) was first established in 2002 (SCR 1401, referencing Secretary-General's Report, S/2002/278) to fulfill the tasks and responsibilities entrusted to the United Nations in the Bonn Agreement. In the area of human rights, these particularly focused on supporting the establishment of an independent national Human Rights Commission (S/2002/278, OP 41). The Mission was also particularly mandated to monitor and report on the human rights situation, as well as investigate violations and recommend corrective action (S/2002/278, OP 104 (a) and (g)). I joined UNAMA in 2003 and by 2006, the Mission's mandate called for full respect for human rights throughout Afghanistan and tasked the Mission to "assist in the full implementation of the human rights provisions of the Afghan constitution and international treaties to which Afghanistan is a State party", with a priority on women's rights (SCR 1662, OP 12). Reiterating the same language, the mandate renewal in 2007 also called for UNAMA "to continue to contribute to human rights protection and promotion, including monitoring of the situation of civilians in armed conflict" (SCR 1746, OP 4). Thus, UNAMA encompassed a broader and more explicit human rights mandate than UNAMSIL, including building the national human rights capacity; monitoring, reporting and investigating; and assisting in implementing human rights law.

---

<sup>2</sup> The writer also served in UNTAET and UNMISSET before and after independence in East Timor but these mandates are not reviewed in this statement.

The United Nations Mission in South Sudan (UNMISS), established in 2011, has an even broader and more robust human rights mandate, and has developed considerably from its predecessor mission, the United Nations Mission in Sudan. The founding UNMISS mandate included capacity-building, particularly in the rule of law and security sectors, as well as supporting the development of strategies for human rights capacities and institutions (SCR 1996, OP 3(c)). Noting the need for “technical human rights investigation expertise” (OP 1), the resolution also includes a strong mandate for “[m]onitoring, investigating, verifying, and reporting regularly on human rights and potential threats against the civilian population as well as actual and potential violations of international humanitarian and human rights law . . . bringing these to the attention of the authorities as necessary, and immediately reporting gross violations of human rights to the UN Security Council” (OP 3(b)). These two areas of work – capacity-building and monitoring, investigating and reporting – form the core of the UNMISS human rights mandate. They are combined with a strong protection of civilians mandate both to advise and assist the Government in its responsibilities to protect and to independently protect civilians where the Government does not (OP 3(b)(iv-v)). The UNMISS mandate further directs the Mission to advise and assist the Government to uphold human rights by ratifying and implementing human rights treaties and conventions (OP 11); combating impunity and holding human rights perpetrators accountable (OP 13); and ending prolonged, arbitrary detention and establishing safe, secure and humane prison conditions (OP 14). Finally, UNMISS has a strong mandate to address conflict-related sexual violence through the appointment of women protection advisors to monitor and report on such issues (OP 24). The mandate renewal in 2012 reiterated all these areas of human rights concerns and efforts and further emphasized the protection of civilians (SCR 2057).

Other missions contemporary to UNMISS, such as UNOCI, MINUSTAH, and MONUSCO, likewise have broad, explicit human rights mandates. These include elements of promotion and protection of human rights; monitoring and reporting on violations; and ensuring accountability, fighting impunity, and bringing perpetrators to justice. The mandate language also directs attention to vulnerable groups, primarily women and children but also returned refugees and IDPs, as well focuses on sexual and gender-based violence.

This evolution throughout my career in human rights in peacekeeping operations demonstrates that as mandates of peacekeeping operations have expanded and become both more detailed and more robust generally, human rights has been one of the primary beneficiaries. Promoting and protecting human rights is central to the role of many of today’s peacekeeping operations, both as a specific area of work and as a mainstreamed approach to all peacekeeping activities and goals.

Whether these stronger mandates are being implemented effectively on the ground and what needs to be done to improve implementation is the subject of the next part of my presentation.

### **Policy on Human Rights in UN Peace Operations and Political Missions**

In 2011, OHCHR, DPKO, DPA and DFS concluded a policy on human rights in UN peace operations and special political missions. This landmark document incorporates in a single binding document all existing policies and practices on human rights integration in peacekeeping contexts and sets out an operational framework. The policy is the result of integration arrangements among OHCHR, DPKO, DPA and DFS by which OHCHR opted for structural

inclusion of human rights components in peace missions instead of establishing separate OHCHR field offices. The policy provides guidance on the mainstreaming and prioritization of human rights throughout the work of DPKO and DPA missions, as well as administrative policies and procedures to ensure effective implementation.<sup>3</sup> The policy applies to all staff planning, overseeing and implementing the work of UN peace operations. Compliance with the policy is mandatory for all UN personnel, in particular senior mission leadership.<sup>4</sup>

In my view the policy is a valuable tool and adherence to it would undoubtedly reinforce the centrality and effectiveness of human rights in peace operations. Its point of departure is the indivisibility of peace and justice, noting that many of the worst human rights violations and abuses are at the root of conflict situations and impunity fuels new cycles of violence. Thus protection and promotion of human rights and protection of civilians under imminent threat of physical violence, in particular the protection of vulnerable civilian populations, including women and children, are essential elements of UN efforts to prevent conflicts, achieve and maintain peace and assist post-conflict reconstruction efforts.

The policy provides detailed guidance flowing from the Secretary-General's decision to fully integrate human rights in UN peace operations to maximize UN actions to address the human rights dimensions of conflicts and build a foundation for sustainable peace. In addition to providing direction to field operations, the policy also guides cooperation at UN headquarters level including with regard to mandates, mission planning, early deployment and, in the later stages of a mission, transition, drawdown and follow up strategies. It is required that all components of a mission - civilian, military and police - should respect international human rights standards and integrate human rights into their work. The policy explicitly requires that mission personnel must not become perpetrators of human rights abuses or be complicit in them.

It is the responsibility of the Head of Mission (HOM) to deliver on the missions' human rights mandate and uphold international human rights law in the delivery of the overall mission's mandate. In this regard, in order to ensure the adequate level of commitment to human rights in mandate delivery, a minimum commitment and understanding of human rights competency should be required in the selection of HOMs, their deputies, Force Commanders and Police Commissioners. It should also be part of their performance evaluations as required by the Policy, a provision which is rarely implemented. This leadership responsibility cannot be overemphasized. It is a key area where missions succeed or fail with regard to their mandated human rights responsibilities. The selection process for HOMs should take into account the candidates' capacity and commitment to fulfill the mission's human rights mandate and obligations. Equally, HOM's performance in terms of human rights indicators should be

---

<sup>3</sup> These include the Decision of the Secretary-General on Human Rights in Integrated Missions (2005/24); the Note of the Secretary-General on Guidance on Integrated Missions; the Decision of the Secretary-General on Rule of Law (2006/47); the Decision of the Secretary-General on Security Sector Reform (2011/1 and 2007/11); the United Nations Peacekeeping Operations Principles and Guidelines; the Decision of the Secretary-General on Human Rights and Development (2008/18); the Decision of the Secretary-General on Integration (2008/24); the OHCHR/DPKO/DPA Policy on Public Reporting by Human Rights Components of UN Peace Operations; the Guidelines on UN Strategic Assessment; the IMPP Guidelines: Role of the Headquarters – Integrated Planning for UN Field Presences; the IMPP Guidelines: Role of the Field – Integrated Planning for UN Field Presences; the Secretary-General's revised Guidelines for UN Representatives on Certain Aspects of Negotiations for Conflict Resolution; and the Guidance Note of the Secretary-General on UN Approach to Transitional Justice.

<sup>3</sup> This policy replaces the memorandum of Understanding between OHCHR and DPKO signed in 1999 and renewed in 2002.

<sup>4</sup> This policy replaces the memorandum of Understanding between OHCHR and DPKO signed in 1999 and renewed in 2002.

assessed. A good first step would be to ensure that the HCHR is consulted before HOMs are selected and that selection interviews include an assessment of their human rights understanding.<sup>5</sup> Similarly, an annual discussion between the HCHR and each HOM on the human rights achievements of the concerned mission, by videoconference if necessary, could be a useful and relatively non-bureaucratic means of engagement that would provide a measure of accountability in exchange for OHCHR agreement to be fully integrated within mission under HOM's leadership.

Heads of human rights components in peacekeeping missions are double-hatted. They are the principal advisor on human rights to the HOM and the Representative of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (HCHR) in the country. In the latter role they represent OHCHR on the UN Country Team and Humanitarian Country Team, along with other UN agencies, funds and programmes and distinct from the peace operation. Thus, heads of human rights components report both to the HOM (directly or through a Deputy HOM) and to the HCHR. It is essential, and required by the policy, that the head of a human rights component has effective direct access to the HOM and is part of all relevant decision, policy and strategy-making bodies of a mission. In many cases, however, Human Rights heads are not included in the most senior level of planning and decision-making within missions. HOMs sometimes justify this on the basis that they want a lean top-level decision-making team and including Human Rights heads will lead to other components (Political Affairs, Civil Affairs and so on) making similar claims. However, this disregards the point that human rights is a cross-cutting issue that touches almost every aspect of a multi-dimensional peace operation. Further it is not always predictable or obvious when human rights implications will arise so that inclusion in discussion on an 'as needs' basis is insufficient.

In an integrated peace operation, not only the human rights component but several other components contribute to the implementation of Security Council mandates on promotion and protection of human rights. The human rights component helps mainstream human rights across all mission activities and leads all the human rights-related work. Its overarching goal is to contribute to protection of human rights through both immediate and long-term action, to empower the population of the host country to claim their human rights and to enable State and other national institutions to fulfill their human rights obligations. I will not list all the activities undertaken but they typically include:

- Regular monitoring of the human rights situation, including the active collection, analysis and reporting of information with a view to verifying alleged human rights violations and abuses, promoting accountability informing preventive action and identifying longer term needs for reform and capacity development;
- Visiting sites such as places of detention, hospitals, IDP or refugee camps;
- Observing events such as demonstrations, trials and elections;
- Deploying human rights or multidisciplinary mobile teams to remote areas to collect information, undertake advocacy with authorities and non-state actors and engage with

---

<sup>5</sup> The HCHR is already consulted with regard to the selection of Resident and Humanitarian Coordinators but not yet heads of peacekeeping operations and political missions.

groups that are particularly vulnerable during and after conflict including women, children, the elderly, persons with disabilities, internally displaced persons and refugees;

- Analysing and formulating effective strategies to prevent and respond to sexual and gender-based violence; and
- Conducting in-depth investigations into serious human rights violations or emblematic cases, including mapping of systematic violations.

### Public and internal reporting

The human rights component's assessment of violations and the overall human rights situation leads to private interventions with national authorities and, where appropriate, public reporting and advocacy. Reporting plays an important role in contributing information to and engagement with member states and the Security Council. The more detailed and extensive mandates are helpful in this respect because not only is human rights reporting included in the Secretary-General's report to the Security Council but also specific reporting is required on matters such as Children Affected by Armed Conflict and Conflict Related Sexual Violence through the SRSGs on those matters. Reports also have immediate operational utility in that they provide analysis from the ground including early warning that should shape the mission's responses.

Public reports and statements are an essential tool for a mission's advocacy, in particular with the host government, and also through raising awareness among the national and international community about human rights concerns and potential remedies. In this regard the HOM and the HCHR are encouraged to coordinate so that the effectiveness of the advocacy is maximized. Missions should not be reluctant to speak out about human rights violations committed by state or non-state actors. At the same time, in some cases where the HOM is mindful of the need to maintain a particular relationship with the national authorities in order to achieve long-term mission objectives, a partnership with the HCHR can be helpful when issuing a public report or making a statement.

### Capacity building for national counterparts

An equally important role for human rights components is to work alongside host governments to strengthen their capacity to promote and protect human rights, for example by establishing or strengthening independent national human rights institutions or ratifying and reporting on international and regional human rights treaties. Human rights components also provide advice on legislative and institutional reforms, including harmonization of national laws with international standards, and contribute during the establishment or review of national constitutions. Support, in coordination with partners, for the establishment and implementation of laws, policies, institutions and practices that safeguard the rights of women and girls is a particular focus. Human Rights components also support efforts towards institutional reforms with a view to establishing the rule of law and ending impunity.

Capacity building therefore includes, but goes beyond, training with State authorities such as armed forces, law enforcement officials, judicial officials and so on, as well as promoting human rights awareness and education generally. Monitoring, assessment, reporting, advocacy, advice, training and awareness-raising form an integrated human rights agenda that aims to enhance respect for human rights through a peace operation and in concert with the UN Country Team and other partners.

Last but not least, civil society, among them human rights defenders, victims' groups and women's associations, as well as members of the media, are critical to the development of a robust human rights climate in any country. Human rights components must engage proactively and strategically with civil society if there is to be any chance of a sustainable commitment to human rights in a country emerging from conflict.

### **Conflicts and Tensions in Peacekeeping**

The tension between robust peacekeeping mandates and the principle that force only be used in self-defense has been ameliorated over the years by an expansion of principles guiding the use of force. While the use of force is still considered as a last resort, Chapter VII mandates, which are increasingly common, allow the use of force notably for the protection of civilians (which represents a subset of the overall human rights protection framework). By developing protection of civilian strategies, politically engaging on protection issues, adequately outlining the rules of engagement and properly training mission personnel, peacekeeping operations can thereby implement robust mandates with the minimal but necessary amount of force.

Similarly, the mandated tasks of "extending state authority" and "protecting civilians" can be seen as in conflict, but are not necessarily so. Indeed, even in missions with strong PoC mandates, the primary responsibility for the protection of civilians remains with the State and the main aim of the mission is to assist the State to fulfill its responsibilities (other than where the peacekeeping operation serves as a transitional authority). Therefore, peacekeeping operations first and foremost seek to prevent and reduce threats to civilian populations from armed conflict and violence *by* building the capacity of the State. This is accomplished in part through capacity-building efforts directed towards the security forces, in particular training and mentoring on protection and human rights. Peacekeeping operations can also assist logistically to extend state authority in order to facilitate the State exercising its protection responsibilities. Increased emphasis on early warning can also prevent conflict and thereby mitigate the need for protection of civilians. To this end, human rights indicators are key; by fielding human rights officers in conflict-prone hotspots to monitor and report on the human rights situation, peacekeeping operations are better equipped for political engagement on protection issues before a crisis hits. Human rights inputs contribute to advocacy by mission leadership to prevent situations where State actions lead to the need for protection of civilians.

Only when the State is unwilling or unable to protect civilians should the peacekeeping operation act independently to prevent harm to civilians.

The conflict, then, between the mandated tasks of "extending state authority" and "protecting civilians" arises primarily where some State organs are a threat to civilians. The ability to politically engage the State at the highest levels on its protection responsibilities, combined with the unique ability to use force and provide physical protection, give peacekeeping operations a comparative advantage. . . However, where there is no opportunity for engagement with the State to encourage it to fulfill its responsibilities towards the civilian population because the State itself poses the threat, the peacekeeping operation has a duty to protect civilians, within its resources and capabilities. In accordance with the peacekeeping operations' Rules of Engagement, intervening in a conflict to protect civilians should generally only occur after all other measures have failed and as a last resort.

An intermediate and perhaps more common scenario occurs where one or more elements of the State's forces threatens or violates civilians and are unable to be reined in. Some national armies – South Sudan where I am working at present is an example – have absorbed militias who are more or less untrained and ill-disciplined. There is therefore a lack of command and control and this, combined with poor infrastructure and communications, and a large territory, can result in situations where 'renegade' elements of the State's forces can create havoc. *In extremis* peacekeepers may find themselves needing to use force to protect civilians in such a scenario.

### Human rights due diligence policy

One tool developed to assist in managing the delicate balance between extending state authority and protecting civilians is the United Nations Human Rights Due Diligence Policy (HRDDP) (2011), which governs UN support to non-UN security forces.<sup>6</sup> The foundational principle of this policy is that "UN support cannot be provided where there are substantial grounds for believing there is a real risk of the receiving entities committing grave violations of international humanitarian, human rights, or refugee law and where the relevant authorities fail to take the necessary corrective or mitigating measures." In order to meet these standards, before providing support to non-UN security forces, the UN must pursue a due diligence policy including: a risk assessment, considering the likelihood of violations being committed by the recipients of the support; transparency with the recipients of the legal obligations and principles tied to the support; and development of an effective implementation framework, including procedures for monitoring compliance and guidance for intervention and suspension or withdrawal of support. If support is extended and the UN receives reliable evidence that there are substantial grounds to believe that violations are being committed by recipients of UN support, the UN must intervene with the authorities to bring the violations to an end, and if unsuccessful, must suspend or withdraw support. Although the HRDDP has only begun to be rolled out since late 2011, it has great potential for providing a framework and guidance for the work of peacekeeping operations, particularly those mandated to protect civilians. UNMISS is one of the first peacekeeping operations to endeavor to implement the HRDDP and there will be much to learn from the process.

### Matching mandates with resources

Broader and stronger human rights mandates issued by the Security Council are often not being matched with adequate resources. At mission level a continuing lack of sufficient priority being accorded human rights has resulted in allocation of resources being prioritized elsewhere resulting in an inability of the human rights component to adequately carry out its functions, notably with regard to monitor and investigations which require specialized expertise, transport and sometimes security protection. As a result, human rights components are not always in a position to respond adequately to requests for reliable information on serious human rights incidents in a timely fashion. This hampers the ability of the mission to make interventions with the host government, provide member states with timely information and to act as early warning regarding protection threats.

---

<sup>6</sup> The Policy is not limited to peacekeeping operations, but governs *all* UN support to non-UN security forces, including support from agencies, funds, and programmes.



Insufficient resources have also been provided to headquarters to provide the backstopping needed for human rights work in peace operations. Indeed, to date OHCHR is not benefitting from any resources coming from the Peacekeeping Support Account (PKSA) which was created by the Secretary-General in 1990 to fund headquarters backstopping peacekeeping operations. In 2012/13, the PKSA amounted to 292 million USD and was used to fund 1,259 posts at HQ, including: OIOS (97 posts); the Ombudsman (7 posts); OLA (15 posts); Dept. of Management (242). But no posts were allotted to OHCHR despite its support to close to 900 human rights staff in peace missions. As a result, OHCHR has financed its support solely out of OHCHR regular budget and extra-budgetary contributions, which has remained limited to 5 dedicated posts at HQ.

This year, OHCHR has submitted a request for some 15 posts to the support account to ensure that headquarter can provide the field with the adequate guidance and operational support they require to deliver on their important mandates.

## **Observations and Recommendations**

**Accountability of mission leadership for human rights performance:** The OHCHR-DPKO-DPA-DFS policy provides incentives for peace operations to effectively integrate human rights into all relevant activities. For example, the performance of HOMs and other principals within the mission is required to be assessed against human rights commitments and achievements. The outcome of these assessments should feed into work plans for the following year. OHCHR

**Strategic, policy and operational planning and decision-making:** While according to policy heads of Human Rights components must be part of a mission leadership team and participate in major decisions, it is not clear this is followed consistently and completely. . For example, UNMISS has a Human Rights Division headed by a Director at equivalent seniority with, for example, the Force Commander and Police Commissioner. However, unlike the Force Commander and Police Commissioner the Human Rights Director is not automatically at the table when mission-wide decisions are made and is called upon on a case by case basis when matters considered relevant are being decided. The justification given for this is structural. The top level decision making meeting consists of principals and the Human Rights Division reports through a DSRSG to the SRSG. However, given the broad and cross-cutting ambit of human rights, there is an argument that the Human Rights Director should be a full participant in all discussions at this level.

**Reporting:** In my view it is desirable that heads of Human Rights components should report to the SRSG directly. Reporting through a Deputy SRSG (DSRSG) could be acceptable provided Human Rights is a major component of that pillar (that is, not just one among several others) and all the other elements of the OHCHR-DPKO-DPA-DFS policy on human rights in peace operations are respected. For example, a pillar dedicated to Human Rights and Rule of Law would be acceptable as is the case in, for example, MONUSCO. A pillar that includes multiple components with human rights as one among many is less likely to give sufficient emphasis to human rights. Although this can be mitigated to some degree with a strong mandate

and a highly motivated HOM or deputy, in this situation it is preferable for Human Rights to report directly to the SRSG.

**Mission structure:** In a typical mission there are two pillars. One of them tends to focus more on political matters while the other focuses more on humanitarian and development issues. If the Human Rights component is located in a pillar (rather than reporting directly to the SRSG) OHCHR prefers it to be the political pillar. It is considered that analysis and advocacy is better suited to the political side of the house and the capacity to influence may be greater. However, at times this placement can separate human rights from some or all of its natural partners such as gender and child protection. In UNAMA, for example, the Gender section was in the humanitarian pillar, as was the Rule of Law section. I consider that a closer partnership with Human Rights would have resulted in Gender and Rule of Law having more impact. Notwithstanding that integration should cut across pillars, the fact remains that when components with allied functions have different reporting lines the opportunities for cohesion are affected. In UNMISS both Gender and Child Protection are in the humanitarian pillar while Human Rights and Rule of Law are in the political pillar.<sup>7</sup> One option to solve these challenges of cross-cutting work could be to cluster functions related to human rights in a third pillar, a notion that has been considered in the past but has not been taken up thus far. Under such an arrangement it is suggested there be a pillar dedicated to Human Rights and the Rule of Law. Human rights should also encompass gender, women's protection and child protection units where they exist.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, in 2012, human rights mandates for UN peace operations are generally satisfactory. This illustrates that the Security Council is taking the role of human rights in post-conflict situations seriously, with an expectation that peace operations report extensively on the human rights situation. A policy was adopted a year ago by the relevant UN departments that provide detailed guidance on the implementation of human rights mandates. It is a very good tool and its full implementation, which is not yet complete, is strongly encouraged. In particular, further attention to an understanding of and commitment to human rights, together with the capacity to give human rights the necessary profile during the selection of the leadership of peace operations is desirable. This should be followed up with regular assessments of performance. Within missions, human rights components should be given the necessary resources and support to do their work and the heads should be included in all mission decision making processes and the highest level, including strategic planning, budgeting and operational matters. If these actions are undertaken, human rights mandates will be more effectively implemented than at present with consequent benefits for UN peace operations and the countries that should benefit from them.

---

<sup>7</sup> Recently a new function, Women's Protection Officers, have been added and these have been placed largely within the Human Rights Division in the political pillar, though some are also based in Gender in the humanitarian pillar.