

Chapter 25

National Peacekeeping Institution

25.1 Throughout this report, the committee has made frequent mention of the need for a whole-of-government and whole-of-nation approach to peacekeeping operations at strategic and operational levels. Given the increased number and scope of these operations, some submitters and witnesses recommended that a peacekeeping institute be established in Australia.

25.2 In this chapter, the committee assesses the advantages of establishing a peacekeeping institute in Australia. It draws together the evidence of previous chapters and considers some of the major peacekeeping centres in the world. Finally, the committee concludes by making some recommendations on how a future Australian peacekeeping institute may be constituted.

Current situation in Australia

25.3 Australia has yet to establish a comprehensive or centralised peacekeeping operations centre. As discussed in previous chapters, training, doctrine formulation and evaluation are predominantly done through existing departments and organisations. These include the ADF's Peacekeeping Centre (as discussed in Chapter 9), the AFP's International Deployment Group (Chapter 10) and AusAID's Fragile States Unit (Chapter 13). The committee also noted the coordinating and training activities undertaken by the NGO and university sectors.

25.4 The ADF Peacekeeping Centre (ADFPKC) was established in 1993 as part of the ADF Warfare Centre (ADFWC) at the RAAF Base in Williamstown.¹ As noted in Chapter 9, it currently operates with a staff of two to four, and conducts the annual International Peacekeeping Operations Seminar (IPOS). The centre also monitors international peacekeeping issues and contributes to the development of peacekeeping doctrine.² However, citing its limited capacity, Major General Smith suggested to the committee that Defence were wrong to identify it as a peacekeeping centre because it was more like an internal ADF unit 'of about three people'.³ Indeed, the committee has already drawn attention to the centre's limited capacity and lack of resources to fulfil its stated objectives.⁴

1 <http://www.defence.gov.au/adfwc/peacekeeping/> (accessed 20 August 2007); and Defence, answer to question on notice 1, 24 July 2007.

2 ADFPKC, About the Centre, <http://www.defence.gov.au/adfwc/peacekeeping/about.htm> (accessed 20 August 2007).

3 *Committee Hansard*, 6 September 2007, p. 29.

4 See Chapter 9, paragraphs 9.25–9.33.

25.5 Nevertheless, it should also be noted that Defence advised the committee that the Warfare Centre's operations, including those of the Peacekeeping Centre, may be contracted out. It is intended that the Peacekeeping Centre would retain its core responsibilities and that the existing staff would be supplemented by a contractor pool and reservists.⁵

25.6 The AFP's IDG is the central coordination point for the AFP's international deployments and is involved in training and preparedness. As noted in Chapter 10, evidence to this inquiry suggested that the AFP has been innovative in developing its peacekeeping capacity.

25.7 AusAID's Fragile States Unit (now Fragile States and Peacebuilding) analyses international experiences in relation to fragile states, particularly those in Australia's region. It has developed the government's understanding of conflict prevention and peacebuilding and helped to coordinate the various agencies involved in peacekeeping.⁶

25.8 The committee is also aware of a number of institutions, and projects being conducted, in Australia that are concerned with aspects of Australia's engagement in peacekeeping. The following list provides an indication of the work currently being undertaken in Australia:

- The AFP is collaborating with the University of Queensland in the *Framework for Performance Indicators in Australian Federal Police (AFP) Peace Operations* project to develop performance measures to assist in evaluating AFP contributions to peace and stability operations, and capacity development missions.⁷
- The AFP is also collaborating with the Flinders University and the Australian National University in an AFP and Australian Research Council (ARC) project *Policing the Neighbourhood* in which they aim to describe and analyse Australia's recent involvement in police assistance missions in Timor-Leste, Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea.⁸
- A team of researchers at the ANU, led by Professor John Braithwaite, has received ARC funding for a 20-year comparative peacebuilding project which will produce case studies of peacebuilding activities across the world.⁹
- The Centre for International Governance & Justice (CIGJ), ANU, has received funding for a project titled *Building Democracy and Justice after*

5 Defence, answer to written question on notice W20, 24 July 2007.

6 *Submission 26*, p. 8.

7 AFP, attachment to answer to question on notice 2, 25 July 2007.

8 Professor Goldsmith, *Committee Hansard*, 20 August 2008, pp. 47–48.

9 Braithwaite et al., Peacebuilding and Responsive Governance Project, Discussion Draft, http://peacebuilding.anu.edu.au/documents/Discussion_Draft.pdf (accessed 6 May 2008).

Conflict. The project, led by Professor Hilary Charlesworth, aims to advance thinking about building the structures for democracy and justice after conflict.¹⁰

- A consortium of universities, led by Professor Helen Ware, has received funding from the Carrick Institute for a one-year project titled *Professionalization of Peace Education through Wiki Networking & Innovative Teaching Methods*. It aims to develop a network of peace studies educators. The project involves personnel from the ADF, AFP, AusAID and CARITAS.¹¹
- An official history of Australia's peacekeeping has been commissioned. As outlined in Chapter 23, this project is led by Professor David Horner and funded by the Australian War Memorial.¹²
- As noted in previous chapters, the Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, University of Melbourne, trains Defence personnel in military law and promotes academic research into key issues, including international humanitarian law and law of peace operations.¹³
- The ADF Deployment Health Surveillance Program and the research being done on veterans' mental health by the Australian Centre for Posttraumatic Mental Health.
- The numerous institutions mentioned in Chapter 18 that provide language and cultural awareness training to government agencies.
- The various training programs run by NGOs, in particular the Australian Red Cross basic training courses for volunteers, and the work of RedR.

25.9 While these initiatives represent the efforts of individual agencies and organisations to respond to the changing nature of peacekeeping, the committee notes that no centralised capacity exists for doctrine development, research, evaluation and lessons learnt. The committee now turns to consider international examples where a centralised capacity has been established.

10 Dr Jeremy Farrall, *Committee Hansard*, 13 September 2007, p. 14.

11 Carrick Institute, Professionalization of Peace Education through Wiki Networking and Innovative Teaching Methods, http://www.carrickinstitute.edu.au/carrick/webdav/users/siteadmin/public/dbi_investigations_peacestudies_projectsummary.pdf (accessed 6 May 2008).

12 See for example, <http://www.awm.gov.au/histories/peacekeeping/index.asp> (accessed 6 May 2008).

13 Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law, <http://www.apcml.org/overview.php> (accessed 6 May 2008).

International models

25.10 In its 1994 review of peacekeeping operations, the UN General Assembly encouraged the establishment of peacekeeping training centres for military and civilian personnel on a national or regional basis:

The General Assembly...encourages Member States that have peacekeeping training programmes to share information and experience and, if requested, to enable personnel from other Member States to participate in the work of national staff colleges to help in the development of training programmes and to receive personnel from other Member States interested in such programmes.¹⁴

25.11 Following this review, a series of training centres were established in Canada (1995), Malaysia (1996), Bangladesh (1999), India (2000), Germany (2002) and Ghana (2004).¹⁵ Austcare noted some of the commonalities between these centres:

I am very impressed with what is happening in European countries—even at places like the Centre for Excellence in Hawaii in the United States, the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre [in Canada], the new German centre that has started and the new Swedish centre. These are all centres that are under civilian control. They are centres that are independent of government. They are centres that have long-term funding and they are able to bring these various elements together to look at how to be more effective on the ground.¹⁶

25.12 In this section, the committee looks in detail into some of these centres.

Canada

25.13 Canada's Pearson Peacekeeping Centre (PPC) is one of the leading peacekeeping centres in the world. It was established shortly after the 1994 UN General Assembly's review of peacekeeping operations, which encouraged the establishment of peacekeeping training centres. The PPC is an incorporated not-for-profit organisation, with a focus on making 'peace operations more effective through research, training, education and capacity building'.

25.14 The centre trains civilians, military personnel and police officers from different professional, cultural and national backgrounds. Training is carried out by a 200-strong international network of subject matter experts, industry leaders and key organisations, including practicing and retired academics, senior police officers, diplomats and high-ranking military personnel.

14 UN General Assembly, *Comprehensive review of the whole question of peacekeeping operations in all their aspects*, A/RES/49/37, 9 December 1994, paragraph 51. For full text, see <http://www.un.org/documents/ga/res/49/a49r037.htm> (accessed 9 July 2008).

15 Bangladesh, <http://www.bipsot.net/> (accessed 5 May 2008); Malaysia, <http://maf.mod.gov.my/HOMEPAGE/atm/NewUNTRG/mptc.htm> (accessed 5 May 2008).

16 *Committee Hansard*, 6 September 2007, p. 29.

25.15 Apart from training, the PPC conducts research on emerging trends and best practices and incorporates the findings into its training. It has its own generalist researchers and collaborates with other academic institutions, policy-makers, international organisations and development groups. It organises seminars, field work and conferences incorporating interdisciplinary perspectives.¹⁷

25.16 The centre has received a funding of CAD\$5 million annually from the government, including '\$1.5 million from the Department of National Defence's Military Training Assistance Program to deliver peace support training to foreign military officers'. National Defence provides six personnel to the centre.¹⁸

United States

25.17 The Center for Excellence in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance (DMHA) is a small US Department of Defence organisation located in Hawaii. It was established in 1994 to address the changing nature of peacekeeping. The centre promotes 'effective civil–military management in international humanitarian assistance, disaster response and peacekeeping through education, training, research and information programs'. The centre offers courses to both US and other countries' military forces and organises the Asia Pacific Peace Operations Capacity Building Program, 'a series of conferences, seminars, workshops and games' held in various parts of the Asia–Pacific region.¹⁹

Germany

25.18 The German centre, *Zentrum für Internationale Friedenseinsätze* (Centre for International Peace Operations—ZIF), was established in 2002 by the German Government to enhance the country's civilian crisis prevention capacities.²⁰ The centre recruits, trains and supports German civilian personnel for peacekeeping operations and election observation missions.²¹

25.19 ZIF is organised into three units:

17 Pearson Peacekeeping Centre, 'Who we are' and 'What we do', <http://www.peaceoperations.org> (accessed 9 April 2008). In addition to PPC, Canada has a Peace Support Operations Training centre that prepares Canadian soldiers for peacekeeping operations, http://armyapp.dnd.ca/pstc-cfsp/default_e.asp (accessed 16 April 2008).

18 The Hon Bill Graham, Minister of Foreign Affairs, 'Government of Canada underscores its commitment to Pearson Peacekeeping Centre in Cornwallis, Nova Scotia', No 192, 11 December 2003, http://w01.international.gc.ca/minpub/PublicationContentOnly.asp?publication_id=380589&Language=E&MODE=CONTENTONLY&Local=False (accessed 15 April 2008).

19 Centre for Excellence DMHA, <http://www.coe-dmha.org/index.htm> (accessed 18 April 2008).

20 ZIF, <http://www.zif-berlin.org/en/index.html> (accessed 18 April 2008).

21 ZIF, <http://www.zif-berlin.org/en/index.html> (accessed 18 April 2008).

- The Recruitment Unit maintains a pool of pre-trained and pre-selected German civilian professionals who can be deployed to peace operations and election observation missions.²²
- The Training Unit prepares civilian personnel for peace operations. Courses cover issues such as international humanitarian law, intercultural communication and election observation. Field exercises simulate complex crisis situations. ZIF cooperates with international organisations and European training centres.
- The Analysis and Lessons Learned Unit analyses and monitors current international crisis management issues with special relevance for ZIF's mandate. The unit organises seminars and provides advice to the German Government and Parliament.²³

25.20 ZIF provides support for its personnel both during and after deployment. Each member has a liaison person at ZIF. The centre's staff make regular field visits and provide debriefing sessions for members upon their return.²⁴

25.21 The centre is a non-profit state company, governed by a supervisory board which includes members from foreign, defence, interior and economic cooperation and development ministries, as well as four members of the Federal Parliament. It also has an advisory board with fifteen prominent members.²⁵

Nordic military training cooperation

25.22 Nordic countries (Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden) have taken a regional, cooperative approach to training peacekeepers since the 1960s.²⁶ For example, each country provides training in a specific subject area: military observer courses take place in Finland, military police officer courses in Denmark, and so on. Courses are designed for military officers of all ranks; some also include police and civilian personnel. While primarily a Nordic training initiative, a number of positions are available to students from non-Nordic countries.²⁷

22 German citizenship is a prerequisite for admission to the ZIF database, http://www.zif-berlin.org/en/Recruitment_and_Support.html (accessed 15 April 2008).

23 ZIF, <http://www.zif-berlin.org/en/index.html>, and About ZIF, http://www.zif-berlin.org/en/About_ZIF.html (accessed 15 April 2008). Currently, about 180 German professionals are serving in UN, EU, and Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) field missions. ZIF has, since its founding, deployed globally more than 1300 German election observers.

24 About ZIF, http://www.zif-berlin.org/en/About_ZIF.html (accessed 15 April 2008).

25 http://www.zif-berlin.org/en/About_ZIF/Governance.html (accessed 15 April 2008).

26 NORDCAPS, History, <http://www.nordcaps.org/?id=81> (accessed 15 April 2008).

27 NORDCAPS, Courses, <http://www.nordcaps.org/?id=82> (accessed 15 April 2008).

25.23 Nordic countries also provide training in country to officers from the Western Balkans to become instructors, mentors and course directors at their respective national training centres.²⁸

Sweden

25.24 Folke Bernadotte Academy is a Swedish government agency dedicated to improving the quality and effectiveness of international conflict and crisis management, with a particular focus on peace operations.

25.25 The academy functions as a focal point for cooperation between Swedish agencies and organisations. It aims for broad international participation in its activities and cooperates closely with partner institutions throughout the world. Its main areas of responsibility are:

- national cooperation and coordination;
- joint multifunctional education and training;
- research, studies and evaluation;
- recruitment of Swedish civilian personnel to international peace operations;
- method and doctrine development; and
- funding of civil society peace projects.²⁹

25.26 The academy has an advisory council to which the government appoints members from various government departments and agencies.³⁰ It also has a reference and advisory group.³¹

India

25.27 In 2000, a UN peacekeeping centre was established in India.³² It was set up as a joint endeavour of the Indian Ministry of External Affairs, Ministry of Defence and the Armed Forces. Its establishment was considered necessary due to India being one

28 NORDCAPS, Training support, <http://www.nordcaps.org/?id=107> (accessed 15 April 2008).

29 http://www.folkebernadotteacademy.se/roach/The_Academy.do?pageId=75 (accessed 15 April 2008).

30 Advisory council, http://www.folkebernadotteacademy.se/roach/Advisory_Council.do?pageId=287 (accessed 15 April 2008).

31 Reference and advisory group, http://www.folkebernadotteacademy.se/roach/Reference_Group.do?pageId=288 (accessed 15 April 2008).

32 Permanent Mission of India to the United Nations New York, 'India and the United Nations: UN Peacekeeping', http://www.un.int/india/india_and_the_un_pkeeping.html (accessed 16 April 2008).

of 'the longest serving and the largest troop contributors to UN peacekeeping activities'.³³ The United Service Institution of India—Centre for United Nations Peacekeeping (USI-CUNPK) is guided by a board of management under the chairmanship of Vice Chief of the Army Staff. Its functions are to:

- provide integrated training to junior officers, military observers and staff and logistics officers;
- promote research in all facets of PKO and organise international seminars;
- enhance and update the doctrinal aspects of training; and
- act as a repository of Indian experience in UN peacekeeping operations.³⁴

25.28 The centre conducts command post exercises with other countries. The aim is to 'foster regional and multilateral cooperation amongst the peacekeeping partners while improving their interoperability and operational readiness in the area of planning and execution of peacekeeping operations at an operational level'.³⁵

25.29 The centre also prepares weekly situation reports and a monthly report on the missions where Indian peacekeepers are participating.³⁶ It participates in instructor exchange programs with other peacekeeping training centres such as the ADF Peacekeeping Centre in Australia and the Canadian Peace Support Training Centre (PSTC).³⁷

Ghana

25.30 The Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre in Ghana was officially opened in 2004. It was envisaged that the centre would assist Ghana meet its need for a complex and multidimensional peacekeeping force. Yet, just as importantly, it was developed in order to provide for the West African sub-region and the continent as a whole. The centre conducts research into peacebuilding and conflict prevention, provides courses of study and delivers pre-deployment training to Ghanaian peacekeepers to increase interoperability and coordination between

33 Indian Foreign Secretary, Keynote address, National Seminar on 'Complex Peace Operations: Traditional Premises and New Realities', 21–22 August 2003, paragraph 4, <http://mea.gov.in/speech/2003/08/21spc01.htm> (accessed 18 April 2008).

34 About CUNPK, http://www.usiofindia.org/CUNP_Our%20Role.HTM (accessed 16 April 2008).

35 About CUNPK, http://www.usiofindia.org/CUNP_Our%20Role.HTM (accessed 16 April 2008).

36 About CUNPK, http://www.usiofindia.org/CUNP_Our%20Role.HTM (accessed 16 April 2008).

37 International linkages, http://www.usiofindia.org/CUNP_International%20Linkage.HTM (accessed 16 April 2008).

agencies.³⁸ The centre's activities have a regional focus on conflicts and conflict prevention in West Africa.³⁹

25.31 For the establishment of the centre, the German Government provided 1.8 million Euros towards the first phase of the building cost, with further contributions from several countries.⁴⁰

Attitudes towards a peacekeeping institute

Previous inquiry

25.32 In its 1994 report on Australia's participation in peacekeeping, the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade recommended the establishment of an Australian peacekeeping institute within the Australian Defence Studies Centre (ADSC).⁴¹ It recommended further that a feasibility study be undertaken to determine whether the ADSC was the most appropriate location for the institute. In its response to the report in October 1995, the then Labor Government did not see a need for such an institute arguing that:

- the government already takes an integrated approach to training and preparation of all civilian and military personnel for deployment in peace keeping operations;
- the academic study of peacekeeping was already well covered by Australian academic institutions—the Departments of Foreign Affairs and Trade, and Defence already provided funds for such research;
- the ADF Peacekeeping Centre already provided training and doctrine for peacekeeping operations; and
- although there may be scope to develop the multi-dimensional and interdisciplinary approaches of the centre, there was no real need to establish a new institution or move the ADFPKC from its location within the ADSC at that time.⁴²

38 About KAIPTC, History of the KAIPTC, <http://www.kaiptc.org/aboutus/default.asp?nav=1>; Introduction to the Training Department, <http://www.kaiptc.org/training/default.asp?nav=1> (accessed 16 April 2008).

39 Conflict prevention, management and resolution, http://www.kaiptc.org/conflict_prevention/default.asp (accessed 16 April 2008).

40 About KAIPTC, History of the KAIPTC, <http://www.kaiptc.org/aboutus/default.asp?nav=1> (accessed 16 April 2008).

41 Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, *Australia's Participation in Peacekeeping*, December 1994, Recommendation 50, p. 140.

42 Government response to the report of the Joint Standing Committee on Foreign Affairs, Defence and Trade, *Australia's Participation in Peacekeeping*, October 1995, pp. 26–27.

Committee view

25.33 The committee notes the government's response to the Joint committee's report in 1995 and considers that circumstances have changed significantly since then. As this report demonstrates, Australia's commitment to peacekeeping, particularly in the region, has increased dramatically since that time.

Evidence to current inquiry

25.34 Some submitters were in favour of enhancing Australia's existing peacekeeping capacity. The United Nations Association of Australia (UNAA) supported the expansion of the ADFPKC and proposed that a 'similar facility should be established for the training of police and civilians from government and non-government organisations to ensure an adequate focus on peacemaking'.⁴³ As noted in Chapter 13, Associate Professor Wainwright supported a centralised institutional capacity focussed on aspects of peacebuilding that are not directly security related, such as democracy, finance and economics. She considered that one possible avenue would be to expand the Fragile States Unit within AusAID.⁴⁴

25.35 A number of other submitters favoured the establishment of a national peacekeeping institute. Major General Ford argued that Australia should develop a national peacekeeping facility to integrate all civil, military and police peacekeeping training:

For our contributions to international peace and security to be most effective and beneficial to our own interests, we need to develop a coherent 'whole of government' approach...It would be most beneficial if all Australian peacekeeping training and research was conducted in a coherent environment that was jointly manned by civil, military and police experts.⁴⁵

25.36 He suggested that the centre should be funded by government but operate at arms length from it, and perhaps could be located within DFAT.⁴⁶

25.37 Major General Smith, Austcare, supported the establishment of an institute but added that it should be civilian controlled.⁴⁷ The centre should be focussed on training, with a research component 'directed to the applicability on the ground'.⁴⁸ He envisaged the centre to have a regional focus and representation.⁴⁹ Austcare

43 *Submission 3*, p. 8.

44 *Committee Hansard*, 20 August 2007, p. 9.

45 *Submission 4*, p. 2.

46 *Committee Hansard*, 20 August 2007, p. 24.

47 *Committee Hansard*, 6 September 2007, pp. 3 and 31.

48 *Committee Hansard*, 6 September 2007, p. 33.

49 *Submission 11*, p. 3.

recommended that 'a study be commissioned to confirm the structure, location and costs of such a centre based on world's best practice'.⁵⁰

25.38 Dr Jeremy Farrall, ANU, proposed that a centre of excellence for civilian peacekeeping be established. In addition, he suggested that there be an audit of Australia's human resources in civilian peacekeeping, with 'a roster of Australian experts' to undertake civilian peacekeeping activities. He saw the centre of excellence maintaining the roster or database.⁵¹

25.39 Government agencies were divided in their views on the establishment of a national institute. DFAT argued that existing structures and mechanisms were adequate for ensuring that relevant agencies and individuals were sufficiently prepared for peacekeeping operations.⁵²

25.40 The AFP's Assistant Commissioner Walters was supportive of a strategic 'think tank' capability that is 'forecasting and looking a lot further out than we do in an operational context'. He expressed a view that such a facility could be placed within government, but 'not to the exclusion of having non-government organisations engaged and involved in it'. Assistant Commissioner Walters noted that the AFP had had some discussions with the ADF on the matter.⁵³

25.41 Defence was initially cautious in its attitude towards an institute. When he appeared before the committee in July 2007, Lt Gen Gillespie acknowledged the need for coordination but left the means for doing that open:

I think there are a lot of suggestions out there like that at the present time about bringing together not only the whole of government elements but also those soft elements of power necessary to bring about success in challenged countries, to create a common understanding and trust between each other. As to whether or not it should be via an institute or whether we can do it through different media, I think the jury is out on that but certainly the need for better coordination is acknowledged by all groups.⁵⁴

25.42 A couple of months later, in a presentation at the Australian War Memorial in September 2007, Lt Gen Gillespie was more definite:

Some integration and perhaps the establishment of a united, Whole of Government peace operations training establishment, or at least a research institute, would seem to be logical, and both cost and operationally

50 *Committee Hansard*, 6 September 2007, p. 24.

51 *Committee Hansard*, 13 September 2007, pp. 15–16 and 19.

52 *Committee Hansard*, 25 July 2007, p. 62.

53 *Committee Hansard*, 25 July 2007, pp. 35–36.

54 *Committee Hansard*, 24 July 2007, p. 20. The RSL supported the ADF's approach. See *Committee Hansard*, 20 August 2007, p. 2.

effective. Such a development, in my opinion, should be looked at sooner rather than later.⁵⁵

Committee's findings

25.43 In this report, the committee identified a number of reasons for establishing a peacekeeping institute in Australia. In Chapter 11, the committee noted that 'the foundations for effective interoperability are set long before deployment' and that mutual understanding and trust start with secondments, education and training in the pre-deployment phase.⁵⁶

25.44 In Chapter 12, the committee recognised the need for adequate training for all Australian peacekeepers before deployment. It noted that some departments do not necessarily have adequate resources or expertise to train their staff. The committee also noted that the current training programs for Australian public servants 'could be better structured' and that more could be done to coordinate them.⁵⁷

25.45 In Chapter 13, the committee noted that a central agency may be 'required to promote a whole-of-government strategy to peacekeeping involving not only training but a whole range of activities including the development of doctrine and the evaluation of programs'.⁵⁸ It concluded that an effective whole-of-government training framework requires integrating 'the various separate training programs and *ad hoc* courses into a coherent whole'. Further that 'this whole-of-government approach would avoid duplication, identify and rectify gaps in training and promote better cooperation and coordination among all participants in the field'.⁵⁹

25.46 In Chapter 14, the committee observed the important role of NGOs in peacekeeping operations and noted that they do not provide standardised training to their workers. It further noted that a joint education and training facility should encompass NGOs and provide training to their members preparing to go on a peacekeeping operation.⁶⁰

25.47 In Chapter 15, the committee examined the civil–military relationship and noted that there are misunderstandings about the roles and mandates on both sides, and that regular consultation, joint planning and training would help them to resolve

55 Lieutenant General Kenneth Gillespie, 'The ADF and Peacekeeping', speech at the conference 'Force for Good? Sixty Years of Australian Peacekeeping', Australian War Memorial, Canberra, 13 September 2007, MSPA 70913/07, <http://www.defence.gov.au/media/SpeechTpl.cfm?CurrentId=7061> (accessed 14 November 2007).

56 Chapter 11, paragraph 11.24.

57 Chapter 12, paragraphs 12.26 and 12.27.

58 Chapter 13, paragraph 13.53.

59 Chapter 13, paragraph 13.56.

60 Chapter 14, paragraphs 14.17–14.19.

any tensions.⁶¹ In the same chapter, the committee built upon its previous findings and concluded that through training programs, seminars and workshops, the peacekeeping institute:

...could draw together teachers, students, researchers and former, current and future peacekeepers from government and non-government sectors. The facility would enhance CIMIC and develop future forms of civil–military–police coordination. It would also provide a site for empirical, evidence-based research and the evaluation of past and current practice. It would operate at the policy and operational levels, ensuring that Australia keeps abreast of new ideas and approaches to peacekeeping. It would also be involved at the practical level by assisting individual agencies prepare their personnel for deployment and foster a whole-of-nation approach to peacekeeping.⁶²

25.48 In Chapter 18, the committee noted that 'efficiencies could be gained by adopting a whole-of-government approach' to language and cultural awareness training for Commonwealth officers. The proposed peacekeeping institute could facilitate this type of training.⁶³

25.49 In Chapter 19, the committee noted Australia's and individual agencies' cooperation with regional nations and organisations and proposed that 'these endeavours could be consolidated at both planning and operational levels'. It saw 'particular value in Australia seeking to establish joint training exercises with ASEAN nations'.⁶⁴ It also believed that a peacekeeping institute could facilitate these engagements.⁶⁵

25.50 In the previous chapter, the committee suggested that the proposed peacekeeping institute could have a vital role in the evaluation and continuous improvement of Australia's peacekeeping performance. It was of the view that the institute would be the ideal mechanism for ensuring that Australia has:

- appropriate performance indicators to measure the success or otherwise of its whole-of-government performance in peacekeeping activities;
- a repository for lessons learnt; and
- a central body responsible for ensuring that doctrine and practices are developed and refined in light of past experiences.⁶⁶

61 Chapter 15, paragraphs 15.61 and 15.91.

62 Chapter 15, paragraph 15.98.

63 Chapter 18, paragraph 18.27.

64 Chapter 19, paragraph 19.32.

65 Chapter 19, paragraph 19.68.

66 Chapter 24, paragraph 24.30.

25.51 The committee noted, however, that the institute would not in any way counter or make redundant the work on peacekeeping being conducted by other groups or organisations. The committee believed that the institute 'would complement and indeed add value to the work of such organisations'.⁶⁷

Asia–Pacific Centre for Civil–Military Cooperation

25.52 Prior to the 2007 election, the current government proposed the establishment of an Asia–Pacific Centre for Civil–Military Cooperation (APC-CIMIC) to 'streamline coordination between security, economic, emergency management, institution-building and non-government organisations' to address instability in the region and help avoid a 'revolving door' of military deployments.

25.53 The centre is expected to focus on issues such as:

- better coordinating existing resources and training between different agencies, including NGOs;
- conducting governance training for public officials from states in the Asia–Pacific region to bolster governance before conflict situations emerge and strengthen peace building operations post-conflict;
- liaising with international partner institutions such as the UN Peace Building Commission, Japanese Terakoya, United States Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization and UK Post Conflict Reconstruction Unit, to enhance cooperation and mutual reinforcement;
- liaising with other relevant emergency management bodies, both national and international, on disaster management and co-ordination; and
- developing doctrine, interagency exchange and training on disaster and crisis management, coordination and preparation and contributing to the development of international doctrine and policy on stabilisation and peace building missions.

25.54 The centre is to be located in Queanbeyan, NSW, close to other key government agencies in peacekeeping operations and the Joint Operations Command Centre in Bungendore. The government has allocated \$5.1 million in 2007–08 towards the centre.⁶⁸ It should be noted that no additional funding will be provided to Defence for this measure, with the cost being met from within Defence's existing resources.

Committee view

25.55 The committee is of the view that a peacekeeping research and training institute is required and welcomes the government's initiative. It notes that the institute

67 Chapter 24, paragraph 24.31.

68 ALP, 'Asia Pacific Centre for Civil–Military Cooperation', Media statement, 13 November 2007.

is also to cover emergency management which the committee regards as appropriate. The committee believes that the institute should have a broad representation of the organisations engaged in peacekeeping operations, including police, military, government agencies, NGOs, universities and other research institutions in Australia and in the region. The centre should be involved in training; research; evaluation; developing doctrine and policy; and building capacity in the region. It should also cooperate and collaborate with similar international peacekeeping institutes.

25.56 Based on the evidence and the committee's findings, the committee can see advantages in expanding the scope of the institution's mandate. For example, rather than focus on CIMIC, the committee suggests that it may be time, especially with the increasing involvement of police in peacekeeping, for the government to consider the broader civil–military–police doctrine. The committee also suggests that the government consider re-wording the institute's mission statement to reflect the importance of the institute as:

- the hub of a national network of institutions currently working in various areas of peacekeeping—the institutions or projects to maintain their independence but become linked through the coordinating efforts of the institute;
- a national repository of information on peacekeeping and Australian peacekeepers—for example, the institution could take an active role in ensuring that lessons learnt by agencies become part of a central body of knowledge; it could be involved in the evaluation of missions and the development of peacekeeping doctrine; and establish and maintain databases on all Australian projects on peacekeeping and individuals who are experts in the field of peacekeeping in Australia;
- a regional centre of excellence—the committee noted the need for regional capacity building and would like to see this aspect of the institute, not just governance training, given greater prominence in its mission statement; and
- a vital part of the international web of similar institutes throughout the world.

25.57 The committee is also concerned that important decisions are being made about the role, functions and structure of the institute without the benefit of a scoping study. The Australian Government could learn much from the experiences of established and highly-regarded overseas institutions. With this in mind, the committee suggests that the government commission a small fact-finding team of people knowledgeable and experienced in the various fields of peacekeeping to visit the relevant institutes around the world, and to report on their findings. This report to recommend to government ways in which the peacekeeping institute can be further developed or refined to improve its ability to be a national and regional centre of peacekeeping excellence. This team will also consider and make recommendations on issues such as funding and the future management and administration of the institution.

Recommendation 38

25.58 The committee recommends that the Australian Government establish a task force to conduct a scoping study for the Asia–Pacific Centre for Civil–Military Cooperation, focusing on best practice. The task force would:

- include representatives of the ADF, the AFP, DFAT, AusAID and NGOs;
- visit the major international peacekeeping centres and hold discussions with overseas authorities—visits could include the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre in Canada, Centre for International Peace Operations (ZIF) in Germany and centres in Malaysia and/or India.
- examine the structure, reporting responsibilities, administration, funding and staffing of these institutions—the task force would seek specific information on matters such as the civil–military–police coordination, administration of a civilian database and domestic/regional focus;
- assess the strengths and weaknesses of the various institutions with a view to identifying what would best suit Australia and the region; and
- based on this assessment, produce a final report for government containing recommendations on the Asia–Pacific Centre for Civil–Military Cooperation.

The government should make the report available to the committee.