REVIEW OF THE

GLOBAL FOCAL POINT FOR POLICE, JUSTICE, AND CORRECTIONS

August 2018











Published by the Center on International Cooperation, Folke Bernadotte Academy, and the Norwegian Institute of International Affairs. Copyright © 2018

Center on International Cooperation – New York University cic.nyu.edu

Folke Bernadotte Academy fba.se

Norwegian Institute of International Affairs nupi.no

Acknowledgments: The review team is grateful for the generous support of Folke Bernadotte Academy, the Foreign & Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Norway. The review team is also deeply appreciative of the efforts made by staff at United Nations headquarters and in the field for making this review possible, with special recognition to Jennifer Schmidt and Clément Hamon.

REVIEW OF THE

GLOBAL FOCAL POINT FOR POLICE, JUSTICE, AND CORRECTIONS

August 2018

Authors:

Paige Arthur (lead author), Center on International Cooperation

Christian Ahlund, Folke Bernadotte Academy Maaike de Langen, independent consultant Kari Osland, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Additional review team members and advisors:

Sarah Cliffe, Center on International Cooperation

Cedric de Coning, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Bård Drange, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

Ryan Rappa, Center on International Cooperation

Natasja Rupesinghe, Norwegian Institute of International Affairs

ABBREVIATIONS

ASG	Assistant Secretary-General	NUPI	Norwegian Institute of International Affairs
AU	African Union	OCT	Office of Counter-Terrorism
BPPS	Bureau for Policy and Programme Support	OHCHR	Office of the High Commissioner for Human
CAR	Central African Republic		Rights
CIC	Center on International Cooperation	OROLSI	Office of Rule of Law and Security Institutions
CIVCAP	Civilian Capacities in the Aftermath of Conflict	PBF	Peacebuilding Fund
	(UN report/initiative)	PBSO	Peacebuilding Support Office
CSPAJ	Community Security, Protection and Access to	PD	Police Division
	Justice	PJC	Police, Justice and Corrections
CTED	Counter-Terrorism Committee Executive	PKO	Peacekeeping Operation
	Directorate	RBB	Results-Based Budgeting
DDR	Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration	RC	Resident Coordinator
DFS	Department of Field Support	RoL	Rule of Law
DM	Department of Management	RoLCRG	Rule of Law Coordination and Resource Group
DPA	Department of Political Affairs	SCC	Special Criminal Court
DPET	Division for Policy, Evaluation and Training	SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
DPKO	Department of Peacekeeping Operations	SGBV	Sexual and gender-based violence
DPPA	Department of Political and Peacebuilding	SPC	Standing Police Capacity
	Affairs	SPM	Special Political Mission
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo	SRSG	Special Representative of the Secretary-General
DSG	Deputy Secretary-General	SSR	Security Sector Reform
DSRSG	Deputy Special Representative of the	SSRTF	Security Sector Reform Task
	Secretary-General	TOR	Terms of Reference
EOSG	Executive Office of the Secretary-General	UMIRR	Mixed Unit for Rapid Intervention on Gender-
EU	European Union		Based Violence
FBA	Folke Bernadotte Academy	UN	United Nations
GFP	Global Focal Point for Police, Justice, and	UNAMID	African Union/United Nations Hybrid Operation
	Corrections		in Darfur
HIPPO	United Nations High-Level Independent Panel	UNDAF	United Nation Development Assistance
	on Peace Operations		Framework
HQ	Headquarters	UNCT	United Nations Country Team
IFI	International Financial Institution	UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance
IOM	International Organization for Migration		Framework
IOT	Integrated Operational Team	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
JCSC	Justice and Corrections Standing Capacity	UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
MINUJUSTH	United Nations Mission for Justice Support	UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
	in Haiti	UNIOGBIS	United Nations Integrated Peacebuilding Office
MINURCAT	United Nations Mission in the Central African		in Guinea-Bissau
	Republic and Chad	UNODC	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime
MINUSCA	United Nations Multidimensional Integrated	UNMAS	United Nations Mine Action Service
	Stabilization Mission in the CAR	UNMIL	United Nations Mission in Liberia
MINUSMA	United Nations Multidimensional Integrated	UNMISS	United Nations Mission in South Sudan
-	Stabilization Mission in Mali	UNOPS	United Nations Office for Project Services
MINUSTAH	United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti	UNPOL	United Nations Police
MONUSCO	United Nations Organization Stabilization	UNSOM	United Nations Assistance Mission in Somalia
	Mission in the Democratic Republic of the	USG	Under-Secretary-General
	Congo	UN Women	United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding		the Empowerment of Women
MPTF	Multi-Partner Trust Fund		•

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive summary	1
Table of priority recommendations	7
1. Background	9
Purpose	
Progress since the 2014 review	
Methodological snapshot	
2. The origins and current structure of the GFP arrangement at HQ	13
What is the GFP today?	
What does the GFP deliver?	
The added value of the GFP at HQ	16
3. GFP contributions to joint arrangements in the field	
Joint arrangements in rule of law work in the field	
Factors affecting GFP contributions to joint arrangements	
Areas for attention and improvement	24
4. Contributions of joint work to rule of law assistance in the field	
National-level outcomes of joint programs	
Factors affecting increased coherence of rule of law assistance	
Areas for attention and improvement	33
5. GFP structures and processes at HQ	
Overview of GFP processes	
Analysis of GFP processes	
Areas for attention and improvement	37
6. Overarching issues	
A changing GFP for a changing UN	40
Current integration of thematic areas	
Potential for thematic expansion	
Measuring GFP assistance	46
Areas for attention and improvement	46
7. Conclusion and recommendations	
Overall achievements	
Strategic recommendations	49
Managarial actions	52



EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

n 2012, recognizing that the United Nations (UN) system was at a crossroads with respect to its fragmented, sometimes duplicative, and often competitive efforts on rule of law assistance in post-conflict countries, the Secretary-General took steps to incentivize cooperation and collaboration across a highly siloed structure. The Global Focal Point for Police, Justice, and Corrections Areas in the Rule of Law in Post-Conflict and Other Crisis Situations (the GFP) was thus born.

The Policy Committee decision that established it makes the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) and the UN Development Programme (UNDP) accountable for delivering on operational responsibilities with respect to the UN's police, justice, and corrections work, with a focus on responding to country-level requests for assistance. DPKO and UNDP were to co-locate relevant staff and to link up with other UN entities in the Secretariat, as well as agencies, funds, and programs, that provide specialized police, justice, and corrections assistance. Current partners are the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), UN Women, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the Executive Office of the Secretary-General (EOSG).

As the length and complexity of the GFP's name suggest, its establishment was contested internally, with differing views on its scope and composition. The approach was fairly minimalist, drawing together the largest parts of the UN's expertise without changing mandates, functions, or reporting lines, and within a framework that was intended to be cost-neutral. But the meaning involved for the professionals housed within it is simple: it signals a clear ex-

pectation that people work together and do not duplicate efforts or compete.

This review evaluates how the GFP has contributed to joint working arrangements that have produced real outcomes on the ground in post-conflict and crisis situations. It also considers the barriers that these efforts have faced and the need for adaptation going forward. This is timely as the Secretary General has emphasized the critical need for more system-wide collaboration to address challenging conflict dynamics, highlighting the GFP as a model in significant reports such as the recent Report on Peacebuilding and Sustaining Peace (A/72/707-S/2018/43). The clear conclusion of the review is that a "GFP 2.0" is needed if the UN is to deliver. The GFP has improved the UN's coherence in the areas of police, justice and corrections but has now reached the limits of the initial model. The review lays out a number of recommendations that UN leadership could consider to enable a GFP 2.0.

Outcomes of GFP collaboration to support the field

verall, the review found that the GFP has helped to leverage comparative advantage, position the UN to avoid setbacks during peace operation transitions, reduce duplication, and create efficiencies in the field:

→ In Central African Republic, the joint program on impunity re-established functioning courts in Bangui and a handful of other cities, allowing the resumption of basic justice services including the first criminal hearings since 2010. in January 2018, the Bangui Central Court rendered its first conviction

- for conflict-related crimes, sentencing an anti-Balaka warlord to life in prison.
- → In Somalia, the joint program has built capacity in the justice chain, helped establish Ministries of Justice in the South Central States, provided scholarships for future legal professionals, and created a Policing Model that has received political buy-in and is now being developed by state organizations.
- → In Haiti, joint work has made possible the continued training of police cadres (or mid-level management), as well as digitization of police systems, bringing the police force into the twenty-first century with databases, servers, and more.

These outcomes have been made possible through a great deal of detailed work to support joint arrangements and programs in the field (see box). These field-based innovations, of which this is only one or many, foreshadow some of the more systematic recommendations in this review.

Constraints

hile there have been positive results, it is notable in the country cases reviewed that the outcomes (and GFP supporting activities) have often not moved to a scale sufficient to address country-level

challenges. Specific constraints that emerged in reviewing the country cases include:

- → Limited variety of (and lack of clarity about)

 GFP assistance. While the focus on missions
 to support joint programming is understandable—the absence of joint UN programs was
 a criticism that spurred the formation of the
 GFP—this has limits. Field entities wanted
 more varied types of practical assistance
 and evidenced a need for more strategic
 approaches. They also wanted to understand
 better what the GFP has to offer.
- → Insufficient capacity to develop broader knowledge and partnerships, both within and outside the UN system. For the managers and staff within the GFP at headquarters (HQ), the experience of the last six years has been that cooperation has real value, but it takes time: there is too little dedicated staff time available to make it happen.
- → Inefficiencies due to continuing siloed approaches. While joint approaches have improved, especially at HQ, these efforts face challenges: joint work in many instances is stitched together rather than genuinely integrated; resource mobilization still can push entities apart; thematic elements like gender and human rights sometimes do not get their due; and entities are still working with reference to different plans, timelines, and analyses. In some countries, these contributed to an imbalance in UN approaches to police, justice, and corrections, where

BOX 1: Reducing duplication and filling gaps in Mali

预览已结束,完整报告链接和二维码如下:

https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/report?reportId=5_11832



