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Abstract
The project ‘R2P in Oceania’ is a political assessment of the impact and influence of R2P principles on the developing police forces of three states, Timor-Leste, Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea (PNG). It links most strongly with the Centre’s priority concept two: supporting states to build their capacities to protect their own populations from abuses of human rights, including genocide and mass atrocities. This articulates with the Responsibility to Assist, the least studied aspect of the UNSG’s ‘Three Pillars’ Approach to R2P. Our research provides empirical findings surrounding the process of police-building in these states. It points to the critical role of CSOs in monitoring police actions, and in education the community. At the same time we have identified a need for greater involvement by CSOs in the process of police-building, in particular in drawing attention to the importance of gender mainstreaming in peace-building in post conflict societies. A key finding has been identifying the disjuncture between the international norms of UNSC Resolution 1325 and their implementation by patriarchal institutions such as police forces, especially in relation to addressing the serious social problem of sexual and gender based violence.

International police-building efforts are conscious of this matter, however progress is slow. A central problem is the creation or renewal of trust in police as an institution. Progress is being made, and police in Timor-Leste and Solomon Islands are showing the effects of the large international investment. Police-building in PNG is too small to expect any outcomes, and while this remains the case the propensity for abuse of power and abuse of rights by police continues.
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About the Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect (AP R2P)

The Centre’s mission is to advance the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) principle within the Asia Pacific region and worldwide, and support the building of capacity to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity.

It was launched by Special Adviser to the United Nations Secretary-General (UNSG), Dr Edward Luck, who conveyed the UNSG’s support for the initiative, and former Foreign Minister of Canada, Lloyd Axworthy, in Bangkok on 20 February 2008.
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In August 2008, the Australian Foreign Minister, the Hon Stephen Smith MP, announced that Australia would strengthen its support for the R2P by establishing a $2 million Australian R2P Fund to support research projects that would enhance the dissemination and consolidation of the framework. The Minister outlined that the Australian R2P Fund was to be made available on a competitive basis to institutions, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), and individuals in Australia, for projects or research which would advance the concept and enhance other states’ capacity to protect populations from genocide and mass atrocities.

The Hon Stephen Smith MP announced the successful applicants in September 2009. Applications were assessed by a Selection Committee comprising of eminent experts in the field, chaired by Dr Edward Luck, who was then the Special Adviser to the UNSG on matters relating to R2P. Of the 14 projects resourced by the Australian R2P Fund, 7 were Australia based, the others were attached to institutions in Washington, Vancouver, Jakarta, Singapore, Oxford and New York. The combined effect of the 14 projects has been the development of a critical mass of R2P expertise and policy-relevant research, which has propelled the AP R2P Centre to the forefront of regional and global research innovation.

At the mid-point stage of many of the projects, the Centre published the first Research in Focus booklet. This exercise enabled the project teams to reflect on their progress in relation to the Australian R2P Fund goals; additionally, it enabled the AP R2P Centre to share these milestone achievements with other stakeholders through its proliferating knowledge networks. The first booklet can be accessed at the Centre’s website www.r2pasiapacific.org

The end-date of the Australian R2P Fund projects coincided with the culmination of the Centre’s first phase: since August 2012, AP R2P has begun a second phase, following a renewed funding arrangement agreed by the Australian Agency for International Development (AusAID) and the University of Queensland (UQ). In dialogue with AusAID, we decided that it was important to mark the successful completion of these projects, even though the second and final Research in Focus booklet coincides with a new stage in the Centre’s history.

In the course of putting together this booklet, it is evident that these research projects have made a significant contribution to the advancement of knowledge about the application of R2P to humanitarian catastrophes (actual and potential). Together with the AP R2P Centre, these projects have enabled this corner of Southern Queensland to become the hub of a transnational knowledge network that connects up scholars, practitioners, and educators.
The origins of this network are well known and go back to the 2001 International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) funded by the Canadian government. Australia had a prominent place in the ICISS process, as former Foreign Affairs Minister Gareth Evans was the co-chair. The region, at this time, was marginal in the sense of it being largely dis-engaged from questions about mass atrocity prevention, reaction, and response (disengaged despite the experience of genocide and mass atrocities in several countries during the 20th century). This dis-engagement was captured by the lead academic researcher involved in ICISS, Thomas Weiss, when he noted that the Asia Pacific region shared with other developing regions ‘a deep seated skepticism’ towards the development of a regulative framework for dealing with genocide and other crimes against humanity.

We know that the phrase ‘deep seated skepticism’ no longer applies to countries in the Asia Pacific region as was evident earlier in 2012 when the Centre coordinated a conference on ‘Regional Capacity to Protect, Prevent and Respond’ held in Bangkok on 17–18 May. One aspect of this event was the showcasing of several Australian R2P Fund projects, including ‘R2P in Oceania’ (based at the University of Wollongong [UOW]), ‘Assessing the Parameters for Identifying a “Manifest Failure” to Protect Populations’, (Yeshiva University in New York), and ‘Developing Ad-Hoc and Systemic Strategies for R2P’ (Oxford University in the United Kingdom [UK]). Also represented at the Bangkok conference was the highly ambitious project ‘Understanding and Forecasting Political Instability’. Chief Investigator Benjamin Goldsmith (University of Sydney) and co-Investigator Arcot Sowmya (University of New South Wales [UNSW]) have developed an outstanding model for forecasting mass atrocities. The dissemination of their findings has been first class; 11 presentations in the US, Europe, and Australasia (including the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade [DFAT] and the Office of National Assessments [ONA]), and several in Washington D.C. Their forecasting placed Myanmar as the 6th most at-risk country in terms of the likelihood of politicide or genocide, a prescient judgment in light of the inter-communal violence being experienced in the Rakhine state in late 2012.

Not only does this booklet foreground the tremendous increase in knowledge about the R2P principle, it also contains case studies in capacity-building. An example here is the project led by Dr Rizal Sukma from the Centre for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS).
in Jakarta, ‘Mainstreaming the Principle of R2P in Indonesia’. Dr Sukma used the project grant to employ an early career researcher (Lina Alexandra) to develop R2P awareness in a country in which it was virtually unheard of outside a narrow network of foreign policy specialists. The project managed a number of achievements in relation to bridge-building between the government and various civil society groups. It is also noteworthy that Lina Alexandra published an article in the journal Pacific Review which is rated 5* by Australian Political Science Association (the peak body for the discipline). It is no coincidence that, in the period since this project started, Indonesia has become one of the most active members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in terms of advancing normative commitments to humanitarian protection, signified by the fact that it has joined the UNSG’s ‘group of friends of R2P’.

One general conclusion from these projects is to note how awareness about the R2P norm has grown steadily among various stakeholders in the region. For example, through the Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific (CSCAP) Study Group on R2P, a network of advocates among think tanks (Track II) and civil society groups has been created that could potentially contribute to further localization of the norm. Discussions on R2P however have put greater emphasis upon Pillar 1 (prevention) and Pillar 2 (assistance) in this region, with a concomitant tendency to avoid confronting the decisive coercive measures that may need to be taken if the full spectrum of R2P ‘tools’ is to be available to decision makers at times of crises.

The fact of norm localization in no way diminishes the success of R2P’s diffusion, and gradual adoption or adaptation, in many countries in the Asia Pacific. Yet this process of diffusion is incomplete and prone to setbacks. The emergence of an Asia Pacific hub driven forward by these Australian R2P Fund projects is one reason why it is possible to be optimistic about the future of R2P as a framework for mass atrocities prevention and response. R2P is neither about to ‘die’ as some critics have suggested in the aftermath of Libya and Syria; nor is it going to become irrelevant, as ethnically targeted mass atrocities are not going to go away. What these projects illustrate is how R2P has become, in Dr Edward Luck’s words, at ‘risk of relevance’. By this phrase, the Chair of the original Australian R2P Fund Selection Committee is drawing our attention to the reality that implementation generates friction. Turning words into deeds in a complex institutional environment is slow and prone to reversals. Putting the point in a different way, the choice of adopting or resisting international rules and policies is never as one-dimensional as some political science models suggest. This is particularly the case when the cultural and political assumptions that underpin the framework are not always easily separable from the contested histories and painful memories of the colonial period.

Looking at the cumulative impact of the projects, it is apparent that they have leveraged a step-change in the quantum of research and analysis on R2P in the Asia Pacific and beyond. This contribution will continue long after the end-dates specified on the contracts that were agreed by the research teams. An important task for the AP R2P Centre, in its second phase, is to ensure that the knowledge that has been generated informs policy analysis in the future and is widely disseminated amongst various stakeholders through education and training seminars. We look forward to continuing to work with a number of these excellent research teams on future collaborations in the hope that we can continue to develop better frameworks for implementing R2P in a region where security from violence is not assured.

"Looking at the cumulative impact of the projects, it is apparent that they have leveraged a step-change in the quantum of research and analysis on R2P in the Asia Pacific and beyond."

Professor Tim Dunne
Director of Research
The Centre is in its early stages of its second stage of renewed funding, 1 July 2012 – 30 June 2015.

Over the next 3 years the Centre’s research will focus on building its three research programs; Noel Morada is leading a program on Regional Diplomacy and Capacity Building and Sara Davies is heading a program on Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities, supported by the Centre’s Deputy Director Sarah Teitt. The third main program is Doctrine, Concepts and Inter-Agency Coordination which is led by Tim Dunne.

The Centre’s leadership is strengthened by its partnership with Griffith University (GU) colleagues, all with a past association with the Centre.

The Centre’s leadership comprises the staff members listed below; further details on the Centre’s combined staffing capacity, research fellows, PhD students and research programs can be found by visiting the Centre’s website: www.r2pasiapacific.org


He serves as a non-resident Senior Adviser at the International Peace Institute, New York. He is also Director (International) and Founding Director (2007-2010) of the AP R2P Centre.

**Sara Davies** is a Senior Research Fellow at the Human Protection Hub, Griffith Asia Institute and Centre of Governance and Public Policy at GU. Sara is also Program Director of the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities program.

**Tim Dunne** is Director of Research and Professor of International Relations. He is leading the program on Doctrine, Concepts and Inter-Agency Coordination. He also serves on the governing council of the International Studies Association (ISA).

**Marie Hobman** is the Centre Manager and is responsible for the financial and administrative operations of the Centre.

**Noel M. Morada** is Director of Regional Engagement and Program Convenor of the Regional Diplomacy and Capacity Building program. Noel’s role relates to engagement in the Asia Pacific region and building on collaborative policy-research and training projects.

**Sarah Teitt** is Deputy Director and Researcher at the Centre where she is responsible for advancing research and building partnerships aimed at the prevention of genocide and other mass atrocities in the Asia Pacific. Sarah is a researcher on the Centre’s program on the prevention of widespread and systematic sexual and gender based violence, as well as the program on R2P Regional Diplomacy and Capacity Building.
Australian R2P Fund projects: Final reports

What follows is a description of 13 Australian R2P Fund projects which met or exceeded the goals set out in the Australian R2P Fund Agreement.

One of the projects is not featured in this booklet as its outcomes have not yet matched expectations; planned outputs from the project, led by Dr Bruce Jones, are still in progress. This research project can be viewed – with all the others – on the Centre’s website at: www.r2pasiapacific.org
SYNOPSIS

The Brookings-Bern Project developed a set of 12 benchmarks in its well-regarded Framework for National Responsibility to assess and to support the response of governments to the presence of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) within their territorial boundaries. Our research uses this Framework to identify the challenges and opportunities facing governments in their efforts to protect and uphold the human rights of IDPs and to analyse how governments can best translate abstract conceptual frameworks into concrete national protection policies.

REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION PROGRESS

The 15 country desk studies were completed and reviewed by principal investigators, Dr Elizabeth Ferris and Erin Mooney, on a rolling basis between July and August 2011. These studies were reviewed by a final reviewer between July and September 2011 and subsequently revised to incorporate the reviewers’ comments. The 15 studies were then incorporated into Chapter 1, which is dedicated to a discussion of each of the 12 benchmarks per section of the chapter across all 15 countries (hence, one section of the chapter is dedicated to Benchmark 1 on findings across all 15 countries on prevention of displacement, and so on through Benchmark 12). The external review process was mostly conducted by country analysts at the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), but some countries were reviewed instead by either the International Organization for Migration (IOM) or the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). In addition, Walter Kälin reviewed each of the finalised country case studies and revisions were made accordingly.

Between March and August 2011, Ferris and Mooney finalised the drafting of the introduction to the report which discussed the conceptual framework and the report’s methodology and limitations; Chapter 1 which incorporated the findings from each of the 12 benchmarks across the 15 country desk studies, as mentioned above, and the four in-depth country assessments; and Chapter 3, which included additional observations and recommendations to states experiencing internal displacement.

Chapter 2 consists of the four in-depth country assessments. The four countries selected in November 2010 for these assessments were Myanmar, Kenya, Turkey and Sri Lanka. However, owing to challenges faced during the reporting period as explained below, Georgia was substituted for the Myanmar draft developed by the contracted researcher, and Turkey was changed to Afghanistan as Iraq did not prove a feasible alternative, as suggested in the Annual Report. A first draft of each of the four in-depth country assessments was to be provided by the researchers to the Project by 1 March 2011. The first Kenya draft was submitted 20 February, but the other studies required
more time: Georgia was submitted by Mooney at the end of April and the original Sri Lanka draft was submitted by mid-April. Principal investigators Ferris and Mooney provided edits and comments to the researchers in a process that took a few drafts back and forth, while Mooney also revised her draft and shared it for review by United Nations (UN) officials and internal contacts at the ministry responsible for IDPs in Georgia. The Kenya study was reviewed by a country analyst at IDMC with whom the Project had previously collaborated. The researcher sent the Myanmar draft by 1 June 2011; however, it fell short of the Terms of Reference and Ferris and Mooney decided not to publish it or pursue it further given the time constraints and lack of access of any alternate researchers to or within the country. It is for these reasons as well as Mooney’s expertise in Georgia that it was decided to have Mooney undertake an expansion of the Georgia desk study. Similarly, the final version of the Sri Lanka assessment was submitted to the Project on 22 June, but the Project had decided in May that the Sri Lanka draft was not up to par with the Terms of Reference. Hence, the Project sought out an alternate researcher recommended to the Project who also had field experience with IDPs in Sri Lanka, during the most recent war. That researcher submitted his draft by early July, with comments and edits provided by Ferris and Mooney and the final draft submitted to the Project at the end of August 2011 after having been reviewed by senior staff at the UNHCR. The Kenya and Georgia final drafts were submitted to the Project by 30 June 2011. The Afghanistan assessment—an extended version of the original Afghanistan desk study as reviewed by a country analyst at IDMC—was completed by the end of August, having been reviewed by an international lawyer with expertise in Afghanistan as well as the author of the Sri Lanka assessment, who had worked with the UN in Afghanistan. All researchers included in their drafts executive summaries of the displacement situation in the country and national response.

LESSONS LEARNED

In finalising the manuscript, the Project greatly depended upon its strong working relationships with Brookings Institution Press (hereinafter, ‘BI Press’) which recently collaborated with Dr Ferris on her book, Politics of Protection: The Limits of Humanitarian Action (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2011) and a design firm which has worked on Project publications in the past. The fact that both entities were very familiar with the language and subject matter used in Project publications greatly facilitated the Project’s ability to complete the final report with excellent results. In addition, the Project was able to cut down on potential costs for the design of the text-heavy publication by selecting and securing free photographs germane to 14 of the 15 countries as well as the subject matter at hand. In total, 26 photographs were secured, saving about US$1,300 to US$2,000. The photographs were given to the

A refugee camp on the border between Libya and Tunisia
Project on a complimentary basis by UNHCR and a UN field photographer in Darfur as well as another independent photographer, provided they were properly cited. The citations and captions were used in the final piece and the providers were thanked in the report for their generous contribution. The volume of these free photographs meant that Brookings only had to purchase a few photographs from Reuters; there were not enough free photographs up to par for the cover; one country was not available from the UN (Myanmar); and there was no quality photo to lead the Afghanistan case study.

In order to improve the final manuscript after the internal and external updating and review processes, the Project subcontracted BI Press to conduct the final copy edit of the entire report. BI Press was able to review the over 300 page manuscript including the hundreds of footnotes for formatting, language and style. The copy editing was done on a rolling basis in a few tranches between the end of August and early October after substantive comments were received from Walter Kälin and incorporated by the Project into the final chapters.

In terms of selecting the countries for the four in-depth country assessments, it was not unusual that some challenges were encountered. Conducting any type of research project on Myanmar was anticipated to lend itself to difficulty owing to the particular situation in that country. The quality of the Myanmar and the original Sri Lanka case study did not meet the Project’s standards; it is hard to have anticipated otherwise as the Myanmar researcher had been strongly recommended. The Project benefitted from having dependable alternate plans to cope with these two cases as well as the Turkey researcher falling ill. Generally, it is always necessary to have alternate plans for any sort of in-country research in this field of work, as well as strong relationships with various UN agencies and research institutions, which the Project was able to call upon not only for the drafting of the four country assessments but also for the hosting of the launch events in Geneva and Calcutta to reach those two very distinct sets of audiences.

RESEARCH IMPACT

Four in-depth country assessments

The inclusion of these four country assessments—Kenya, Georgia, Sri Lanka and Afghanistan—was consistent with the Project’s goals to provide a geographical balance as well as a wide range of issues in applying the Framework. These countries also proved feasible to complete in a limited period of time, owing to the considerable expertise of principal investigator Mooney, who authored the Georgia assessment, and the ability of the Project to convert and update its legal and policy research conducted in 2010 in Afghanistan.
Final manuscript

Ferris and Mooney drafted an analytical manuscript analysing the challenges and opportunities for conceptual research implementing national responsibility frameworks as well as the findings drawn from the 15 country desk studies and the four in-depth country assessments. They wrote comparative studies for each of the 12 benchmarks, examining the trends and contrasting policies and practice across all 15 countries. The manuscript looks specifically at the Framework and extrapolates lessons for the implementation of R2P national responsibility frameworks, with the goal of providing guidance as to how the Framework can strengthen efforts by national governments to operationalise R2P. The report also features a Foreword by Special Rapporteur on the Human Rights of Internally Displaced Persons, Dr Chaloka Beyani. The report drafting process greatly benefitted from the feedback received from the external reviewers as well as that of the field researchers.

The anticipated summer 2011 deadline for the publication of the final report was pushed back to November 2011. At that time, the Project published the report in English which included the analytical manuscript and the four in-depth country assessments. In line with common practice for most reports, and in light of the length of the final report—over 300 pages—an Executive Summary was drafted summarising the key findings of the report. This addition proved to be very well received across the board.

DEVELOPMENT RESULTS

The development results remain unchanged from those outlined in the proposal and Annual Report. The research met all five of the objectives of the Australian R2P Fund. The final report built stronger evidence for policies and programs advancing national responsibility, which will assist the development of national R2P frameworks and advance the R2P concept. Similarly, the research deepened the pool of understanding and expertise on the R2P concept globally and within the Asia Pacific region by increasing knowledge about the relationship between national and international responsibility and about the best ways for states to implement abstract conceptual frameworks, such as R2P. As relayed and echoed in the launch events, this research has also generated further understanding of how states can best translate abstract international concepts, such as R2P, into concrete and measurable policies which have a direct impact on the lives of large numbers of people.

Specifically, it provides a significant opportunity to facilitate the ability of governments, especially those facing internal displacement crises, to use the Framework as a guide to adopting sound policies – thereby strengthening national capacity on internal displacement issues and the concept of responsible sovereignty – in the four countries featured in the in-depth assessments as well as the 11 other countries. These assessments also serve to foster linkages that encourage solutions to the problems associated with the prevention of mass atrocities.

The Project has also learned that the UN has also found that both the Framework and the final report to be important in their response to internal displacement. UNHCR informed the Project that it has 7 integrated parts of the Framework for National Responsibility, into its ‘results based management’ framework, aiming to improve both the legal and policy framework for IDPs, and the administrative practice for IDP protection, in certain countries. UNHCR-Afghanistan has notified the Project that it would discuss the final report in detail at an IDP Task Force meeting, headed by UNHCR and the ministry which leads IDP response. This also dovetails with a request to Dr Beyani to assist with the development of an IDP policy in Afghanistan.

In light of the above, the Project also still intends for this research to strengthen general awareness of R2P, forced displacement, the Framework, the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement, and – perhaps most importantly – the relationship between national and international responsibility. The Project is of the opinion that this report serves a solid basis to conduct further analysis in the future, on conflict-
induced displacement and taking into account more thoroughly natural disaster-induced displacement as well as development-induced displacement. Meanwhile, this report stands out as the first to comprehensively analyse national response to internal displacement situations in various countries throughout the world.

**ACTIVITIES**

The final report was first launched in Washington, DC in December 2011 with subsequent launches in Geneva in January 2012 and in Calcutta in April 2012 at an event convened by Calcutta Research Group (CRG). The DC launch event featured an introduction by Brookings senior fellow and Project co-founder and former co-director Roberta Cohen, as well as presentations on the report’s findings by Ferris and Mooney. A summary of the presentations and discussion was subsequently posted on the Project website: [http://www.brookings.edu/about/projects/idp](http://www.brookings.edu/about/projects/idp)

The Geneva launch featured remarks by Beyani and Ferris as well as Louise Aubin of UNHCR’s Division on International Protection Services and Kate Halff, Head of IDMC. Press coverage was obtained by way of an article published online by Integrated Regional Information Networks (IRIN) on the launch event and the main findings of the report.

The Calcutta launch event featured a pre-taped video address by Ferris on the findings of the report and the limitations of the research. Walter Fernandes, Director, North-Eastern Social Research Centre in Guwahati, also offered his comments on the report and discussed development-induced displacement as an additional cause of internal displacement affecting large numbers of people. A panel discussion on the report, chaired by Ranabir Samaddar, Director, CRG, followed, with remarks by Subodh Raj Pyakurel, Chairperson of the Nepalese non-governmental organisation, Informal Sector Service Centre (Insec) whose remarks focused on IDPs displaced by development projects in Nepal; by Ameena Mohsin, Department of International Relations, Dhaka University, Bangladesh, who discussed the current situation of IDPs in Bangladesh; by I.A. Rehman, Director, Human Rights Commission of Pakistan who highlighted the various types of displacement in Pakistan; by Jeevan Thyagaraja, Director, Consortium of Humanitarian Agencies, Sri Lanka, who discussed the evolution of the Sri Lankan institutional response to internal displacement; and the panel concluded with remarks by Paula Banerjee, Secretary, CRG, as the last speaker, spoke on internal displacement in India.

All three launch events were very well attended. Attendees included senior staff from UN agencies, international humanitarian organisations, NGOs and academics. The DC launch also had US government staff in attendance, while donor representatives attended the Geneva launch, including those from Austria, Australia, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Norway, Switzerland, UK, and the United States Agency for International Aid (USAID).

In addition, Mooney presented the report’s main findings at the ‘Regional Capacity to Protect, Prevent and Respond: United Nations-Asia Pacific Strategy and Coordination Conference’ held in Bangkok, 17-18 May 2012. At the conference, Mooney drew links to internal displacement, the theme of national responsibility and the need to support governments to fulfill their national responsibilities, the research, and experience with regional organisations as well as national institutional focal points on IDP issues.
The results of the research were also presented at a panel on ‘national responsibility’ at the biannual conference of the International Association for the Study of Forced Migration (IASFM) held in Uganda in early July 2011.

The Project conducted its dissemination strategy of the final report produced as outlined in the Proposal. To date, the Project has mailed over 400 copies of the report. A quarter of the 400 copies were sent to the launch events in Geneva and Calcutta; 86 copies were sent to Protection Cluster lead agencies (usually UNHCR) in the field in most of the 15 countries; 62 copies were sent to NGOs and 42 copies were sent to UN agencies, including the Special Adviser on R2P, Dr Edward Luck, and the Special Adviser of the Secretary-General on the Prevention of Genocide, former Representative of the United Nations Secretary General (RSG) on IDPs and Project co-founder and co-director Francis Deng. Copies have also been sent to AusAID, AP R2P, academics, NGOs, including IDMC, as well as to various individuals who provided comments on the drafts and others who signed up for receiving copies at the Bangkok conference.

The Project continues to receive and fill external requests for receipt of the report, as well as some inquiries as to whether or not the study has been printed in French. The Project also distributed the report through its electronic newsletter, which boasts over 10,000 global subscribers. The report was featured on the Project’s website which averages over 8,000 hits a month, with both the report and the Executive Summary available for downloading.

Ferris and Mooney also drafted a two-part blog post on the findings of the report, featured in a housing, land and property blog managed by Rhodri Williams. These two articles, which include links to the report itself, were also reprinted on the Project’s website and were featured in the Project’s March 2012 electronic newsletter and the February 2012 Brookings Alert electronic newsletter which features the latest Brookings research and events.

The report was also discussed and commended by Dr Chaloka Beyani in a video published by the Project and posted in May 2012 on the new Project website. This video is as of end May 2012 one of the five ‘most viewed’ content items on the Project website, along with two other videos discussing IDPs and the work of the Project with remarks by Dr Ferris and Francis Deng, respectively.

Additional opportunities to highlight the report and its findings include in forthcoming country missions conducted by Dr Beyani and his ongoing dialogue with countries affected by internal displacement as well as the annual San Remo, Italy workshop on internal displacement held in June 2012.
The responsibility to prevent: developing ad-hoc and systemic strategies

CHIEF INVESTIGATOR
Professor Jennifer Welsh
University of Oxford

CO-INVESTIGATOR
Dr Serena Sharma
University of Oxford

SYNOPSIS
Our project has contributed towards the implementation of R2P by elaborating on how one of its key elements – prevention – can be operationalised in international society. While early work on R2P identified prevention as an important component of the concept, and the UNSG’s 2009 report on R2P emphasised prevention as a core part of the diplomatic strategy for implementation, there is still relatively little research on how mass atrocities should or can be prevented. With this critical gap in mind, we commenced the project with four key aims:

- To develop an overall framework for understanding the prevention of mass atrocities;
- To analyse and synthesise the ‘best practice’ on prevention from other contexts, and build this evidence base into the strategic framework;
- To demonstrate how prevention works in relation to the other components of R2P; and
- To highlight possible barriers to the successful implementation of prevention, and how they might be overcome.

In pursuing the above aims, our project addressed both designated research priority areas set out by the Australian R2P Fund: (1) Advancing the concept of R2P; and (2) Supporting state capacity to protect populations from mass atrocities.

RESEARCH IMPACT
We have overseen the completion of a series of papers (by both scholars and practitioners) that examine different aspects of atrocity prevention. Some of these papers address particular cases in which mass atrocity prevention was attempted (Kenya, Burundi, the Philippines, and Macedonia), while others looked more generally at conceptual and operational challenges associated with the prevention of mass atrocities (such as clarifying the aim of prevention, assessing the capacities of the UN system to engage in prevention, and evaluating the International Criminal Court (ICC) as a potential preventive ‘tool’). This collection of papers both clarifies and deepens our understanding of the responsibility to prevent, but also engages with wider debates about: a) the relationship between conflict prevention and mass atrocity prevention; and b) the impact and evolution of the more general principle of the responsibility to protect. The project papers will be included in an edited volume (See Appendix 1 for Table of Contents) that we intend to submit to a publisher by September 2012.

In addition to the project papers, we have developed a strategic framework for approaching atrocity prevention, by drawing on related disciplines (such as public health and criminology). This framework, which was further refined through our case studies, elaborates
specific preventive tools and examines the context in which these tools are most effective. Our framework advances a number of key findings:

- **Distinguishing atrocity prevention and conflict prevention.** Atrocity prevention needs to take account, analytically as well as operationally, of the reality that the target or aim of prevention is an international crime. This requires an appreciation of the differences between the related, but distinct areas of conflict prevention and conflict resolution, and the particular context and dynamics of mass atrocity crimes. There are three main reasons for this. First, while a large majority of the episodes of mass killing observed since 1945 occurred within the context of armed conflict, at least a third of the cases did not. Second, some instances of mass atrocities occur under the ‘cover’ of armed conflict, but are not directly linked to either the causes of that conflict or the conduct of the war itself. And finally, whereas strategies to prevent or resolve conflict are generally aimed at the elimination or avoidance of violence and the use of force, the prevention of mass atrocities – particularly at a late or imminent stage – may require military means (as illustrated by the 2011 NATO-led action in Libya).

- **Focusing on crimes against humanity.** Of the four R2P crimes referred to in the 2005 UN World Summit Outcome Document (WSOD), the legal category of crimes against humanity represents the best characterisation of what the principle of R2P was designed to halt or address. Whereas war crimes can include random acts committed by a single soldier or member of a rebel group, crimes against humanity are more widespread and demand some evidence of an organisational policy. Moreover, while crimes against humanity encompass instances of genocide, they do not need to satisfy the latter’s demanding requirements of proof of discriminatory intent. Finally, while genocide refers particularly to racial, religious, or ethnic groups as targets of violence (and, importantly, excludes members of political groups), the possible targets of crimes against humanity are more inclusive. With this in mind, preventative strategies associated with R2P should be aimed more specifically at ‘attacks directed at any civilian population, committed in a widespread or systematic manner, in furtherance of a state or organisational policy, irrespective of the existence of discriminatory intent or an armed conflict.’
- **Systematising preventive tools.**
  Tools for prevention vary along at least two dimensions (1) Scope: whether they are aimed at a particular crisis (‘targeted’) or at those situations, which are at risk (‘systemic’). (2) Nature: whether they are creating incentives to change the behaviour of particular perpetrators, to reduce the vulnerability of potential victims, or to address the enabling environment for the commission of atrocity crimes.

- **Focusing systemic prevention.** By definition, preventive action needs to be more systemic and to cast a wider net than curative action (i.e., it cannot be limited to ‘11th hour’ interventions). However, longer-term, systemic prevention still lacks an empirical foundation that allows policy-makers to identify which particular risk factors, and which particular institutional weaknesses or social cleavages, are most likely to lead to the commission of mass atrocity crimes. This gap has resulted in a tendency to recommend a broad set of systemic tools – engaging in issues as diverse as poverty alleviation, rule of law development, and democratisation. We argue, by contrast, that a strategic framework for atrocity prevention needs to identify specific tools and capabilities that are not necessarily synonymous with these broader economic or political agendas.

- **Understanding the limits of a crimes approach.** While framing R2P prevention as ‘crimes prevention’ will help to sharpen preventive strategies, this kind of formulation carries with it challenge for policy-makers. First, many of the actions required to change the incentives of perpetrators and the vulnerability of victims require the UN, regional organisations, and national governments to relinquish the principle of impartiality which has often dominated approaches to conflict prevention and resolution. This could have significant effects on the perceived legitimacy of regional and international organisations, and limit opportunities for compromise or political settlement. Second, the prevention of mass atrocity crimes requires a willingness and capacity to deal with individuals – as perpetrators or victims – rather than sovereign states. This too challenges some of the core principles that have governed inter-state relations in the past, such as non-intervention and sovereign equality.

- **Implementing the ‘3 pillar approach’.** While Ban ki-Moon has stressed that the ‘3 pillars’ of R2P are of equal importance, and can apply simultaneously, in practice the third pillar has often been perceived as the reactive and coercive aspect of R2P, and the first two pillars as the preventive and non-coercive dimensions of the principle. Our project challenges these assumptions. Most importantly, our research underscores that preventive action does not end with the onset of Pillar 3, and that prevention and reaction may not be mutually exclusive.

In addition to advancing the conceptual parameters of atrocity prevention, a closely related aim of our project was to enhance the capacity of states and other actors to protect populations from atrocity crimes. With that in mind, we conducted an in-depth policy engagement process, which involved a series of regional policy dialogues in the US, UK, Africa, and the Asia Pacific. The purpose of these meetings was to initiate a dialogue between academics, NGOs and policy-makers about the challenges associated with mass atrocity prevention. Engaging with the policy community in different regional contexts enabled us to effectively draw out the practical implications of our research, but also to refine our framework and analysis to take account of the specific experiences and knowledge of relevant policy makers.

To further enhance the impact of our research, early on in the project we identified and developed links with a number of organisations involved in or concerned with the implementation of R2P. This paved the way for collaboration with the following partner organisations throughout the policy-engagement process: The Stanley Foundation; The Global Centre for R2P (GCR2P); Cardozo School of Law; The Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC); The Australian Civil-Military Centre; and the United Nations Association of the United Kingdom (UNA-UK). We worked closely with the Cardozo School of Law in organising a policy meeting in Accra, and have
continued to consult the findings of their complementary project on Evidentiary Standards. We have also recently become an associated centre of the GCR2P.

Finally, at our final project conference in December, we invited participants from organisations involved in the ‘practice’ of R2P, including NGOs; officials from humanitarian organisations and R2P advocacy groups; government officials from the UK Foreign and Commonwealth Office, military and development agencies; representatives from foundations that support mass atrocity prevention; and the key figure advancing R2P within the UN system – Dr Edward Luck, Special Advisor to the UNSG on R2P.

On the basis of our discussions with policy makers we produced an accessible policy brief, which will be disseminated widely throughout our network of contacts and partnering organisations. The policy brief clarifies the aim of prevention; identifies specific preventive tools and the enablers that need to be in place to ensure their effectiveness; examines barriers to successful prevention and ways to overcome them; and highlights specific capacities that will need to be built at the national, regional and international levels. Further to this, we intend to submit up to three high quality articles to peer-reviewed journals. The first article will be an adaptation of our strategic framework. The second article will examine the implications of the Libya case for R2P. A final article will explore the normative development of R2P in the context of pivotal events and cases.

**SUSTAINABILITY OF RESEARCH THEMES**

- Our research project is both timely and relevant. As demonstrated by recent events (Libya, Syria, and Cote d’Ivoire), the international community’s capacity to respond to the commission or threat of mass atrocity crimes continues to be tested, and in some instances has been found wanting. These events testify to the importance of understanding the opportunities and limits of preventive action. In addition, in July of 2012 the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) will engage in a dialogue on the international community’s capacity to respond to mass atrocity crimes – so-called Pillar 3 tools. Some of our findings are directly relevant to this discussion. Finally, in a recent speech marking the first decade of the responsibility to protect, UNSG Ban Ki-moon declared 2012 ‘the year of prevention’, designating it as one of the five generational themes for the UN. His declaration suggests that there will be continuing demand for relevant scholarly research on the kinds of approaches which can and should be taken to advance the prevention of mass atrocity crimes.
- The project outcomes and spin-off work will continue to make a contribution to the theory and practice of atrocity prevention. Our edited volume will be the first of its kind, focused exclusively on the preventive dimension of R2P, and will continue to serve as a point of reference for practitioners and scholars. Also, the Kenya case study will be expanded by Dr Serena Sharma into a monograph for the Global Politics and Responsibility to Protect Series. An assessment of this episode – what has been called R2P’s ‘first test-case’ – will contain a number of insights and lessons for preventing atrocities in related contexts. In addition, Professor Jennifer Welsh will be contributing to an authoritative new volume on military intervention; the focus of her chapter will be on examining the implications of viewing R2P through the lens of ‘crime’. Finally, a doctoral student who has been assisting with the project, Ruben Reihe, will be further developing in his dissertation the conceptual foundations of mass atrocity prevention, particularly those relating to the nature and scope of preventive tools.

- This project has also opened up prospective avenues for further research. Some of the areas that warrant further analysis include: risk factors in the commission of mass atrocities (and associated systemic strategies); dilemmas that arise from the application of particular preventive tools; and the relationship between the ICC and R2P. The Institute for Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict (ELAC) is currently exploring, in collaboration with the Cardozo School of Law, the potential for a book-length treatment of this final topic.

**ACTIVITIES**

- June 17, 2011: Operationalising the Responsibility to Prevent: A workshop co-hosted by the GCR2P and ELAC
- July 11-12, 2011: Expert meeting, Accra, Ghana.
- December 12, 2011: Operationalising the Responsibility to Prevent, Final Project Conference
SYNOPSIS
This project was funded by AusAID’s Australian R2P Fund via AP R2P at UQ. The application described the project in the following way:

‘The project has the overall purpose of greatly improving capacity for forecasting mass atrocities and genocide globally and in the Asia Pacific region. The specific aims are to 1) develop sophisticated, appropriate, and cutting-edge quantitative forecasting models, 2) improve understanding of the causes of political instability and conflict which greatly increase the probability of mass atrocities or genocide, 3) improve understanding of the crucial causal processes which lead from instability to mass atrocities or genocide, and 4) produce forecasting software and reports which are useful as early warning tools for protection of vulnerable populations.’

The Principal Investigators believe that all project goals have been met. Central to the success of the project and its specific outcomes has been considerable intellectual advancement in understanding quantitative modelling of ‘rare events’ such as political instability, genocide, and politicide. This forms the foundation for the quality work the project has produced, but can also serve as a basis for future work in this area of research. The process of consultation with various stakeholders throughout the project has been especially useful and informative, and improved the final result in terms of relevance and substance. The specific outcomes include four journal-

PRIORITY THEME
The project related to the ‘priority theme’ (as outlined in the call for proposals) of ‘Supporting states to build capacities to protect populations from genocide and mass atrocities.’ The academic papers produced provide the analytical foundation for this, while the policy reports, website, presentations to policy audiences, consultations and other activities are the direct manifestation of this.

ACADEMIC OUTCOMES
The proposal laid out a plan for ‘two presentations of results at major international conferences’ and ‘two articles in leading social science journals.’

We have produced nine academic works under the project, comprising five conference papers and four article or chapter manuscripts. Among

Understanding and forecasting political instability, mass atrocities and genocide: combining social science and machine learning approaches

CHIEF INVESTIGATOR
Dr Benjamin E. Goldsmith
University of Sydney

CO-INVESTIGATOR
Professor Arcot Sowmya
University of New South Wales
these, three have been accepted for publication (pending some revisions). Specifically, our article ‘Forecasting the Onset of Genocide and Politicide: Annual Out-of-Sample Forecasts on a Global Dataset, 1988-2003,’ has been provisionally accepted at the Journal of Peace Research, which is ranked 7th of 80 International Relations journals by 5-year impact factor in the Thomson/ISI Web of Science. Our conference paper ‘Predicting Onsets of Genocide with Sparse Additive Models,’ has been accepted for publication in the peer-reviewed conference proceedings for the 2012 International Conference on Pattern Recognition, Tsukuba City, Japan. And our chapter ‘Political Instability and Mass Killing: Comparing Causes in Asia and the Pacific and Globally,’ has been provisionally accepted, pending revisions, for the book Genocide and Mass Atrocities in Asia: Legacies and Prevention (New York: Routledge; Deborah Mayersen and Annie Pohlman, editors). Full lists of academic works from the project are provided below.

Academic Conference / Workshop Presentations

There have been five presentations of the research at academic meetings, four of which were at major international conferences while the fifth was at AP R2P. Regarding the first item listed, we note that conference proceedings in Computer Science such as this are prestigious and common venues for publication. Specifically, the presentations are:

1. Dimitri Semenovich, Arcot Sowmya, Benjamin E. Goldsmith, ‘Predicting onsets of genocide with sparse additive models,’ International Conference on Pattern Recognition, Tsukuba City, Japan, November 2012 [paper accepted for publication June 2012].


Academic Articles / Chapter

There are four article or chapter manuscripts from the project. One chapter and one article have been accepted for publication, pending revisions in response to referees’ comments (see attached letters of acceptance). It is especially noteworthy that the article manuscript is accepted by a leading journal in political science and international relations, the Journal of Peace Research, which is ranked 7th of 80 international relations journals and 15th of 148 political science journals (by 5-year impact factor in the Thomson/
The other two manuscripts are/will also be submitted to leading outlets. The four are:


**POLICY-RELEVANT OUTCOMES**

The proposal included ‘2 Policy-relevant forecasting reports for government and policy communities, one Global in focus, one focused on the Asia Pacific,’ a ‘project website hosted at the University of Sydney,’ and a ‘Software package for forecasting.’ It also included ‘policy-relevant presentations... [with] initial expressions of interest from some important organisations: the Brussels-based International Crisis Group (ICG), the Brookings Institution in Washington, DC (a widely known think tank), the Lowy Institute for International Policy (a globally renowned think tank in Sydney), and three within the Australian government, DFAT, Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet (PM&C), and the ONA’.

These goals have been met, although the software has been incorporated into the website, rather than being created for separate distribution. This will facilitate updates as new data become available or the forecasting model itself is improved.

**WEBSITE**

The project website, found at [http://sydney.edu.au/arts/research/r2pforecasting](http://sydney.edu.au/arts/research/r2pforecasting), covers essential information about the project including methods and publications, it presents our forecasts for the period up to 2015, discusses how we assess forecasting performance, and gives contact details. It also provides access to our software tools created specifically for the project, allowing analysts to look inside the data and model to assess risks for particular countries in particular years, and to understand why our model ranks countries as it does by providing information on the most powerful forecasting variables by individual country-year. The website also allows users to download our two policy reports, one with a global focus and the other focused on the Asia Pacific region.

**POLICY REPORTS**

The policy reports are available via download from the website, and will also be distributed to stakeholders directly by email. The reports contain in-depth qualitative discussion of the relevance and implications of our quantitative models, for policy applications. They also discuss in an accessible way how we assessed the forecasting performance of our models, and of course they present our forecasts. For example, we show that while the leading example of genocide/politicide forecasting until now correctly classified 74% of genocide onsets, while also correctly classifying 73% of non-onsets, our model was able to correctly classify 82% of onsets correctly, while also correctly classifying 73% of non-onsets. Arguably our task was also more difficult, since we used a dataset including all countries in the world for all years we studied, and we followed best practice in forecasting methods by using ‘out-of-sample’ tests. Thus we ‘trained’ the model on data for 1974-1987, but tested its performance on data it had
not ‘seen’ before, from 1988-2003. In its annual forecasting performance, our model classified 7 out of 11 genocide onsets (64%) in the top ten or fewer at-risk countries per year from 1988-2003 when predicting one year into the ‘future’ (e.g., using data up to 1999 to forecast events for 2000).

We also have produced forecasts over 5-year periods. This is the result we focus on in the policy reports, since we feel such a period is more relevant for policy applications than forecasts for a single year. It is also more practical, given data limitations, since most of the data for our models are not available until 1-2 years after the events or measurements in question. Thus we base our actual future forecasts on data for the year 2010, and produce forecasts for the period 2011-15. Table 1 below presents our forecasts for the 15 countries most at risk of genocide/politicide onset in this period. Table 1.

The reports are:
- Understanding and Forecasting Political Instability and Genocide for Early Warning
- Political Instability and Genocide in the Asia Pacific: Risks and Forecasts

**PRESENTATIONS AND CONSULTATIONS**

We have made eleven presentations at a range of key organizations in Australia, the US, and Europe. These typically lasted 90 to 150 minutes and involved an in-depth discussion of our approach, models, and forecasting results, as well as demonstration of some of the software applications we have developed, and a question-and-answer session. Among the organizations hosting us were DFAT (Australia), ONA (Australia), Council on Foreign Relations (US), the Research and Development Corporation (RAND) (US), and the ICG (Europe). A full list is provided below.

These talks have created strong awareness of our work among policy, intelligence, and analytical communities in Australia, the US, and (to a lesser extent) Europe. We now have interaction with a wide range of people in this community. We have also noticed a pattern by which our on-line working papers posted at the Social Science Research Network receive large numbers of views and downloads after we give a presentation. The two papers have a total of 490 views and 112 downloads as of 13 July 2012, although they are relatively recently posted (March and June 2012). They can be found at:


Presentations aimed at demonstrating the potential utility for policy applications of the project’s work were made at the following organizations and venues.

1. Harvard University, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Carr Center for Human Rights (5 April 2012, Cambridge, MA, USA)
2. Council on Foreign Relations (16 April 2012, Washington, DC, USA – stakeholders from the US Government foreign policy and intelligence communities also attended)
3. Lowy Institute for International Policy (2 May 2012, Sydney)
4. ONA (3 May 2012, Canberra)
5. The RAND Corporation (8 May 2012, Santa Monica, CA, USA)
6. Monterey Institute for International Studies (11 May 2012, Monterey, CA, USA)

**TABLE 1**

Forecast for 2011 – 2015: Top 15 Countries at Risk of the Onset of Genocide or Politicide

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Country Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Somalia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Angola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Myanmar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ecuador</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Burundi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Syria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Cameroon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Libya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. DFAT (4 June 2012, Canberra) – stakeholders from several other Government organizations also attended

9. ICG (13 June 2012, Brussels, Belgium)

10. SciencesPo/ Centre for International Studies and Research (CERI/CNRS) (19 June 2012, Paris, France)

11. German Institute for International and Security Affairs (SWP) Berlin (27 June 2012, Berlin, Germany)

In addition, there were consultations about our work and findings when an interest was expressed but a full presentation could not be arranged for various reasons.

1. Harvard University, Satellite Sentinel Project (5 April 2012)

2. The Brookings Institution (18 April 2012)

3. United States National Holocaust Memorial Museum (17 April 2012)


MEDIA

Although not a focus of our efforts, we were offered some opportunities to give interviews or write brief pieces for various media outlets.

- ABC Radio, ‘PM’ [30 April 2012]
- Radio New Zealand, ‘Checkpoint’ [1 May 2012]
- Lowy Interpreter Blog [3 May 2012]
- E-IR website feature article by project Research Associate Dr Charles Butcher, ‘Forecasting Genocide’

CONSULTATION WITH STAKEHOLDERS

Our consultations with stakeholders proceeded in three stages. A number of people were contacted even before the project received funding, as indicated in the application. We remained in contact with them and asked all for input along the way, especially around the midpoint of the project in June 2011. Further valuable feedback and advice was received during our eleven presentations and three consultations listed above. We have consulted with
project stakeholders regarding both their support of our project’s overall design and goals, and also their specific needs and preferences. Stakeholders involved from early on were based at leading organisations including: ICG; Brookings Institution; Lowy Institute for International Policy; DFAT (Australia); Australian Office of PM&C; ONA (Australia); Georgetown University. We canvassed a number of aspects of our predictor and outcome factors, and among the most important areas of focus indicated were: geographic contagion effects; civil wars which lead to mass killing; political or ethnic motivations for mass killing; change in the nature of the problem over time. We prioritized these factors where possible. We also came to understand that for policy applications, stakeholders want not only lists of at-risk countries for a given future period, but also substantive descriptions of why these countries are on the list, and what the implications might be for prevention or reaction to instability or mass-atrocity events. In our policy reports we have tried to provide a rich representation of such information in both qualitative and (accessible) quantitative formats.  

**DEVELOPMENT IMPACT, SUSTAINABILITY, AND LESSONS LEARNED**

The impact on international development of this project is clearly indirect, but also potentially large. Put simply, this project makes a considerable contribution to capabilities in Australia and globally for forecasting uncommon but hugely destructive and disruptive political events. It also points to central aspects of development and human welfare, which when neglected are powerful predictors of both serious political instability and the risk of genocide or politicide. These include the infant mortality rate and overtly discriminatory government policies and behavior, as well as sudden jumps in military outlays. Our analysis also points to election periods and democratic reforms as periods of particular danger, although elections in ethnically divided states we find actually help reduce the chance of serious political instability. Such forecasting capability, in combination with other existing qualitative and quantitative tools, can help provide early warning and help decision makers make the most well-informed and considered choices about development aid and diplomatic relations, understanding broader risks of rare but high-impact events such as instability and mass killings. This, we hope, contributes to the sustainability of aid in support of political and economic development.

The project and its impact can also be considered sustainable in the sense that updating our forecasts, website, and policy reports should now be relatively low-cost in terms of time and resources. We have learned valuable lessons as analysts from our work on this project. These include ideas for ways to further improve our models, for example by developing cross-national datasets on ‘threat’ and ‘hate’ rhetoric, or on paramilitary forces, over sufficient time periods, which currently do not exist but we expect to be quite useful to enhance forecasting performance. We have also learned quite a lot about variables and approaches which have not proved useful, allowing us to chart the most productive path forward towards future work. And we have learned much about the needs of the policy community, broadly defined, in this issue area, allowing us to better understand how to translate our academic skills, knowledge, and findings into more readily useful information for policy analysts and policy makers.
SYNOPSIS
The purpose of the project is to deepen understanding of the relationship between International Humanitarian Law (IHL) and R2P in order to increase respect for R2P and to enhance protection for vulnerable communities.

The relationship between IHL and R2P is not well understood despite significant overlap of the relevant international legal principles and of the underlying humanitarian imperative. Clarification of this relationship – particularly the identification of areas of overlap as well as of the separate and distinct aspects of both normative regimes – will be important for the advancement of understanding of R2P.

RESEARCH IMPACT
While there are many areas of similarity and divergence between IHL and R2P, there are two important elements that emerged from the research and should be noted. The first is that unlike IHL, R2P is not, itself, a legal concept. It derives its authority from existing bodies of international law such as the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of Genocide, the Rome Statute of the ICC, and of course, from IHL. The obligations on States with regards to R2P crimes are, therefore, as diverse as their origins. For example, the Genocide Convention requires states to prevent and punish the crime of genocide, whereas there is no...
International humanitarian law (IHL) imposes obligations on States with regard to crimes against humanity. The extensive obligations on States found in IHL, however, do not all relate to R2P which leads to the second important element of the research.

R2P only focuses on the protection of vulnerable populations from the four crimes of genocide, ethnic cleansing, war crimes, and crimes against humanity. It is by nature narrow in scope. IHL, on the other hand, offers a wide array of protection. It protects people not only from R2P crimes but it also determines that the wounded and sick must be collected and cared for, and prisoners and detainees must be treated humanely and benefit from judicial guarantees. IHL protects objects such as hospitals, ambulances and significant pieces of cultural property. The types of weapons and military tactics that can be supported by the Australian Government, used during armed conflict are also regulated by IHL. R2P is silent on these matters.

Significant research and wide consultation was undertaken in the development and completion of the booklet entitled International Humanitarian Law and the Responsibility to Protect, which outlines many of these differences. This booklet is available in printed form, in electronic form on CD and can be downloaded in English and French from the IHL Resources page of the Australian Red Cross website: [http://www.redcross.org.au/ihl-resources.aspx](http://www.redcross.org.au/ihl-resources.aspx)

An aligned power-point presentation has also been developed and is available for use by trainers, trainers of trainers, IHL education officers and other interested parties.

The booklet and presentation were launched in Canberra on 24 March 2011 at the Australian Red Cross National IHL Committee meeting. The Australian Defence Force (ADF), Australian Federal Police (AFP), AusAID, DFAT, and the Commonwealth Attorney General’s Department were all in attendance and have taken materials back to their departments for distribution. Several government departments indicated an interest in receiving training on the relationship between IHL and R2P, further contributing towards the advancement of the R2P concept throughout the public service.

International Red Cross societies have also expressed an interest in the materials, requesting access, use and training to enable further education and dissemination of information regarding R2P and IHL. In addition, an academic article has been developed addressing some of the convergence and divergence between IHL and R2P. This article will be published in an edited edition by the United Nations University (UNU) in mid-2012 and will contribute to the expansion of the original intent and reach of the project.

The relevance of the relationship between R2P and IHL has been particularly pertinent in the first half of 2011, which has seen unprecedented action by the international community in the protection of civilians (POC) in armed conflict. The materials produced by this project are easily accessible through the internet and through the National Red Cross and Red Crescent societies and can therefore help to provide some clarity and explanation where there are questions and uncertainty in the relationship between IHL and R2P.

The military intervention in Libya, widely hailed as the first R2P military intervention for the POC, raises with even greater importance the need to understand the relationship between R2P and IHL. The booklet produced by this project also provides research on the non-military preventative aspects of R2P.
The Red Cross and Red Crescent societies play an important role in assisting States to fulfill their legal obligation under Common Article 1 of the Geneva Conventions which is ‘to respect, and ensure respect for’ IHL. By making the connection between IHL and R2P, this project is also helping governments to build capacity to provide not only the wide array of protection offered under IHL, but also to protect against R2P crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and ethnic cleansing.

**ACTIVITIES**

Research material from the project has been presented at a number of training workshops, conferences and international meetings including:

- Red Cross presentations in Norway, Sweden and Jordan in July and October 2010, respectively.
- The POC and R2P Workshop in Sydney, November 2010.
- Training of Red Cross colleagues from Samoa and Solomon Islands, 2010.
- The Australian Red Cross is using the research in their Fundamentals of IHL and International Humanitarian Action Training (IHAT) sessions. They are also incorporating the research into the Masters of Crisis Management Program at Monash University, and the Training for humanitarian practitioners.
- Copies of the booklet were widely distributed at the International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent movement in Geneva in November 2011, to both National Society and Government representatives.
- Public seminars by Dr Phoebe Wynn-Pope covering the research and the booklet in Perth, Adelaide, Sydney and Melbourne through March to May 2012 attended by approximately 250 people in total, as well as Victoria University Law School in Wellington, New Zealand in July 2012 with over 100 attendees.

While these conference attendances and presentations were not a requirement of the project this work has been undertaken as part of the dissemination of the material and as a contribution to the priority theme of the R2P fund – advancing the R2P concept.
SYNOPSIS
This project aimed to improve and deepen cooperation and exchange among local, national and international actors engaged in peacebuilding, the prevention of violent conflict and the protection of populations. It focused on the interface between local peace and order actors and international practitioners, and sought to foster greater understanding among international policymakers and practitioners of the significance of local actors and capacities for peacebuilding and protection.

Local actors and institutions embedded within communities and community life are often at the forefront of providing everyday security, order and protection to local populations. Yet, these non-state capacities tend to be overlooked in mainstream policies for implementing R2P. Through its focus on engaging with local strengths for conflict prevention and protection this project sought to widen and deepen the ways R2P is understood and implemented, particularly regarding Pillar 2.

To explore possibilities for enhancing the capacity to protect by drawing upon local societal strengths, the project undertook research in the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Bougainville and East Timor, with the Solomon Islands being the primary focus. Targeted fieldwork in the Solomon Islands gathered a range of perspectives on the legitimacy, effectiveness and inter-relations of state and non-state providers of peace and order, justice, social norms, security and protection.

The research outlook departed from the emphasis on ‘fragile states’. Instead, to make an empirically grounded assessment of the potential for cooperative exchanges and links between local, national and international actors, the researchers examined three potential forms of relationship: incompatibility or significant tensions between particular aspects of community and state approaches; substitution, indicating societal equivalents to state capacities; and finally; complementarity, indicating areas in which state and community approaches overlap and supplement each other.

RESEARCH IMPACT
The countries researched are characterised by significant diversity of culture, historical experience and political circumstance. Even the targeted research sites within the Solomon Islands are diverse. Nevertheless, the research also revealed important commonalities. The following comments refer directly to the Solomon Islands, but are broadly applicable to all the countries studied.

Across the sites studied, peace, social order and protection are provided primarily by non-state actors and processes. Chiefs and church leaders in particular take key roles in maintaining day-to-day order and communal peace. They have a significant and comprehensive presence on the ground. State actors and institutions, by comparison, have limited presence within the local communities. Overall, people rated non-state actors as more effective and legitimate than
state actors. In the Solomon Islands, international actors tend to fall in between; local people often indicated that they see international agencies as important for maintaining order, but also as often lacking understanding of, and responsiveness to, local context.

**INCOMPATIBILITIES, SUBSTITUTABILITY, COMPLEMENTARITY**

There can be tensions or incompatibilities between international and local approaches, for example regarding the relationship between state law and customary laws or between custom and human rights, and diverging understandings of participation and inclusion. Yet, most people who drew attention to incompatibilities also considered these issues as negotiable, and as already being negotiated. Our research indicates that local actors, including customary leadership, are receptive to engaging in dialogue about their roles. Engagement and exchange that takes local approaches seriously frequently reveals flexibility and capacity for change in local customs, and promising avenues for connecting local values and those embedded in human rights and related discourses.

The research found that substitutability is limited (although some discrete instances are working well). Non-state actors do not entirely take on state functions, and state actors do not entirely substitute for non-state actors. For example, in the Solomon Island sites chiefs cannot take over the tasks of the police, or vice versa. Similarly, restorative justice in the community context (compensation payments, fines, community work) cannot completely substitute for punitive justice in the state context (court rulings, imprisonment), nor would people be happy with either a solely state-based, or customary, system of justice.

Finally, research revealed substantial scope for complementarity. State actors such as the police are aware that chiefs and church leaders are important for maintaining order in the local context. Given their limited resources state actors are not able to guarantee peace and order across the entirety of state territory. Chiefs and community leaders, on the other hand, indicated that they cannot deal with all the challenges to peace and order on their own, and need the support of state actors able to handle problems beyond customary reach. Non-state actors actively seek complementarity and to adapt to the work of state institutions. In the Solomon Islands, the reality on the ground is often characterised by what might be called ‘complementarity in weakness’ with a (mutual) tendency to demand ‘complementary’ action from other actors when one’s own capacities are insufficient, with chiefs expecting more from police, and vice versa. In all the countries studied, deliberate facilitation of dialogue to better understand each other’s roles and negotiation over ‘divisions of labour’ will be important in enhancing overall capacity for peacebuilding and protection.

International assistance, in turn, can by definition only fulfil roles that complement local activities. While research revealed local appreciation of international assistance, it was widely noted that the ultimate success of international protection support depends on collaboration with local actors and their genuine ownership of the process.
Research findings and workshop inputs shaped a Guidance Framework of Engagement. The Framework offers broad policy advice on principles and steps to build on complementarity, strengthen collaboration, and prioritise engagement with local societal practices and capacities.

The research findings and Guidance Framework for Engagement have generated considerable interest among practitioners, policy-makers and academics across the local-national-international spectrum. Examples include:

- The Framework was tabled and distributed at the Regional Security Committee meeting of the Pacific Islands Forum in June 2012
- Discussion of the Framework at the 2011 Solomon Islands National Leadership Forum generated substantial interest
- A brochure on Localising R2P in the Solomon Islands was widely distributed nationally
- The ADF has incorporated the Framework in selected training manuals
- The United States Institute of Peace (USIP) Working Group on R2P has included the Framework in their agenda for policy development;
- In East Timor, a National University program has introduced principles from the Framework in peacebuilding work undertaken with Oxfam
- The United Nations Development Program (UNDP) Pacific Centre’s Capacities for Peace and Development in the Pacific (CPAD) is using the Framework for its guidelines and project design;

- In Fiji, several NGOs have included the Framework into the training of staff and facilitators;

- In Fiji, the Pacific Theological College (PTC) has incorporated the Framework in its peacebuilding course.

Workshop feedback indicates that the project facilitated spaces for local, national, regional and international actors to meet, exchange ideas and concerns, and initiate networks of cooperation and trust. Dialogue enables partnerships and cooperation and enables meaningful cross-cultural exchange. This is key to the project’s goals and to its potential ongoing impact.

SUSTAINABILITY

The level of engagement among participating bodies generated by the project, and the interest in further exchanges, augur well for the sustainability and potential of the approach of working with local strengths to enhance capacities for protection and peace.

Working in respectful and inclusive ways is a central element in the long-term sustainability of international and national efforts to protect populations from atrocity.

This project endeavours to contribute to the conceptualisation and implementation of R2P becoming more inclusive and attuned to existing local approaches to peace and protection. The interest the project generated, and the outcomes produced so far, suggest the value of further support to national, regional and international dialogues and networks of exchange, linked with policy development. Exchanges already initiated with this project in the Pacific could be further developed, or efforts made to test and develop similar dialogues and approaches in other Global South regions.

ACTIVITIES

Four regional interactive workshops – two in Honiara and one each in Brisbane and Suva – brought together international agencies, community representatives and state agencies from regional states. The workshops enabled exchange and engagement across a wide spectrum of perspectives. Research team members facilitated dialogues designed to challenge, test, deepen and elaborate on the research findings, and to elicit discussion of the participants’ experience of the strengths and weaknesses of community-based approaches to peace, conflict resolution and protection.

The Honiara workshops focused on the Solomon Islands. Participants included members of the Solomon Islands Government and police force, representatives of women’s groups, local NGOs, Church associations, and participants from international agencies including the World Bank and Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands (RAMSI).

The Brisbane workshop had a regional focus, and brought together people working with peace and protection from Australia, the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Bougainville and East Timor, including academics, customary actors, and police. The AFP and ADF personnel participated, as did researchers from the ANU and the School of Political Science and International Studies (POLSiS) and AP R2P, UQ.

The Fiji workshop, co-hosted by the UNDP, further developed the regional focus. Members of the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat (the leading regional political body), regional women’s networks, chiefs, University of the South Pacific academics and NGOs participated.

As a follow-up to the Fiji workshop, a UNDP-hosted meeting in Fiji discussed experiences of NGOs and civil society organisations (CSOs) that have used the Framework in their work.

International Seminar. Research outcomes were also presented at a meeting of the United States Institute for Peace R2P Working Group in Washington DC to promote policy focus on engaging with local strengths in the implementation of Pillar 2 of R2P.
SYNOPSIS
The S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies (RSIS) Centre for Non-Traditional Security’s (NTS) objectives are mostly directed to the Australian R2P Fund’s first research priority: advancing the concept of R2P and its understanding. This focus of the Centre incorporates an implicit understanding that advancing understanding and acceptance of the principle will indirectly support the development of capacities to protect populations, by inculcating broad-based support for the activities of R2P ‘champions’.

RESEARCH IMPACT
The RSIS Centre for NTS Studies is pleased to report that activities carried out in the final reporting year, March 2011 – March 2012, were successful and helped the Centre move towards meeting its R2P project objectives. The activities conducted in this last reporting year included: (1) Second Dissemination Meeting/Policy Roundtable on R2P, Bangkok, 28 March 2011; (2) a presentation on ‘R2P in Asia: Issues and Challenges’ in a Dissemination Meeting on Non-Traditional Security, 28–29 November 2011; and (3) R2P research and in particular, fieldwork conducted in Cambodia.

Publication of Study Group Research Papers from the Study Group were published in a special edition of The Pacific Review in March 2012 (Vol. 25, No. 1). This special edition includes the following peer reviewed articles:
- ‘Thailand and the Responsibility to Protect’ by Keokam Kraisoraphong;
- ‘R2P by Increments: ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights (AICHR) and Localising the Responsibility to Protect in Southeast Asia’ by Herman Kraft;
- ‘Indonesia and the Responsibility to Protect’ by Lina Alexandra;
- ‘The Responsibility to Protect Norm in Southeast Asia: Framing, Resistance and the Localization Myth’ by David Capie;
- ‘Japan and the Responsibility to Protect: Coping with Human Security Diplomacy’ by Jun Honna;
- ‘The Responsibility to Protect in Southeast Asia: Opening Up Spaces for Advancing Human Security’ by Mely Caballero-Anthony;
- The ASEAN Political and Security Community (APSC): Opportunities and Constraints for R2P in Southeast Asia’ by Rizal Sukma; and
- ‘China and Responsibility to Protect: Maintenance and Change of Its Policy for Intervention’ by Liu Tiewa

A final paper on assessing the role of CSOs and social movements in the region, and how they can contribute to operationalising R2P in Asia, will be published later this year.

Centre researchers conducted field research in Thailand, Myanmar, and Cambodia, investigating how
R2P is perceived, promoted, and operationalised in the region. Based on the field research findings, one Peace Review academic journal article and two in-house publications were produced in late 2011, highlighting the potential of civil society groups to act as regional champions of R2P in Asia. These works explored the UN-backed international war crimes trial in Cambodia and argued that the fundamental value underpinning the tribunal in Cambodia converges with the ethos of R2P; which is POC against mass atrocities. A third in-house publication released in February 2012 investigated R2P’s traction in Southeast Asia, identified key stakeholders in the region, and offered pathways forward.

Below is a list of work published from the field research:

- ‘Peacebuilding Governance – Negotiating the Khmer Rouge Trials’ by Gong Lina and Manpavan Kaur (NTS Alert, No. 1, October 2011)
- ‘Roadmap for R2P in Asia: Personalities, Institutions and Processes’ by Alistair D.B. Cook (NTS Perspectives, No. 8, February 2012)

**OUTCOMES**

At the beginning of the two-year project on ‘Operationalising the Responsibility to Protect in Asia: Mapping Out Differing Voices and Building Constituencies to Advance R2P’, the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies had set out to achieve the following key objectives:

- Map out and understand the different voices on R2P in Asia – both from state and non-state actors;
- Explore how R2P can be advanced in tandem with significant regional developments in human rights and human security;
- Examine the existing regional mechanisms or lack of it for civilian protection from mass atrocities
- Analyse the role played by major powers in the region – China and Japan – in operationalising R2P in Asia;
- Identify national actors to promote and advance R2P in selected Southeast Asian countries: Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand;
- Broaden the community of individuals and institutions involved in the shaping of a normative security architecture in Asia.

The following outcomes have been achieved:

- Achieved a good grasp of the thinking and understandings of R2P in Asia.
- Raised awareness of R2P and its relevance for Asia among policymakers and civil society actors.
- Mapped out through systematic research the extent to which R2P has been operationalised in Asia and issues relevant to implementation.
- Identified national constituencies and how they feed into regional processes.
- Examined the role of major and middle powers in the region and studied the possibility of R2P champions in Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand.
- Evaluated the traction that R2P has gained in regional architecture.
- Assessed the role of the UN in Asia to promote and address R2P-like situations.

**IMPACT**

Both public engagement activities and closed door sessions on R2P carried out by the Centre targeted policymakers, NGOs, academics and analysts. These activities provided an opportunity to not only facilitate the dissemination of knowledge to the wider public but also a platform for these stakeholders to discuss issues related to R2P. International organisations that the Centre has engaged in the span of this project include the AICHR, the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF), the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women), and the UNHCR.

The Centre’s R2P publications have also been circulated widely with these publications being used as teaching material in universities and executive training sessions. International organisations are also using these as policy reference documents. An indication of the impact the Centre has in the study of R2P is the recognition it is receiving in the first and second editions of the International Coalition on the Responsibility to Protect (ICRtoP) publication on civil society actors. Without the Centre’s strategic approach to engaging with think tanks, international organisations and policymakers on R2P research, and subsequently disseminating R2P information and research to targeted stakeholders, gaining traction and policy influence in the region would not have been possible.

Key activities organised throughout the two-year project include the following:

- Study Group Meeting on R2P (7 April 2010)
- Regional Consultation on R2P (8–9 April 2010)
- Seminar on Misrepresenting Norms and R2P: An Alternative Cascade? (by Thomas G. Weiss, Presidential Professor of Political Science, The City University of New York (CUNY) Graduate Center; and Director of the Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies, 12 April 2010)
- Regional Workshop on the POC (15–16 July 2010, in collaboration with the ICRC)
- Seminar on ‘Understanding and Preventing Mass Atrocity Crimes outside of a Crisis Context’ (by Mr Francis Deng, Special Adviser to the UNSG on the Prevention of Genocide, 12 November 2010)
- Seminar on ‘Recalibrating Norms: Europe, Asia and Non-Traditional Security Challenges’ (by Associate Professor Katja Weber, Sam Nunn School of International Affairs, Georgia Institute of Technology, 29 November 2010)
- First Dissemination Meeting/Policy Roundtable on R2P (Tokyo, 26 January 2011)
- Second Dissemination Meeting/Policy Roundtable on R2P (Bangkok, 28 March 2011)
- Dissemination Meeting on Non-Traditional Security (Singapore, 28–29 November 2011)

**ACTIVITIES**

Publications produced during the project include the following:

**Conference reports:**

- Report on Regional Consultation on R2P (8–9 April 2010)
- Report on Regional Workshop on the POC (15–16 July 2010)
- Report on First Dissemination Meeting/Policy Roundtable on R2P (26 January 2011)
- Report on Dissemination Meeting on Non-Traditional Security (28–29 November 2011)

**Journal articles:**
- Special Issue of *The Pacific Review*, Vol. 25, No. 1, March 2012

**In-house publications:**
- ‘Preventing Crimes in South-East Asia’ by Alistair D.B. Cook and Priyanka Bhalia, The Brunei Times, 16 June 2010
- ‘Reserving the Right Not to Comply: ASEAN Legal Reservations to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the Convention to Eliminate all Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW)’ by Mely Caballero-Anthony and Priyanka Bhalia (NTS Alert, No.1, June 2010)
- ‘Regional Champions – Examining the Comparative Advantages of AICHR and the ASEAN Commission on the Promotion and Protection of the Rights of Women and Children (ACWC)’ by Alistair D.B. Cook and Priyanka Bhalia (NTS Insight, June 2010)
- ‘R2P – A Way Forward’ by Omar Halim (NTS Insight, July 2010)
- ‘Advancing ASEAN’s Political-Security Community: The POC Agenda’ by Manpavan Kaur, Holly Haywood and Mely Caballero-Anthony (NTS Alert, No. 1, November 2010)
- ‘Advancing POC through the AICHR’ by Holly Haywood, Manpavan Kaur and Mely Caballero-Anthony (NTS Alert, No. 2, November 2010)
- ‘Developing a ‘POC’ Agenda for Southeast Asia’ by Mely Caballero-Anthony (NTS Perspectives, No. 5, January 2011)
- ‘ASEAN Community Building: Towards a Comprehensive Framework for...’
Civilian Protection in Southeast Asia’ by Mely Caballero-Anthony and Holly Haywood (NTS Policy Brief, No. 7, February 2011)
- ‘Applying the Ethnic Rebellion Model and Risk Assessment Model to Conflict in Myanmar’ by Lina Gong, Manpavan Kaur and Alistair D.B. Cook (NTS Insight, March 2011)
- ‘Examining ASEAN Capacity in the Context of the Thai-Cambodian Border Dispute’ by Holly Haywood (NTS Alert, No. 1, September 2011)
- ‘R2P: Tensions between Sovereignty and Security’ by Barry Desker and Joel Ng (RSIS Commentaries, No. 142, October 2011)
- ‘Peacebuilding Governance – Negotiating the Khmer Rouge Trials’ by Lina Gong and Manpavan Kaur (NTS Alert, No. 1, October 2011)
- ‘Roadmap for R2P in Asia: Personalities, Institutions and Processes’ by Alistair D.B. Cook (NTS Perspectives, No. 8, February 2012)
- Regional Implications of National Reconciliation in Myanmar by Gong Lina (NTS Alert, March 2012)

Video interviews of experts on R2P and POC
- In conversation with Mr Soliman Santos Jr, South Network for Non-State Armed Group Engagement (June 2010)
- In conversation with Professor Toshiya Hoshino, Osaka School of International Public Policy (June 2010)
- In conversation with Dr Rizal Sukma, Executive Director of CSIS Jakarta (June 2010)
- In conversation with Assistant Professor Liu Tiewa, Beijing Foreign Studies University (June 2010)
- In conversation with Lt-Gen. Satish Nambiar, Advisory Board Member of the UN Institute for Training and Research (June 2010)
- In conversation with Professor Shin-Wah Lee, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Korea University (September 2010)
- In conversation with Mr Rafendi Djamin, former Commissioner of Indonesia to AICHR (September 2010)
- In conversation with Prince Norodom Sirivudh, Supreme Privy Counselor to His Majesty, the King of Cambodia; and Founder and Chairman of Cambodian Institute for Cooperation and Peace (September 2010)
- In conversation with Ms Diane M. Swales, Regional Adviser for Child Protection, UNICEF (September 2010)
- In conversation with Mr Alain Aeschlimann, International Committee for the Red Cross (September 2010)
of the Red Cross, Regional Head of Operations (September 2010)
- In conversation with Professor Ramesh Thakur, Former Senior Vice-Rector, UNU; Former Assistant Secretary-General of the UN; and Director, Centre for Nuclear Non-proliferation and Disarmament, Asia Pacific College of Diplomacy, ANU (November 2011, forthcoming)

**SUSTAINABILITY**
Research findings from this project provided some indication of the opportunities and challenges that could arise from the further development of the R2P norm.

One key finding is that there was poor awareness of R2P in the region. There is thus a pressing need to promote R2P to all stakeholders engaged in internal and cross-border conflicts, and to advance its implementation within the region. In addition, it is important to recognise that, within countries, overseas representatives and domestic officials differ in their opinions of R2P. As a result of interconnected activities (research activities and policy discussions with key actors), Centre researchers were able to learn important lessons in research design, and develop ways to ensure the policy-relevance of our research through engaging officials at the Track II level. Both public engagement activities and closed door sessions not only allowed the dissemination of knowledge to the wider public but also provided avenues, where appropriate, for candid remarks and open discussion. Researchers have developed key research skills and actively contributed to the policy discourse as part of a wider effort to address human security challenges across South East Asia and the wider Asian region.

**LESSONS LEARNED**
In taking stock of the developments in the past two years, we have observed that specific funding sources for R2P research remain a challenge and thus strategic funding approaches are required. That being said, we are pleased to report that significant progress has been made in the mapping of the ways in which the R2P concept is operationalised in Asia and in identifying the key stakeholders at the national level who form the basis of a constituency to promote R2P. Through the development of an active research agenda, the Centre was able to contribute policy-relevant and academically rigorous deliverables over the past two years.

The emergence of national and regional mechanisms, notably in South-East Asia, provides potential added capacity to promote and work towards the POC. The AICHR and the ACWC are institutions through which awareness of these issues could be raised. The most notable institution is the AICHR, which has the ability to gather thematic reports on human rights issues from all stakeholders. While R2P in Asia is contested at present, there remain multiple avenues for building capacity, raising awareness and providing the necessary means to protect civilians within the three-pillar strategy. More research can be conducted to explore these avenues.
ACTIVITIES

Second Dissemination Meeting/Policy Roundtable on R2P

This dissemination meeting was the second of two dissemination exercises to circulate the findings of the R2P Study Group. It was co-organised by the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies, the Institute of Security and International Studies (ISIS Thailand), the National Research Council of Thailand (NRCT) and the Strategic Studies Center (SSC) of the National Defence Studies Institute, Thailand.

The aims of the two dissemination meetings were to introduce possible policy entry points for operationalising R2P in Asia, and more broadly, promote an understanding of R2P and assist in operationalising it in policymaking across Asia. In line with these aims, various topics were covered by the Study Group. The role of major powers in East Asia in the advancement of R2P was a major focus. In addition, the potential of regional mechanisms to promote and raise awareness of R2P was examined. The mechanisms which were assessed included the ASEAN Charter and the APSC, as well as the AICHR and the ACWC.

Prominent participants included keynote speaker Professor Vitit Muntarbhorn, former UN Special Rapporteur on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography, and on the Situation of Human Rights in the Democratic People’s Republic of Korea (North Korea); Lieutenant General Prasart Sukkaset, Deputy Commanding General of the National Defence Studies Institute of the Royal Thai Armed Forces; and General Charan Kullavanijaya, former UNSG of the National Security Council and Chairman of the National Defence Alumni Think Tank of Thailand. There were also representatives from the military forces of Thailand, the Thailand Ministry of Foreign Affairs, foreign embassies in Thailand, the ICRC, research institutes and universities.

In his presentation, Dr Cook pointed out that a key finding from R2P research carried out by the Centre was that R2P remains an elite concept; many in the region remain unaware of the principle. Consequently, there is a pressing need to promote R2P to all stakeholders engaged in internal and cross-border conflicts, and to advance its implementation within the region.

Presentation on ‘R2P in Asia: Issues and Challenges’ in Dissemination Meeting

A presentation on ‘R2P in Asia: Issues and Challenges’ was delivered by Dr Alistair Cook, Research Fellow at the RSIS Centre for NTS Studies, in the session on ‘Multilevel Approaches to Conflict Management and Resolution’ at a Dissemination Meeting on Non-Traditional Security on 28–29 November 2011.
SYNOPSIS
This project is a multi-disciplinary study of the relationship between R2P and POC. It seeks to examine the relationship between these two principles which recently have received new impetus and specific embodiment in the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and UNGA resolutions (for example, those in respect to Libya). The timeliness of the project is evidence in the most recent 2012 UNSG Report to the UNSC on the POC, where for the first time the UNSG explicitly considered the question of the relationship between the two protection principles of R2P and POC. The project however also has a regional specificity for South East Asia. It aims at practical enhancement of the capacity of states in the region to engage in civil military operations involving the protection of civilians.

INTERIM MILESTONES
The interim milestones in relation to the key research priorities are: 1) the undertaking of extensive interviews in Geneva and New York as part of the process of mapping the relationship between R2P and POC in the protection operations of UN intergovernmental bodies and NGOs; and 2) the holding of an Academic Practitioner Workshop in Sydney in November 2010 with participation of major regional think tank Institutions from Philippines, Malaysia, Indonesia and Singapore at which the preliminary findings of the interviews were extensively discussed.

INVESTIGATORS
Professor Charles Sampford
Institute for Ethics, Governance and Law, Griffith University

Major General Michael G. Smith
Australian Civil-Military Centre & Institute for Ethics, Governance and Law, Griffith University

Dr Vesselin Popovski
Institute for Sustainability and Peace, United Nations University

Dr Angus Francis
Queensland University of Technology

Professor Ramesh Thakur
Australian National University & Institute for Ethics, Governance and Law, Griffith University

Dr Hugh Breakey
Institute for Ethics, Governance and Law, Griffith University

Village residents flee fighting. UN Photo: Tim McKulka
The interim milestones in relation to the advancing of the concepts of R2P and POC include the realization that if progress is to be made at a regional level, it will need to build on shared and accepted local understandings of R2P and POC. In the South East Asian region, support for R2P is present, but only if interpreted in a narrow fashion – in particular with only guarded support for military interventions. In particular, practitioners and state representatives evinced support for the important 2011 initiative of Brazil, ‘Responsibility while Protecting’. On the other hand, national governments, regional organizations like ASEAN, and CSOs have commitments more generally to human rights, and have various modalities that are – or could potentially – resolve conflicts, monitor flashpoints and ensure civilian safety. Further, many nations are proactive in their support for POC, both in the context of international humanitarian law, facilitating humanitarian activities and peacekeeping missions. Regional actors have also shown a willingness to work together in responding to humanitarian disasters, in a manner (sometimes termed ‘The Responsibility to Provide’) analogous to the international support envisaged by R2P. A preliminary policy implication was thus to focus on developing and expanding these human rights and POC regional capacities, and to illustrate to regional actors how such development is in keeping with the important preventive aspects of R2P (what Ban Ki-Moon calls the ‘First’ and ‘Second Pillars’ of R2P).
RESEARCH OUTPUTS

These interim milestones set the foundation for achieving the two major outputs of the project:

1. The production of an R2P POC Policy Guide ‘Enhancing Protection Capacity’ designed to assist protection actors (policy makers, military and civilian officials and practitioners) in navigating situations which may require them to take part in R2P or POC missions and/or decision-making. The Policy Guide clarifies several areas of deep-seated ambiguity in the relationship between R2P and POC, and debunks several common myths about each of them. As well as the full (200 page) edition of the Policy Guide, a glossy 20 page ‘Overview Document’ was designed, as an approachable document for peacekeepers and humanitarians. The Policy Guide and Overview Document were to have been presented in New York at UN Headquarters in June 2012, thus sharing these results and impacting on the global R2P research community and international and regional arrangements. However, at the request of Australia’s Ambassador to the United Nations, His Excellency Gary Quinlan, this was postponed until November. The presentation will take place on 19th November in New York, with an additional launch on the 20th. Both the Policy Guide and the Overview Document are freely available for download at:

2. The holding of the three regional workshops in Malaysia, Philippines and Indonesia in June 2011 and follow up meetings in April 2012 added the ‘specificity’ of the regional approach and practical activities to the formation of the Policy Guide. It also supported states within South East Asia, international organizations and regional arrangements to build their capacity to take part in protection missions (whether R2P or POC, or both), and to incorporate protection activities into other operations, as for example occurs through the Human Rights Office of the Armed Forces of the Philippines, in particular through their Bayanihan Internal Peace and Security Plan. The project did this through engaging military and civilian officials and practitioners who take part in protection missions, military operations and humanitarian action.

In addition to the Policy Guide the project has generated the preparation of a number of academic publications, including a collection edited by Dr Francis, Professor Sampford and Professor Thakur to be published in 2012 by UNU Press: *Norms of Protection: Responsibility to Protect, Protection of Civilians and Their Interaction*. This will be launched in New York at the same time as the Handbook. Additionally, the research team contributed to a special edition of the journal *Security Challenges* on R2P and POC in 2011, edited by Ramesh Thakur.

The comprehensive literature review (over 70,000 words and 300 references) created for the project has been made available online: ‘R2P and POC: Review and Analysis 2012’. Recently updated, it is regularly downloaded by researchers from all corners of the globe. It is available as a downloadable pdf at:

Findings also are directly communicated to practitioners, for instance in presenting on R2P and POC in ICRC training courses on IHL.

Thus the project is having positive benefits in terms of advancing local, regional and global knowledge and understanding of R2P and POC.
SYNOPSIS
The project ‘R2P in Oceania’ is a political assessment of the impact and influence of R2P principles on the developing police forces of three states, Timor-Leste, Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea (PNG). It links most strongly with the Centre’s priority concept two: supporting states to build their capacities to protect their own populations from abuses of human rights, including genocide and mass atrocities. This articulates with the Responsibility to Assist, the least studied aspect of the UNSG’s ‘Three Pillars’ Approach to R2P. Our research provides empirical findings surrounding the process of police-building in these states. It points to the critical role of CSOs in monitoring police actions, and in education the community. At the same time we have identified a need for greater involvement by CSOs in the process of police-building, in particular in drawing attention to the importance of gender mainstreaming in peace-building in post conflict societies. A key finding has been identifying the disjuncture between the international norms of UNSC Resolution 1325 and their implementation by patriarchal institutions such as police forces, especially in relation to addressing the serious social problem of sexual and gender based violence. International police-building efforts are conscious of this matter, however progress is slow. A central problem is the creation or renewal of trust in police as an institution. Progress is being made, and police in Timor-Leste and Solomon Islands are showing the effects of the large international investment. Police-building in PNG is too small to expect any outcomes, and while this remains the case the propensity for abuse of power and abuse of rights by police continues.

RESEARCH IMPACT
The project ‘Policing and R2P in Oceania’ asked the following research questions:

- How does international donor assistance support police capacity-building in three developing states of Oceania so that domestic police forces adhere norms of human rights protection?
- Exactly what is being done to assist states with developing the capabilities and capacities of their police forces, and by which states?
- How can the success of such activities be measured?

The impact of this type of linkage of aid and development of capacity is likely to be ongoing and critical for Australia’s security. Finding better ways to assist domestic police forces in developing countries has long-term impact for Australia’s role in the region. Our research has centred on:

- Assessing the effectiveness of international police-building in the region.
- Constructing a typology of the different forms of policing assistance being offered to developing states by International donors at the bilateral, regional and multilateral levels.
- Exploring the complicated flow of ideas surrounding the embedding of concepts of respecting human rights.
- Identifying the crucial role played by CSOs and other NGOs in creating public awareness of the rights of citizens, the duties of police, and the excessive use of force by police.
- Analysing some of the key issues and problems surrounding the acceptance and implementation of ideas of strengthening human rights protection within police-building, specifically effective cross-cultural engagement in police training.

**PROJECT ACTIVITIES**

Project funding was initially awarded to Dr Charles Hawksley and Professor Andrew Goldsmith. In early 2012, Goldsmith left the University of Wollongong (UOW) and the project was fortunate to secure the services of in early 2012 Dr Nichole Georgeou, who has a background in development sociology. Professor Goldsmith visited Timor-Leste and Solomon islands once each in 2010, but transferred his portion of the funding to Dr Hawksley during 2012 when he left UOW. Dr Georgeou was employed from January 2012 for her methodological skills in data analysis, and for her experience in Oceania with interviews and fieldwork.

She has made a substantial contribution to the direction of the project and it has broadened its initial concentration on institution building to a more holistic engagement with wider notions of state-building and gender mainstreaming.

Specific outcomes to date include:

- Seven fieldwork visits to three countries across three years to monitor progress in police capacity building. Dr Hawksley has been with the project from the commencement and has visited Timor-Leste on three occasions, PNG once and by the end of 2012, Solomon Islands three times. Georgeou and Hawksley conducted fieldwork in Timor-Leste in June 2012 and will complete the final project fieldwork in Solomon Islands in November/December 2012.
- In-depth interviews with key participants in the police-building process including international police advisers, local police, and CSOs involved in human rights advocacy and community policing.
- Data analysis and coding of previous fieldwork, writing of background and analysis book chapters.
- A refereed conference paper at the Fifth Oceanic Conference on international Studies (OCIS) in 2010 (Hawksley);
- A conference presentation at the ISA Conference in Brisbane in September 2011 (Hawksley).
- A presentation on Policing and R2P in Oceania at the UN Strategy and Coordination Conference on the Regional Capacity to Protect, Prevent and Respond May 2012 Bangkok.
- A conference presentation to the Sixth OCIS in Sydney in July 2012 (Hawksley/Georgeou);
- The submission of a book proposal (Hawksley/Georgeou) to the editors of the Routledge series Global Politics and The Responsibility to Protect, Professor Alex Bellamy and Dr Sara Davies.

**SUSTAINABILITY OF RESEARCH FINDINGS**

Fieldwork has demonstrated that international and local police forces have no specific knowledge of R2P doctrine. However as a more general set of ideas this project is entirely about exploring how international support for police-building leads to improvements in the treatment of the human rights of citizens in these states. Police-building thus forms part of the larger challenge of Security Sector Reform (SSR), which also involves the training and support for the armed forces. Both of these processes occur within an even wider and enormously complex paradigm of state-building linking economic development, human security, and the development of political institutions. SSR is thus linked with the idea of development, and specifically with aid delivery and the transmission of technical knowledge and expertise.

We argue there is a growing police capability being provided to developing states in Oceania terms of increasing the respect that their police forces have for the rights of their own citizens. In short the assistance provided by Australia and other donors is having an effect, although this is slow and often appears uncertain. The main issue is of rebuilding or in some cases the creation of trust between the community and the police. While there are periods of good will with international policing assistance, the presence of international police forces also creates significant tensions. Some of these are essentially political, such as the international pressure to adopt models of community policing in Timor-Leste that the political leaders of the state have at times been resistant to accept, with a local preference for a paramilitary model of policing. The consistency of what has been introduced is complicated by the presence of police form over 40 nations within United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste (UNMIT), each with their own version of community policing working throughout the 13 districts, for varying periods and at varying levels of intensity. With the United Nations Police (UNPOL) drawing down the question for Timor-Leste’s National Police (PNTL) will be, having been exposed to such variation of international assistance, can it develop a systematic and coherent model of community policing? For the Royal Solomon Islands Police Force (RSIPF) and RAMSI the situation is similar, as RAMSI too will withdraw and the RSIPF must wean itself off its financial dependency, which in 2011 paid for two thirds of the its budget.

In both of these states Australia has, and will continue to have, a significant role. Bilateral policing support programs will continue over the next decade. For PNG the challenge is acute; of the three case studies PNG has the largest problems with police abuse of citizens and the least international assistance. Although Australia has at times shown interest in ramping up its level of police assistance the political legacy of the misjudged Enhanced Cooperation Program of 2004/2005 is a lesson in the importance of having appropriate models of cross-cultural training for police who are deployed to assist overseas.

All case studies have significant issues with sexual and gender based violence and the release this year of the Australian government’s Women Peace and Security material prompted the researchers to submit an application for funding through AusAID’s Australian Development Research Awards Scheme (ADFRAS) to continue their research into the articulation of UNSC Resolution 1325. We see
this research into how police develop responses to the alarming incidence of sexual and gender based violence as critical to stability in the region, and to ensuring the human rights of women and men in these countries. If the most vulnerable in society are well protected then the hopes are high for all.

LESSONS LEARNED
Police are always trained in human rights, but understandings of human rights are dependent on cultural context. Training provided to local police reflects Western policing models and these are often unfamiliar in specific cultural understandings. Policing any community requires the capacity to integrate with that community, and to be able to respond and to work together. Training police is only half the story however as human rights advocacy and role of police in protecting such rights comes also from CSOs and NGOs.

Our research highlights the important role that CSOs play in this process. They disseminate information and knowledge about the activities of police to the public; and they play a critical role not only in educating citizens, but potentially also in developing a culture of understanding of human rights protection within police forces. They pressure the media and the politicians to end the culture of acceptance and impunity that has led to the perpetuation of abuses. That said, there is a need for even greater awareness of the local dimensions of rights protection: consultation at the provincial or district level is not enough, and for an understanding of the ‘village level’, local CSOs that work on rights and social justice need to integrated into discussions with higher level policy makers. CSOs at the Bangkok conference called for greater access to support human rights: our empirical research and interviews prove that such links do indeed serve to protect rights and guard against mass atrocities through a desire to change in police culture.

NGO pressure on politicians and directly on police forces reinforces the message that abuse of power, and the abuse of citizens, is not acceptable. This points to the need for greater cooperation and coordination between international police, local police and NGOs in community policing activities. Promising signs exist in all of the case studies that local NGO pressure on political elites can work to cause politicians to grasp the need for police reform, and to then put in place the legal mechanisms to achieve such ends. How well this is done is always dependent on local factors, especially in post-conflict societies. The important work done by the AFP and other donors continues, and positives signs are present in the Solomon Islands, and in Timor-Leste, while much police assistance remains to be provided to PNG.
SYNOPSIS
This project looked to advance understanding of R2P among Asian states and to explore the implications of the R2P norm for regional actors and organisations. The institutional context within which the project was conducted was CSCAP. CSCAP is the primary, region-wide Track II security dialogue institution of the Asia Pacific region, involving 21 Member Committees across the region, including the US and Canada (see www.cscap.org). CSCAP serves as the Track II mechanism of informal consultations for the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF)—the region’s inclusive, Track II (i.e. official level) political/security institution.

CSCAP operates mainly through Study Groups that are mandated to operate over a period of two to three years to facilitate discussions between academics, NGO representatives, and officials from regional governments on select topics of regional concern. The CSCAP Study Group on R2P was established by the CSCAP Steering Committee in June 2009, in Kuala Lumpur, to examine R2P and ‘explore the implications of this new norm for regional actors and organisations.’ The Study Group was also tasked with producing a report ‘providing policy recommendations regarding possible regional contributions to the global debate surrounding the implementation of R2P’. The Co-Chairs of the Study Group were CSCAP Canada (Brian Job and Pierre Lizée), CSCAP Australia (Alex Bellamy), CSCAP Philippines, and CSCAP Indonesia.

RESEARCH IMPACT
Regional security analysts and R2P scholars, the work and outcomes/products of the Study Group are coming to appreciate the positive impact of the Study Group and its Final Report. In part, this is because of its dispelling of the pre-existing, pervasive skepticism about the receptivity of Asia Pacific states to R2P and of their willingness to engage in discussion and debate regarding its advancement. The Study Group, in particular, benefited from the engagement of Chinese experts and officials, also from India, the participation of Lt Gen Nambiar, bringing to light understandings of their national perspectives and also achieving consensus understandings with them concerning R2P (as articulated by the WSOD in 2005).

The creation and successful working of the Study Group is important to CSCAP itself, in demonstrating that so-called controversial topics need not be avoided, as has been the usual reaction of CSCAP concerning such matters. This should set the stage for CSCAP to return more proactively to its consideration of preventive diplomacy, early warning, capacity building, etc.—topics of importance in reducing tensions and conflict within the region.

The engagement of the Study Group, and thus of institutions around the
region, with the UN has been a notable successful outcome, its impact highlighted in the specific acknowledgement of the Study Group on R2P of CSCAP in the Report of the Secretary General on ‘The role of regional and sub-regional arrangements in implementing the responsibility to protect’ (27 June 2011, A/65/877-S/2011/393, para 8). This marked the first specific notice taken of the work of CSCAP by the UN. The report as a whole appears to have raised levels of attention at the UN to the Asia Pacific and regional institutions, including ASEAN and the ARF.

SUSTAINABILITY
The sustainability of the Study Group’s agenda to raise awareness about, and promote progress towards implementation of, R2P concerns two dimensions.

The first relates to the continued attention and undertaking of initiatives by national governments and by regional institutions, specifically CSCAP and the ARF. The next steps for the Study Group involve motivating CSCAP to prepare and present a Policy Memorandum to the ARF and the monitoring of the implementation of the proposals set forth in the Memorandum. The Study Group looks to organize an ARF Experts Meeting to refine its recommendations, specifically as these related to the ARF and its associated bodies. In this regard, recent efforts to energize the ARF Expert Eminent Persons Group (EEP) should be noted and supported, especially as these could relate to the Pillars 1 and 2 of R2P.

At the national level, attention to R2P and associated agendas of peacekeeping, POC, and human security, continues to be sustained in a number of select institutions, e.g., in Jakarta by the CSIS, in Singapore by the RSIS, in the Philippines by the Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies (IDSS), in South Korea at Korea University, also (albeit more tentatively) in China, and of course in Australia through the GCR2P.

In terms of academic and policy-oriented work on the advancement of R2P, as noted above, the Study Group brought together a community of scholars and experts. There have been, and continue to be, a number of follow-on effects of this engagement, as seen through an increased number of related projects and publications involving these scholars and their institutions. Of note is RSIS’ establishing its own working group on R2P, leading to a recent, special issue of Pacific Review; and a project on the implementation of norms (including R2P) organized by Philip Orchard (UQ) and Richard Betts (Oxford) leading to a volume edited by Oxford University Press. But, these are only two examples of the continued attention and debate on R2P being fostered in and beyond the region on both conceptual (e.g. Brazil’s ‘responsibility while protecting’) and practical levels (e.g. the contention concerning R2P and Libya and Syria).
LESSONS LEARNED

Most all of the ‘lessons learned’ through the organization and implementation of this project were positive. These included (from the investigator’s personal viewpoint) the following.

The first lesson is that stereotypical understandings of Asia Pacific states’ positions and national experts’ regarding R2P are overdrawn, and that in most instances, a more nuanced notion of the norm and appropriate practice of R2P prevails within the Asia Pacific context. As apparent from the project’s results, indeed, an extensive positive agenda for R2P remains to be explored. (Perhaps, most frankly put, researchers and experts should be less tentative about addressing the controversies concerning R2P head-on and more proactive in ‘pushing the envelope’ of advancement of the three Pillars of R2P).

The second lesson concerns the relative ease involved in gaining the participation and engagement of scholars and experts across the region to consider R2P, including from those with critical and skeptical points of view; (In particular, in terms of this specific project, this applies to involvement of Chinese scholars and experts. Indeed, without their initial tacit and subsequent positive support for the Study Group, it probably would have been a much reduced enterprise and one that lacked credibility).

A third lesson was the demonstrable benefit of sustaining a project with multiple meetings over the course of two years, these involving the continued participation of a core cohort of individuals – this in contrast to the usual ‘one shot’ conference/workshop format. Obviously, resources are at issue in this regard, the support of the funder being critically important.

A fourth lesson concerned the critical advantage gained through the linking of the global and regional levels, in specific the involvement of the Joint Office and the Special Advisors to the Secretary General. As one of these individuals concluded, ‘There is too little of the UN in Asia, and too little of Asia at the UN’.

A final lesson was the appreciation gained through cooperation by the project and Study Group chairs and organizers with the GCR2P and the key individuals leading it. Without their support and, at times guidance regarding the precise interpretations of R2P set out in the World Summit Statement and subsequent Secretary General reports, the project would not have achieved the Final Report and results that it did.

ACTIVITIES

Administrative support for the organization of Study Group meetings was provided by CSCAP Canada, with CSCAP Philippines and CSCAP Indonesia serving as hosts for a series of five meetings. The Asia Pacific Foundation of Canada (Vancouver) functioned as the financial agent for the project.

Project activities centred around five key meetings, as follows:

- Scoping Meeting, November 2009, Jakarta: This meeting clarified goals, identified experts committed to participate in subsequent meetings and studies (45 individuals from 14 CSCAP countries), set out an agenda of studies, and established the participation of Dr Edward Luck (Special Advisor to the UNSG on R2P).

- First Meeting, February 2010, Jakarta, examined the meaning and scope of R2P and implementation issues as related to the ASEAN and the ARF.

- Second Meeting, September 2010, Manila, extended work begun at the first meeting and looked especially to the primary responsibility of the state to protect its own population, as well as analysis of implementation issues.
of the Asia
Pacific region to engage on matters
related to R2P. While some of these
individuals were well known to each
in the R2P community, many key
participants (e.g. those from China)
were not. Through their sustained
engagement and debate a more
informed understanding of R2P and
its implications for the region was
formulated.

- The second and major outcome
was the issuing of the Study Group’s
Final Report. This was a significant
achievement in attaining and
presenting a consensus position,
consistent with regional norms and
practices, in support of R2P and its
role in, and relevance to, the Asia
Pacific. The Final Report will continue
to serve as a primary document
for next steps in the normative and
practical advancement of the three
pillars of R2P. The Report provided
a series of findings and associated
twelve specific recommendations
relevant to three domains: national
governments, (informal and formal)
regional arrangements in the Asia
Pacific, and global institutions in
partnership with the Asia Pacific.

• At the national level, the Report
calls upon governments and
national institutions to raise levels
of awareness and capacities
relevant to addressing R2P
situations, locally and regionally, in
line with each of the three Pillars
of R2P.

- At the regional level, (which
received the bulk of Study Group
attention), the Report focused
upon the ARF, calling for the ARF
to conduct regional briefings
among member states, to pursue
establishment of a Regional Risk
Reduction Centre, to utilize its
Inter-Sessional Meetings to focus
on R2P-related preventive and
capacity building measures, and
to strengthen the role of the ARF
EEP Group, as a mechanism
for implementing R2P. The Risk
Reduction Centre was seen as
a key step in achieving early
warning, assessment, and
response capacities.

• At the global level, several
significant initiatives were
proposed in the Report. These
build upon the relationship
established between the Study
Group and the Joint Office of
the Special Advisors to the UN
Secretary General. In specific,
the Report called for Annual
Dialogues between this office and
the ARF, for greater engagement
of the ARF in regional
consultations at the UN, and
for fostering of region-to-region
dialogue involving the Asia Pacific
and Europe (utilizing the Asia
Europe Meeting, ASEM), Africa,
and Latin America.
Mainstreaming the principle of the responsibility to protect in Indonesia

SYNOPSIS
The project ‘Mainstreaming the Principle of R2P in Indonesia’ aims to explore to what extent the R2P principle has been acknowledged and understood particularly among the civil society in Indonesia. The reason for selecting this research project is to provide a comprehensive position, instead of only from the often-cited government position, i.e. the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA), towards this principle, but from the larger society in which the civil society in Indonesia have been engaging heavily in the promotion and protection of human rights. In this context, civil society carries the potential to become the R2P ‘champions’ within the country to alarm the government if there is certain tendency for R2P-type situations to take place. To a certain extent, this research also collects the views from the other government sectors beside the MFA, which can be considered as relevant stakeholders if the R2P principle is implemented in Indonesia. Through various encounters with those targeted respondents, it is highly expected that the knowledge of the development of R2P and possibility of R2P to be accepted and endorsed will be enhanced.

The project had three objectives. Firstly, it aimed to raise public awareness on the principle of R2P among civil society in Indonesia. Secondly, to bridge the gap and differences in the understanding of the principle between civil society and the government of Indonesia since most of the information is still very much held by government only, particularly by the MFA. Through various activities, namely focus-group discussion and national workshops, the project facilitates the dialogue between the two stakeholders to scrutinise on how R2P can be operationalised from principle into deeds in the Indonesian context. Thirdly, this project sought to pioneer the effort of mainstreaming the R2P principle in the country.

RESEARCH IMPACT
There were several outcomes from this project. The first outcome was a set of three policy briefs in Bahasa Indonesia which contain three items: an elaboration about what R2P is as well as its elements; some cases in the world where R2P principle may apply; the final policy brief was on the position of Indonesia’s government on R2P and key points of the civil society’s views on R2P. The second outcome is the final research report (in English) contained the combination of policy briefs with a more detailed elaboration on civil society views of R2P. The third outcome was an expert meeting, policy dialogue and national workshop to disseminate the results of the project to a wider audience in Indonesia. The expert meeting which invited the representative from the MFA, academicians, experts and activists on human rights and peacebuilding NGOs was held in July 2010. Then,
the policy dialogue was held in April 2011 inviting ten representatives from different government institutions, i.e. the MFA, the Vice President Secretariat, Ministry of Home Affairs, Ministry of Defense, Ministry of Law and Human Rights, Coordinating Ministry for Political, Law and Security Affairs, and also one Member of Parliament.

Finally, the national workshop which gathered both representatives from the government institutions and civil society was held on 10 January 2012. In this workshop, all participants received the three policy briefs as well as the final research report.

Before the team started the project, especially conducting the interviews and discussions, the stakeholders, both from CSOs and government did not have sufficient knowledge on the R2P principle, few had heard of the term. Therefore, through various activities as well as sending out the publications, particularly the policy briefs in Bahasa Indonesia, the project succeeding in sharing basic knowledge about R2P in the local language both to the civil society elements as well as the other government agencies.

The fact that many respondents asked to be invited to seminars or workshops on R2P in the future, and also the high participation in other workshops on R2P organised by CSIS (although it was not under the conduct of this project), proved that the project has brought significant impact to the society.1 Furthermore, since some of the interviewees were lecturers at universities, after receiving the policy briefs, they expressed an interest in using them as part of references/reading materials, showing their commitment to raising the R2P concept as one topic in the relevant subject.

It is important also to note that the project has been able to reveal especially to the MFA representatives that more effort should be made on behalf of the government to initiate dialogues or discussions about this topic. Civil society

---

1 Workshop on R2P and POC in Armed Conflict organised by CSIS in Jakarta, 22 June 2010. This workshop discussed about the relationship between R2P and the POC in both governance and practice, funded by the Australian R2P Fund, with support from the Australian Government’s Asia Pacific Civil-Military Centre of Excellence. Around 40 participants attend this workshop, drawn from academicians, experts, think-thanks, research institutes, NGO activists, government officials, and the media.
inputs are deemed necessary to suggest to the government on how R2P can be implemented, particularly to prevent such mass atrocities to occur in the country by creating the effective early-warning system that is relevant to the challenges faced within the country, such as social conflicts, ethnic tensions, and separatist conflicts.

However, since the project can be considered as an initial effort to deepen and widen knowledge about R2P, other projects in the future are encouraged in order to create bigger impacts in mainstreaming the R2P principle. It is hoped that by doing so, the potential for the R2P principle to be observed in Indonesia can be enhanced.

**SUSTAINABILITY**

Although the project was completed in December 2011, CSIS will continue to hold activities to discuss about the R2P principle since then, especially through cooperation with other institutions, both within and outside the country. The team will also publish the results of the project, i.e. policy briefs and final research report on the CSIS website in PDF format to allow those who are interested in the topic to download them freely.

**LESSONS LEARNED**

Firstly, on the aspect of respondents/interviewees. In this project, to meet the requirement for interviewees with religious background, the team mainly focused on people from Islamic-based/oriented institutions. The team indeed has interviewed a lecturer from the Catholic University of Parahyangan based in Bandung, but it became apparent that it was not sufficient to create a more balanced result of the interviews, which could enrich the overall result. Other potential interviewees from Duta Wacana University in Yogyakarta can be added to the list since it is a Christian-based university, however due to the last minute information about the institution, the team failed to conduct the interview. For the next research project, it would be useful to consider conducting similar research in conflict-prone areas outside Java such as in Poso, Ambon and even Papua where CSOs – coming from non-Muslim, particularly Christian/Catholic based groups – mostly exist.

Another lesson is the team should have focused on locally based institutions, where ICRC as one of the proponents to the aspect related R2P such as civilian protection, although it is based in Jakarta might not be included since the gap in term of knowledge with the ‘pure’ local-based NGOs is quite significant.

Second, from the interview process. Almost all potential respondents were well-known activists and academicians/lecturers working in human rights, conflict resolution and peacebuilding areas, as well as government officials; there were some potential interviewees or participants who did not respond to the request for interviews or invitation to participate in expert meetings or dialogue. The team did not receive any response from religious-based institutions. Only one Member of Parliament from Commission 1 turned up in the policy dialogue and none from the Commission III which engages with human rights issues. The problem mostly arose because of the tight schedule of those targeted people which did not match the dates selected to hold either the interview or the workshop.
Specifically, there were two potential interviewees from Duta Wacana University in Yogyakarta whom could not be interviewed since the team had just received the information about them from one of the respondents spoken to on the previous day. Therefore, there was not enough time for the team to make an appointment with the persons. From this experience, the team learned to provide some extra time, particularly to accommodate the ‘snow-ball effect’ where certain interviewees might give information about other potential persons to be interviewed or invited. This problem led to delays in the subsequent process of data analysis, including transcribing all the interview recordings for the final research report.

The team realised it was not easy to construct the list of questions since there is a significant gap between those who have basic knowledge about R2P and those who do not know about it, although the list of names selected are limited to those who ‘should’ know about R2P (NGOs engaging in human rights and peacebuilding issues). The team then had to take the initiative and spend some time to explain some basic knowledge about R2P in order to proceed with the interview. In this case, the team learnt about the necessity to develop a different set of questions according to the level of knowledge of the respondents.

**ACTIVITIES**

The interview as well as focus-group discussion data will be published and uploaded on the CSIS website in December 2012/early January 2013, about one year after the final research report was launched in January 2012. The reason is because the data will be still utilised for further CSIS publications related to R2P. Also, up to the date when this final report is made, the CSIS website is still facing problems with uploading files, and it is expected that this will be rectified by late 2012. All the publications will be in Bahasa Indonesia.

One journal article has been published as a result of this research; ‘Indonesia and the Responsibility to Protect’, *Pacific Review* 25.1 (March 2012). So far, there is no written evidence yet to indicate better understanding on R2P from the public; however, there have been requests from an Indonesia Member of Parliament as well as NGOs to get extra copies of the research report and policy briefs in order to learn more about R2P.
SYNOPSIS

The Human Rights Program at Cardozo Law completed a two-year research project ‘A Common Standard for Applying the Responsibility to Protect’. Led by Professor Sheri Rosenberg, with significant contributions from Dr Ekkehard Strauss and Daniel Stewart, and overseen by a prestigious advisory board, this research clarifies and addresses several normative concerns embedded within R2P, systematically develops a common standard against which incoming information may be assessed in respect of the application of R2P, coherently develops guiding principles for the application of the standard, and rigorously assesses the benefits of, and challenges to, the adoption of a common standard for the implementation of the R2P framework.

During R2P’s first decade its unique potential to unite approaches in addressing mass atrocity situations has been hamstrung by uncertainty over whether a situation comes within the R2P remit – from early prevention to the use of force as a last resort. This uncertainty stems in part from the fact that there is not a common standard...
against which to measure and analyze incoming information to determine R2P’s application. Moreover, debates concerning R2P’s application have been most prominent in situations where violent conflict and the loss of life have already commenced; the main issue on the table being the legality, morality and prudence of intensely coercive forms of intervention, particularly military action. This late term engagement with R2P continues in spite of the fact that UNSG Ban Ki-moon and UN members states have unambiguously stated that prevention is the single most important dimension.

Our research advances the ability of states, regional organizations, international institutions and civil society to focus on the practical implementation of measures to prevent mass atrocities utilizing the R2P principle. The research achieves this aim by systematically developing a common Standard against which relevant actors can assess incoming information in respect of the application of R2P to determine when they should act pursuant to their R2P commitments. It further develops coherent guiding principles for the application of the standard, and rigorously assesses the benefits of and challenges to the adoption of a common standard. The Standard and its guiding principles take the salient features of, and build upon, well-established national and international practice in determining existing risk levels as a basis for determining future developments with an acceptable level of certitude. The Standard and criterion for application are further inspired and guided by international and national laws that share the normative concerns of R2P.

Based upon the detailed review of different areas of law, and consultations with stakeholders, the project developed a set of principles, which should be respected in applying this Standard. The Standard can be used by governments, regional and international organizations, and civil society, which are all called upon to make assessments as to the applicability of R2P. This research does not suggest that the proposed “standard” and “guidelines” are to be implemented as legally binding tests against which to gauge the appropriateness of action. Instead, the standards aim at assisting relevant actors to determine, whether a situation could benefit from applying the R2P. Like all standards guiding international relations it will be open to interpretation by a wide array of actors, but its flexibility will be bound by the common values shared by states and their populations: to prevent mass atrocities.

Our research revealed that most believe that developing a widely-accepted standard with criteria to guide its application will assist in the effort of preventing atrocities and protecting populations in four ways:

1. Promote the full continuum of R2P: While it is universally agreed that the best form of protection is prevention, the lack of common standards of assessment at early stages of potential developments is one factor for the continued focus and association of R2P with military intervention exclusively. Common standards that span the full range of beneficial protection endeavors will help to ensure prevention is promoted forcefully where it is really needed and has a greater likelihood of success.

2. Target application of limited resources: Given the constraints on time and resources that stakeholders can direct to address mass atrocities, a common standard of assessment concerning which situations will benefit most from international assistance will ensure the most effective allocation of those limited resources.

3. Legitimize the norm: A unified, common standard will add a level of transparency, credibility and accountability to the deliberations over the application of R2P to a given situation which will, ultimately, result in greater consistency in outcomes of State action and norm legitimacy. A common standard of assessment, while inevitably open to interpretation by all parties, will at a minimum, begin to require parties to explain their reasoning from a common reference point. Actions that are taken will be seen as more legitimate if successfully applying the standards; decisions not to take a certain course of action will also be seen as more legitimate.
4. Reduce uncertainty: A common standard, along with guiding principles, will increase the likelihood that all relevant stakeholders (including States, regional organizations, NGOs and international organizations) focus on a discussion of appropriate action in any situation of stress, and reduce the depth and duration of debate that is centered on whether a situation would benefit from the application of the R2P.

**RESEARCH IMPACT**

The project’s research findings advance the concept of R2P through their influence on policy, practice, knowledge, and identification of areas for further research. The impact is instrumental – influencing policy-makers and practices; and conceptual – changing people’s knowledge, understanding and attitudes toward several normative concerns embedded within R2P. By assessing the value of a common standard in the policy world and subsequently developing a standard for applying the R2P principle to be utilized as a common measure by all relevant stakeholders, our framework and project findings have potential to make an even greater demonstrable policy impact. Research impacts include:

**POLICY/ADVOCACY COMMUNITY (INSTRUMENTAL IMPACT)**

- A prominent genocide prevention centre in Europe is utilizing the standard and guiding principles in its assessment of several ongoing situations;
- Ongoing discussions with the UNSG’s office on the prevention of genocide and R2P concerning the use of this framework and project findings in its work. Dr Edward Luck write the foreword to the publication of the research paper;
- Request by government officials from China, Brazil, and Thailand for copies of the research paper, including the standards and principles, after its presentation in Bangkok in May 2012;
- Research findings will be disseminated to relevant stakeholders upon publication in November;
- Research findings will be presented at a high-level presentation organized by the GCR2P in November 2012;
- Organized, strategic efforts to operationalize the research finding’s uptake will continue throughout 2012-2013;
- Presentation of our project findings to the R2P taskforce of the US government;
- Presentation of our project findings to several large NGOs;
- Developing thinking among scholars and policy-makers (conceptual impact):

The research findings are a genuine and original contribution to the scientific debate, built upon the most recent writings on R2P:

- As a result of our research, scholars and policy-makers have begun to think concretely about the relationship between the procedures and goals of international criminal law and the procedures and goals of R2P. This was evidenced by the views expressed by the majority of the participants at the three conference we convened and during the interviews we conducted;
- Clarified the interpretation of R2P vis-à-vis international criminal law and standards;
- Transfer of evidentiary standards from international human rights law to R2P;
- Refining the understanding of the exceptionally grave situations that demand R2P attention;

**Future Impact (potential):**

- Apart from the European Centre that is currently applying the standard, we anticipate the application of the standard and guidelines to policy and practices of civil society, states, regional organizations and international organizations.
- Going forward, the findings will provide a background of empirical generalizations and ideas that have the real potential to creep into policy deliberations.
ACTIVITIES

In order to achieve the ultimate goals of this project, the following activities were undertaken throughout the duration of the project:

**Concept Paper:** The creation of appropriate standards and burden of proof for varying situations or threats of R2P acts must be informed by understanding complementary areas of evidence assessment. Throughout international and national law, adjudication revolves around the assessment of evidence. The standards utilised, and the procedures accompanying the fact-finding and assessment of this evidence, must correspond to the moral and practical questions that R2P embodies. The first stage of preparing for consultation and discussion with stakeholders across the globe has been the research and writing of a concept paper that explores a variety of standards of assessment from law. This concept paper is designed to bridge the divide between the desire to create standards that reduce the element of subjectivity in the application of R2P while respecting the inherent necessity to ensure flexibility in determining responses to mass atrocity. Practically, it informed the regional discussions held in July in Ghana and September in Cambodia, as well the consultations held with Permanent Missions to the United Nations in New York City. The key focus of this project is embodied in the paper: to create standards for the mid-term prevention of mass atrocities when early responses have a reasonable prospect of success, and to realign the focus of responses away from an exclusive focus on the UNSC.

**Experts Meeting in November 2010 and April 2012:** Cardozo convened a closed experts meeting in November 2010 where discussions ranged from the nature of standards within R2P to their feasibility, flexibility and potential sources from various areas of the law. Participants included Hon. Gareth Evans; Special Advisor on the Responsibility to Protect Dr Edward Luck; Professor William Schabas; and Professor David Scheffer, former US Ambassador-at-Large for War Crimes.

**Permanent Missions to United Nations Consultations:** The recent events surrounding Libya, Cote d’Ivoire and Syria have further emphasized the importance of the United Nations Headquarters in New York City as a site for the advancement and discussion of the direct practical implementation of the R2P concept in situations that have advanced beyond the role of early action prevention. The Project has commenced consultations with the relevant R2P focal point in a wide number of Permanent Missions, where the Missions learn about the Project, and their vital input into the framing of the evidentiary guidelines project will guide and inform the proposals to be produced.

**Discussions in Europe:** A central component of the success of advancing R2P and of the project is to translate the theoretical grounding into workable
and supported practical mechanisms for states, international and regional organisations, and civil society groups. The project team undertook a wide-ranging series of consultations across Europe, meeting with national governments, international organisations, regional organisations, and leading CSOs. Discussions focused on how these groups are currently utilising the language of R2P, how they assess situations for the risk of R2P acts occurring, and how standardising the assessment could be a feasible goal. In addition, these informal meetings began the process of advocacy in terms of promoting the cause of standardised evidentiary assessment. Participants included the national governments of France, the Netherlands and the UK; the ICC and International Court of Justice; Human Rights Watch and ICG; and international law professors from the Universities of Leiden, Cambridge and Oxford.

Public Fora and Presentations of the Project: The final interim milestone has proceeded from the experts meeting convened in November 2010 at Cardozo Law School. To begin the process of focusing R2P operationalisation upon a common standard of assessment, Professor Rosenberg has undertaken a series of presentations, covering R2P in general, but introducing the contours of the project as part of its ultimate promotion. Most importantly, for each closed session that the project has undertaken, a public session is organised in order to promote outreach on R2P.

RESEARCH OUTPUTS
In terms of specific outcomes, we are publishing the full research paper, with annexes, that provide the theoretical and methodological bases for our research findings, a two-page document that sets forth the Common Standard of Assessment and Guiding Principles, a peer reviewed journal article on R2P and the ICC, a presentation on the research at Vanderbilt Law School that took place in October 2012, and a policy brief, which will be distributed widely in academic, policy and advocacy circles.

OVERALL PROJECT AIMS
With scholarly and policy inputs the project developed a theoretically sound and policy appropriate Common Standard and Guiding Principles that harmonize the approach to determining when stakeholders in R2P should respond to different levels of R2P risk. The most challenging component of this project has been maintaining the broad consensus that currently exists with respect to the norm, while attempting to reduce the level of dissension that surrounds the emergence of any potential threat of R2P acts. The interim milestones laid the foundation for a variety of actors to support the Project and ensure that the current broad consensus on R2P will also support the narrowing of the boundaries in future debates. It is likely that future research will develop an institutional methodology at the state, regional and international levels to assess evidence on R2P situations.
SYNOPSIS

This research project explored the implications of natural resource extraction and resource governance on the generation, prevention, resolution and rebuilding after mass atrocity crimes. Research has identified that societies with natural resource wealth or dependence on natural resources demonstrate a greater risk of conflict, poor economic growth and repression. Conflicts have been found to arise in situations of abundant, high value, extractable non-renewable resources; resource dependence contributing to poor governance, corruption and the decline of states; and grievances related to resource extraction. The project represents the first in-depth study to explore the potential role that extractive resources play within the important subset of conflicts that exhibit mass atrocity crimes.

The project was in two parts. Stage one undertook a comparative analysis of cases of resource conflict, and instances of mass atrocity crimes, to identify whether a relationship exists between extractive resources and the generation, financing and sustaining, and resolution of conflicts and mass atrocity crimes. This part of the project aimed to advance the R2P concept.

Stage two examined the implications of the above analysis for the case of contemporary resource extraction in Cambodia and is supporting efforts to implement applicable natural resource governance policy initiatives to assist rebuilding efforts in the aftermath of atrocity crimes and the prevention and resolution of contemporary resource related conflict. The rationale here is that even where natural resources were not implicated as a contributing factor in the generation of mass atrocity crimes the resource dimension can be an important lever when attempting to respond to, prevent, or rebuild after mass atrocity crimes. The findings of stage two may have broader application for the implementation of R2P in resource-endowed regions.

RESEARCH IMPACT

In the first stage of the project we identified for further analysis 13 cases where extractive resources played a role in the generation, financing and sustaining, or resolution of conflicts that have exhibited mass atrocity crimes. Case studies identified for analysis included: Chile, Indonesia (West Papua), Bougainville, PNG, Sudan, Guatemala, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Solomon Islands, Chad, Philippines, Cambodia, Angola and Myanmar. Case analysis highlighted the role of natural resources in both conflict and atrocity generation and prevention.

The findings from the cases append our understanding of the traditional risk
factors of mass atrocity crimes, which are largely based on late stage factors in cases of genocide (e.g. an ethnically polarised elite, exclusionary ideology, authoritarian regime, hate speech, economic/political crisis, and a history of mass atrocity crimes). The resource conflict cases analysed were not always accompanied by the risk factors listed above. The findings are also important for the development of early warning systems. Resource related early warning indicators, such as the involvement of military and combatant groups in resource extraction, or the financing of arms purchases through resource plunder, may improve the accuracy of early warning systems in resource endowed regions.

Our case analysis has also revealed that the character of resource conflicts appears to influence the type of mass atrocity crimes exhibited. Strategic level resource conflicts (e.g. Chile) and site level disputes over extractive resources (e.g. Bougainville) both can be associated with atrocity crimes including widespread torture, extrajudicial killings and disappearances, however, there is an additional character to site level conflicts, whereby efforts to secure site access to resources are sometimes associated with crimes such as ethnic cleansing and the persecution of a collective group. These situations tend to be smaller in scale, though this is not exclusively the case.

Our cases also reveal that resources play an important role in the resolution of conflicts that have exhibited mass atrocity crimes. In the southern Sudan disputes over oil development contributed to a relapse of violent conflict between the northern Arab Muslim government and southern African and Christian communities during the 1990s. Militarisation of the oil fields, widespread forced displacement of hundreds of thousands of people, pillage and summary executions led to calls for secession and political independence for the south. The resolution of the conflict demanded careful attention to the resource dimension, with the granting of regional autonomy and resource benefit sharing.

Our capacity building activities with civil society and government in Cambodia further explored the role that resource governance initiatives played in rebuilding after mass atrocity crimes and preventing a relapse into conflict.

Finally, natural resources also present challenges for international efforts mobilised under Pillar 3 of the norm. The research has revealed that the international community must be careful to ensure that whatever response is adopted, the natural resource endowment remains in the control of the citizens of that state. To do otherwise has the potential to undermine support for the responsibility to protect norm, as local opinion—and indeed resistance—may coalesce around the action as a form of resource appropriation rather than an effort to curtail atrocity crimes.

**ACTIVITIES**

Stage two of the project has analysed extractive resource development in Cambodia and the opportunities for improved resource governance through in-country research and the involvement of our Cambodian partner. Milestones in this stage of the project have included reconnaissance trips to Cambodia;

- participation in the Early Warning for Protection Conference in November 2010;
- hosting of a roundtable in Phnom Penh on ‘Human Security, Land, and Natural Resources: the role of R2P in May, 2011;
- Our capacity building activities in Cambodia have also consisted of the inclusion of a module on resource
governance during professional development training delivered to the Cambodian General Department of Mineral Resources in September and December 2010; and the co-organization of a policy dialogue with the UNDP Cambodia and the Cambodian Ministry of Industry Mines and Energy on the topic of resource governance and mineral policy reform, in May 2011.

Teak logging in Southern Sudan
SYNOPSIS

Oxfam Australia’s *Prevention is Better than the Cure* project aimed to deepen understanding and build consensus around the meaning and applicability of R2P amongst the Australian and broader Asia Pacific regional NGO and civil society sectors. The project was inspired by the UNSG Ban Ki-moon’s 2009 Implementing the Responsibility to Protect report which characterised R2P as a ‘narrow but deep’ concept; narrowly focused on prevention of genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and crimes against humanity; but requiring a very broad range of approaches and instruments in order to prevent, respond to and rebuild after these crimes. The project was based on the understanding that while states bear the responsibility to protect, the range of approaches required to make protection from these crimes a reality will invariably involve civil society and NGOs working directly with communities at risk. As such, through a process of facilitated dialogue and information exchange the project sought to enhance the capacity and willingness of NGOs and civil society to take...
action to prevent mass atrocity crimes, contributing to the ultimate aims of R2P.

The project involved two major initiatives. Firstly, a two-day Australian based workshop exploring the role that NGOs and civil society play in the prevention of atrocity crimes, held in Melbourne in November 2009 and involving NGOs, scholars and Australian government representatives. One of the key issues emerging out of the workshop was the role of civil society actors supporting early warning and early response to mass atrocity risks. To further explore this issue Oxfam Australia partnered with the AP R2P, the ICRtoP and AusAID to run the Early Warning for Protection conference in Cambodia in November 2010. The conference involved CSOs, NGOs, technology specialists, UN representatives and others from thirty countries around the world.

**RESEARCH IMPACT**

An independent evaluation of the project was conducted in 2011 by humanitarian protection specialist Kate Sutton, to identify the extent to which the project resulted in changes in knowledge, understanding and practice of NGOs and civil society with regards to engagement with the prevention component of R2P. The evaluation involved an online survey of 33 project participants and six key informant interviews including a UN Special Advisor to the UNSG, academics, NGO and civil society representatives and one technology specialist.

The evaluation found ‘clear evidence of improved understanding of the concept and applicability of R2P among the sampled population following project participation’. Amongst respondents to the online survey 78% reported that their understanding of R2P was better or significantly better than before participating in the project and none of the project participants reported a worsening of understanding.

Participants also indicated increased understanding of the potential to support community self-protection mechanisms to respond to mass atrocity crimes. As a consequence of this learning Dr Edward Luck, Special Advisor to the UNSG, noted that the Cambodia conference had contributed to an increased focus on community self-protection mechanisms in international R2P debate. This is demonstrated by the inclusion of this aspect in the UNSG’s 2011 report on The role of regional and sub-regional arrangements in implementing the responsibility to protect, which states:

‘**Bottom-up learning processes can provide essential lessons in the methods of self-protection that have been developed and practised at the village and even family level in places of recurring violence and repression. These complement the responsibility to protect’s emphasis on prevention and on helping the State to succeed, not just reacting once it has failed to protect.**

While the evaluation found that the majority of surveyed participants are more willing to engage with R2P as a result of project participation, there is no clear consensus about what this engagement might look like. The project did not aim to resolve controversial issues related to the R2P concept, but instead intended to provide a forum for dialogue and exchange. The evaluator found that within this context and the scope of the project it may be unrealistic, and perhaps undesirable, to achieve ‘consensus on the meaning and applicability of R2P’. Whilst it may be critical to build consensus on an understanding of the R2P norm among civil society actors, the applicability and implementation of R2P may vary considerably. Diverse approaches to implementing R2P will depend on factors including context, organisational mandate and capacity. As such the evaluation suggested that an alternative approach to a focus on consensus building may be a focus on recognising diversity and fostering collaboration among different actors on R2P, without re-interpreting the R2P standard.

A significant percentage (66%) of the sampled participants have made changes to individual or agency practice, activities or projects to apply
recommendations or learning from the project. A key activity undertaken as a result of the project included networking or collaborating with contacts made through the project (76%). In particular, several participants reported follow-up with Ushahidi and/or the Crisis Mappers Network either to explore the application of new technologies in specific contexts, or to explore more broadly the implications of greater collaboration between humanitarian NGOs and Voluntary and Technical Communities (V&TCs). For example, The Early Warning Early Response (EWER) program in Timor-Leste run by Belun and Columbia University’s Centre for International Conflict Resolution has been exploring the role of new technologies to monitor the impact of the 2012 elections in Timor-Leste on peace and stability.5

There is also evidence that learning through the project was shared more broadly within organisations and established networks extending the overall ‘reach’ of the project. Several participants reported that they had incorporated the concept of R2P or prevention of mass atrocity crimes more generally into established training programs following participation in the project.

There is also evidence the project has inspired and contributed to the development of specific projects and initiatives undertaken by participants since the conference. For example, World Vision, in collaboration with other NGOs, held a workshop in Geneva in November 2011 that they attributed to recommendations arising in the Cambodia conference outcome document.6 The workshop brought together individuals from key NGOs and V&TC to begin a dialogue for strengthened mutual understanding and collaboration, and the application of humanitarian principles and standards in crisis mapping work.7 As an outcome of the meeting World Vision will be working to provide guidance on relevant Codes of Conduct that may be applicable to V&TCs working in humanitarian contexts.8

A number of online survey respondents and interviewed participants also noted that their agency’s policy and advocacy approaches had been influenced or adapted as a result of the Cambodia conference. In the Philippines,
Cambodia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) the conference outcomes were reportedly used to support specific advocacy initiatives. For example, in the Philippines efforts have been undertaken to educate influential actors in Muslim Mindanao about R2P as a mechanism to encourage prevention of conflict and potentially any future mass atrocities. In Cambodia advocates have been providing input into national early warning guidelines to ensure the inclusion of consideration of R2P crimes. In addition five survey respondents reported that their organisation had worked on development of organisational policies or guidance documents on engagement with R2P following project.

An increasing number of projects and initiatives that have prevention of mass atrocity crimes as an objective are being developed or implemented either following on the project or independently of the project. It is clear that learning arising from this work is not being adequately captured and shared. As such the evaluator concluded that it can be assumed that this evaluation has only exposed the tip of the iceberg in terms of the number of national and local initiatives that may be taking place to operationalise the prevention Pillar of R2P. Each initiative will be discovering important lessons regarding the feasibility of various approaches to prevention of mass atrocity crimes. As such the evaluator recommended that civil society and NGO actors should identify systems to collect successful examples of activities and projects with prevention of mass atrocity objectives, to facilitate learning and advocacy at national, regional and global levels.

The evaluation concluded that civil society and NGO actors can make a strong contribution to the operationalisation of R2P through a focus on the prevention of mass atrocity crimes. The evaluator made a number of recommendations based on project outcomes and learning to help realise that potential. Recommendations included fostering new and established networks interested in learning about and operationalising R2P, and enabling continued dialogue and collaboration amongst diverse stakeholders on practical approaches to prevent mass atrocity crimes. Civil society and NGO actors should work together to map out what early warning activities designed for the prevention of mass atrocities might look like on the ground. This work should be documented and distributed as potential tools and approaches for the prevention of mass atrocities, and used in advocacy with states responsible for implementing R2P.

Oxfam Australia will be building on the outcomes and learnings of this project and looking at ways to implement the recommendations of this evaluation to support ongoing and vital efforts to prevent mass atrocities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADF</td>
<td>Australian Defence Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADRAS</td>
<td>AusAID Development Research Awards Scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFP</td>
<td>Australian Federal Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AICHR</td>
<td>ASEAN Intergovernmental Commission on Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANU</td>
<td>Australian National University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP R2P</td>
<td>Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APSC</td>
<td>ASEAN Political and Security Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARF</td>
<td>ASEAN Regional Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEM</td>
<td>Asia Europe Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AusAID</td>
<td>Australian Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BI Press</td>
<td>Brookings Institution Press</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEDAW</td>
<td>Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERI/CNRS</td>
<td>Center for International Studies and Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPAD</td>
<td>Capacities for Peace and Development in the Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRG</td>
<td>Calcutta Research Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSCAP</td>
<td>Council for Security Cooperation in the Asia Pacific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSIS</td>
<td>Centre for Strategic and International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSOs</td>
<td>Civil Society Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUNY</td>
<td>City University of New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DFAT</td>
<td>Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEP</td>
<td>Expert and Eminent Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAC</td>
<td>Institute for Ethics, Law and Armed Conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EWER</td>
<td>Early Warning Early Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCR2P</td>
<td>Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GU</td>
<td>Griffith University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IASFM</td>
<td>International Association for the Study of Forced Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC</td>
<td>International Criminal Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICG</td>
<td>International Crisis Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICISS</td>
<td>International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRC</td>
<td>International Committee of the Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICRtoP</td>
<td>International Coalition for the Responsibility to Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDMC</td>
<td>Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDPs</td>
<td>Internally Displaced Persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDSS</td>
<td>Institute of Defence and Strategic Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHAT</td>
<td>International Humanitarian Action Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHL</td>
<td>International Humanitarian Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insec</td>
<td>Informal Sector Service Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRIN</td>
<td>Integrated Regional Information Networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>International Studies Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISIS (Thailand)</td>
<td>Institute of Security Studies Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAIPTC</td>
<td>Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Ministry of Foreign Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGOs</td>
<td>Non-Government Organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCT</td>
<td>National Research Council of Thailand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTS</td>
<td>Centre for Non-Traditional Security Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCIS</td>
<td>Oceanic Conference on International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ONA</td>
<td>Office of National Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;C</td>
<td>Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNG</td>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNTL</td>
<td>National Police of East Timor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POC</td>
<td>Protection of Civilians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POLSIS</td>
<td>School of Political Science and International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTC</td>
<td>Pacific Theological College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAMSI</td>
<td>Regional Assistance Mission to Solomon Islands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAND</td>
<td>Research and Development Corporation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Glossary of institutions and acronyms (continued)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R2P (RtoP)</td>
<td>Responsibility to Protect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSG</td>
<td>Representative of the United Nations Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSIPF</td>
<td>Royal Solomon Islands Police Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RSIS</td>
<td>S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Strategic Studies Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSR</td>
<td>Security Sector Reform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWP</td>
<td>German Institute for International and Security Affairs of the Stiftung Wissenschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAMID</td>
<td>United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNA-UK</td>
<td>United Nations Association of the United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGA</td>
<td>United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNMIT</td>
<td>United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNPOL</td>
<td>United Nations Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSC</td>
<td>United Nations Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSG</td>
<td>United Nations Secretary General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSW</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNU</td>
<td>United Nations University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOW</td>
<td>University of Wollongong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UQ</td>
<td>University of Queensland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USIP</td>
<td>United States Institute of Peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V&amp;TCs</td>
<td>Voluntary and Technical Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSOD</td>
<td>World Summit Outcome Document</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“For our part, Australia is proud to support the Asia Pacific Centre for the Responsibility to Protect at The University of Queensland in advancing the responsibility to protect nationally and in partnership with our region.”

– Senator the Hon Bob Carr
Australian Foreign Minister