



Report of the Independent Panel of Experts' Assessment of the African Standby Force

and Plan of Action for Achieving
Full Operational Capability by 2015



Report of the Independent Panel of Experts' Assessment of the African Standby Force

and

Plan of Action for Achieving
Full Operational Capability by 2015

10 December 2013



Contents

Acronyms and abbreviations	4
Preface	6
Executive summary	8
Achieving full operational capability by 2015	8
Funding of African Standby Force operations	9
Strategic review	9
Mandating and decision-making	9
Planning elements	10
Pledged capabilities	11
Mission support	12
Concluding recommendation: Rethinking the link between the African Standby Force and African Union operations	13
Introduction	13
Background	15
Aims, scope, methodology and assumptions	16
Observations, findings and recommendations	18
Mandating and decision-making	18
Planning elements	20
Pledged capabilities	23
Mission support	25
Overall findings and recommendations	27
Achieving full operational capability by 2015	28
Funding of African Standby Force operations	28
Strategic review	29
Concluding recommendation: Rethinking the link between the African Standby Force and African Union operations	30
Annex A: Summary of recommendations	32
Annex B: African Standby Force Action Plan 2014–2015	37
Annex C: Secretariat and planning elements observers who supported the Independent Panel of Experts	44

Acronyms and abbreviations

ACIRC	African Capacity for the Immediate Response to Crisis
AFISMA	African-led International Support Mission to Mali
AFISM–CAR	African-led International Support Mission to the Central African Republic
AHRM	Administration and Human Resources Management
AMIB	African Union Mission in Burundi
AMIS	African Union Mission in Sudan
AMISOM	African Union Mission in Somalia
APSA	African Peace and Security Architecture
APSTA	African Peace Support Trainers' Association
ASF	African Standby Force
AU	African Union
AUC	African Union Commission
C3IS	Command and Control, Communication and Information Systems
CCCPA	Cairo Regional Centre for Training on Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping in Africa
CPX	Command Post Exercise
DPA	Department of Political Affairs
EASF	East African Standby Force
EASFCOM	East African Standby Force Coordination Mechanism
EC	European Commission
ECCAS	Economic Community of Central African States
ECOMIL	Economic Community of West African States Mission in Liberia
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
EU	European Union
FOC	Full Operational Capability

FPU	Formed Police Units
FTX	Field Training Exercise
MICOPAX	Mission for the Consolidation of Peace in the Central African Republic
MoU	Memorandum of Understanding
MS	Member States
MSC	Military Staff Committee
NARC	North African Regional Capability
OLC	Office of the Legal Counsel
PLANELM	Planning Element
PSC	Peace and Security Council
PSD	Peace and Security Department
PSOD	Peace Support Operations Division
RDC	Rapid Deployment Capability
REC	Regional Economic Community
RM	Regional Mechanism
SADC	Southern African Development Community
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
STCDSS	Specialized Technical Committee on Defense, Safety and Security
TCE	Training Centres of Excellence
T/PCCs	Troop/Police-Contributing Countries
TNA	Training Needs Analysis
UN	United Nations
UNAMID	United Nations–African Union Mission in Darfur
UNOAU	United Nations Office to the African Union

Preface

The report of the Independent Panel of Experts on the assessment of the African Standby Force and its Rapid Deployment Capability (ASF-RDC) is submitted pursuant to the decision by the Assembly of African Union (AU) Heads of States and Government during its 20th Ordinary Session held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 27 to 28 January 2013. The summit requested the African Union Commission (AUC) to identify progress made and challenges encountered, with a view to propose recommendations that would allow for the full operationalisation of the African Standby Force (ASF) by 2015. Subsequently, the AUC constituted a multidisciplinary team of experts, which I led to undertake this important endeavour.

The ASF-RDC was established as part of the African Peace and Security Architecture (APSA), in accordance with the AU Constitutive Act and Article 13 of the 2002 Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council of the African Union. Since its establishment over a decade ago, progress has been made in building regional capacities to deploy for peace support operations, when necessary. Unfortunately, the attainment of Full Operational Capability (FOC) of the ASF, expected to be achieved by the end of 2015, remains a work in progress. As a result, this has sometimes made it difficult for the AU to respond to crises in a timely and effective manner. It is against this background that my team carefully reviewed the political and technical indicators that could allow for the attainment of FOC of the ASF.

Accordingly, the assessment adopted a qualitative methodology, which involved the distribution of questionnaires to the regional economic communities (RECs) and regional mechanisms (RMs), physical visits and consultations with representatives from the AUC and planning elements (PLANELMs) of the RECs/RMs. The overall assessment was hinged on four main indicators, as follows:

- i. First, the Panel interrogated the multiple levels of decision-making that have often delayed timely responses to crises. Subsequently, recommendations were made on the mandating and decision-making processes; the division of roles and responsibilities between the United Nations (UN), AU and RECs/RMs; and the respective roles of the Peace and Security Council, chairperson of the AUC and PLANELMs in the planning, management and liquidation of AU peace operations.
- ii. Second, the Panel assessed regional and continental PLANELMs and provided recommendations in respect of the structure; composition and responsibilities of PLANELMs; brigade headquarters and logistical depots; force structure and generation processes; ability of PLANELMs to keep track of and verify pledged capabilities, as per tables of organisation and equipment; and the ability of the PLANELMs to develop contingency plans, oversee training and conduct exercises.

- iii. A third set of recommendations on pledged capabilities was made to address the extent to which regions hold the requisite military, police and civilian pledged capabilities as per tables of organisation and equipment, whether these capabilities are being trained and exercised, and whether their operational readiness is being verified, as well as the processes by which member states make the pledged capabilities available to the AUC or RECs/RMs.
- iv. Finally, recommendations were made in relation to mission support in the areas of sustainment of the mission; strategic lift capability (utilising road, rail, air and maritime networks); financing; unit-level self-sustainability; critical mission infrastructure and logistics; logistical depots; deployment stocks and reimbursement. A cross-cutting issue that was also assessed is linked to predictable and sustainable funding, which was perceived as an important foundation for guaranteeing FOC for the ASF-RDC.

It is the wish of the Panel that the PLANELMs, including the continental PLANELM in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, put in greater effort to ensure that the recommendations in this report are considered in all relevant planning and implementation processes, with a view to achieve a continent-wide FOC. In this regard, a plan of action for achieving the FOC provides a concrete roadmap in the four thematic areas of mandating and decision-making processes, PLANELMs, pledged capabilities and mission support. Through this effort, we are assured of a fully operational capability that exists to ensure a stable and peaceful Africa within the context of the APSA.

The Panel also encourages all relevant stakeholders, especially at the policy implementation level of the AU organs within the APSA framework, to refer to the report, ensuring that its recommendations are internalised and considered in all their endeavours.

Last but not least, the Panel would like to express profound appreciation for the highly competent Peace Support Operations Division (PSOD) Secretariat, as well as representatives from the RECs/RMs whose dedication and hard work, sometimes in very difficult administrative circumstances, allowed for the successful completion of this assessment.

1. **Professor Ibrahim Gambari (Nigeria) – Chair**
2. Dr Cedric de Coning (South Africa) – Deputy Chair
3. General Robert Kibochi (Kenya) – Member
4. Ambassador Soad Shalaby (Egypt) – Member
5. Police Commissioner Paul Sondo (Burkina Faso) – Member

Executive summary

1. On the basis of a decision of the 20th Ordinary Session of the AU Heads of State and Government, held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on 27 and 28 January 2013, and the 9th Ordinary Meeting of the Specialized Technical Committee on Defense, Safety and Security (STCDSS), held in the same city on 30 April 2013, the chairperson of the AUC appointed an Independent Panel of Experts to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the ASF.
2. The Panel consisted of a multidisciplinary team of peace operations experts, headed by Professor Ambassador Ibrahim Gambari (Nigeria). Other members were its deputy chair Dr Cedric de Coning (South Africa); a military expert, Brigadier General Robert Kibochi (Kenya); a civilian and gender expert, Ambassador Soad Shalaby (Egypt), and a police expert, Commissioner Paul Sondo (Burkina Faso). The assessment was conducted between July and December 2013. During this period, the Panel visited the AUC three times and met with all the PLANELMs of the RECs/RMs. The Panel also consulted AU member states, the United Nations Office to the AU (UNOAU) and a large number of external partners.
3. The aims of the assessment, within the context of the ASF Policy Framework, Roadmaps I to III, and related decisions and policies, were to ascertain the level of progress made in the operationalisation of the ASF, including the Rapid Deployment Capability (RDC); to identify key challenges encountered in this regard; and to make appropriate recommendations as to the way forward, within the context of the APSA.
4. The Assessment was conducted in the midst of Roadmap III of the ASF programme of work. When the report was submitted, there were approximately 18 to 24 months left until the ASF, including its RDC, was scheduled to achieve FOC by 31 December 2015.
5. The Assessment Panel has framed its review of progress achieved to date around four areas deemed critical for determining FOC: mandating and decision-making, PLANELMs, pledged capabilities and mission support. What follows are the key findings and recommendations offered by the Panel.

Achieving full operational capability by 2015

6. Despite significant progress towards operationalising the ASF, significant shortcomings, gaps and obstacles still remain. The Assessment Panel is of the opinion that at the current pace and scope of effort, it is unlikely that FOC will be achieved by the end of 2015.
7. Therefore, to achieve FOC by 2015, significant effort will be needed over the next 18 to 24 months. Such effort, including the plan of action recommended by the panel, should amount to a final concerted push to achieve FOC and be focused on those key areas that, if left unaddressed, would make it impossible to achieve FOC.

8. The Panel recommends that the AUC, together with the RECs/RMs, develop a collective verification process, and that this verification process should be scheduled for the second half of 2015, with a view to generating a finding on FOC by 31 December 2015. The finding should be presented to the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, scheduled for January 2016.

Funding of African Standby Force operations

9. The Panel recommends that AU member states develop self-financing resource mobilisation options to strengthen the AU Peace Fund and similar funds at the REC/RM level.
10. The Panel recommends that the AUC and RECs/RMs take steps to reduce the cost of the ASF by right-sizing the concept, structures and policies, such as the PLANELMs and the mission support concept, with a view to redesigning the ASF into a leaner, just-in-time standby capability that can be self-sustainably resourced from mainly African sources.

Strategic review

11. The Panel recommends that African heads of state and government commission a high-level panel to undertake a strategic review of African peace operations and the ASF. This high-level panel should assess the experience and current state of African peace operations and relations with the United Nations (UN) and key partners, and provide strategic direction for the future of African peace operations for the period 2015–25. Such a strategic review should be undertaken in the context of the AU's holistic approach to conflict resolution and the Agenda 2063 process. The high-level panel should be convened no later than mid-2014, and should be tasked with presenting its report to the AU Assembly by mid-2015, so that a new strategic vision for African peace operations can be in place, to inform the future of the ASF beyond 2015.

Mandating and decision-making

The Panel recommends that:

12. The AUC, RECs/RMs and member states meet to consider how the mandating processes envisaged in their respective legal instruments can be harmonised and streamlined, and to develop specific procedures for coordination among the various levels, to ensure that the necessary authorisations can be obtained as rapidly as possible when faced with the need to respond urgently to mass atrocity crimes.
13. The AUC and the RECs/RMs develop and enter into an additional memorandum of understanding (MoU) on the roles and responsibilities of the AU and the

RECs/RMs on the mandating, planning, deployment, management, support and liquidation of ASF operations.

14. The AUC develops and/or adapts internal guiding documents on the respective roles and responsibilities of the various divisions and departments of the AUC in support of the mandating, planning, management, support and liquidation of ASF operations, to ensure an effective and coherent strategic headquarters function in support of a holistic approach to ASF operations.
15. The AU's integrated planning *aide-mémoire* be urgently adopted, and its procedures fully implemented. The Panel further recommends a review of key policies and procedures related to the mandating, planning and decision-making of ASF operations; if any critical gaps are identified, remedial measures must be developed and adopted by 2015.
16. The AUC, in cooperation with the RECs/RMs, convenes a special meeting of African chiefs of police in 2014 to consider all aspects related to the role of police in the ASF and in AU peace operations.
17. The AUC, in cooperation with the RECs/RMs, convenes a meeting of relevant civilian member state ministries in 2014 to consider all aspects related to the civilian dimension of the ASF and AU peace operations; in particular, the roll-out and operationalisation of the ASF civilian standby roster in 2014.

Planning elements

The Panel recommends that:

18. The AUC and RECs/RMs review the ASF Policy Framework and the structures provided in it, with a view to adjusting the number of structures provided for as well as their internal composition, to ensure that the ASF can be self-sustainably resourced from within Africa.
19. The Abuja recommendations relating to the structure of the PSOD be approved and fully implemented as soon as possible, and no later than mid-2015.
20. The PSOD and all RECs/RMs review their staffing and structures, and take practical steps to ensure that they have the minimum necessary police and civilian staff and components in place, in line with the ASF Policy Framework.
21. The immediate appointment of an ASF chief of staff, reporting to the head of the PSOD, to be dedicated to the operationalisation of the ASF, as this position will enhance the capacity of the PSOD to oversee the development of the ASF and to communicate effectively with the RECs/RMs.
22. The PSOD appoints military, police and civilian advisors to the head of the PSOD, so that each of these dimensions are clearly identified and represented in the top management structure of the PSOD. These should not necessarily be new posts, but should be the most senior military, police and civilian officers in the PSOD. The head of the PSOD and ASF chief of staff have multidimensional

responsibility for AU peace operations and the ASF and thus cannot be regarded as representing a specific dimension or component.

23. The AUC and RECs/RMs should review the gender composition of their PLANELMs, and take steps to ensure that all their components include men and women. In particular, the PLANELMs need to ensure that they have planners with gender expertise, so that they can generate plans that take gender into account.
24. The PLANELM staff at the AUC and RECs/RMs be recruited or seconded on longer-term contracts, and selected on the basis of merit and experience.
25. The AUC, and especially the PSOD, in their role as continental PLANELM, significantly increase their communication and outreach to the RECs/RMs; for instance, through regular meetings between the chiefs of staff of the PLANELMs and the head of the PSOD.
26. The roles and obligations of the AUC and RECs/RMs be clarified, specifically in relation to operationalisation of the ASF, including the coordination systems and procedures among them. If deemed necessary, such an agreed set of roles and responsibilities could be included in the MoU previously recommended for ASF operations.
27. Every region develops a standby deployable headquarters as part of its RDC and ASF capabilities.
28. The AUC takes steps to harmonise and integrate the African Capacity for the Immediate Response to Crises (ACIRC) concept into the ASF model, as an additional tool for further enhancing the AU's capacity to respond rapidly to Scenario Six-type mass atrocity crimes, and that it be synchronised with the ASF's national or stand-alone RDC model.

Pledged capabilities

The Panel recommends that:

29. The RECs/RMs enter into legal agreements with their member states that clarify the respective roles and obligations of the PLANELMs and the troop/police contributing countries (T/PCCs), in terms of pledges and with regard to deployments.
30. The AUC, together with the RECs/RMs, develop generic tables of equipment for military, police and civilian components where these have not been developed, and that this initiative be coupled with the development of verification mechanisms, procedures and guidance.
31. The AUC takes all steps necessary to ensure that the civilian standby roster is rolled out as soon as possible, and then staffed by each region by 2015.
32. The AUC and RECs/RMs develop additional guidance on the role of civilians in high-intensity operations, including in RDC deployments, so that they can better

- articulate how civilian peacekeepers contribute to achieving mission mandates in these contexts.
33. The AUC and RECs/RMs develop ASF assessment, selection and verification criteria and procedures for police pledges, and that these be used to ensure that all regions have the agreed number of individual and Formed Police Unit (FPU) capacities in place.
 34. That a standardised police command and leadership structure be developed for ASF operations, and that, once approved, pledged capabilities reflect these command and leadership capabilities.
 35. The AU finalises the ASF training needs analysis (TNA) on the basis of a demand-driven analysis and, once it is approved, the training centres take steps to align their curricula with the stated requirements of the ASF.
 36. The AU develops baseline training standards, coupled with a verification and certification regime, with the support of the African Peace Support Trainers' Association (APSTA).

Mission support

The Panel recommends that:

37. The PSOD, in partnership with other relevant departments and divisions of the AUC – such as the Office of the Legal Counsel (OLC), the Administration and Human Resource Management Department (including Procurement) and Finance – undertakes a lessons learned project aimed at capturing the key mission support lessons learned from AU operations to date, so that these can inform the revision and expansion of the ASF mission support concept.
38. The ASF mission support concept be reviewed and expanded, so that it can enable the AUC and RECs/RMs to identify: (i) the human resources they need at the strategic headquarters; (ii) the systems, structures and procedures they need to develop, in addition to what may already exist; and (iii) the kind of stocks and equipment they need to have in strategic reserve, or for which they need just-in-time procurement contracts and arrangements.
39. The AUC and RECs/RMS explore a just-in-time procurement model that relies on preapproved but dormant contracts for the strategic lift, stocks and equipment that may be needed for mission start-up. For those limited areas deemed essential to maintain ready standby stocks, e.g. strategic communications, the Panel recommends that the AU enters into negotiations with the UN to make use of its logistical depot in Kampala, Uganda.
40. That the AUC develops a lead-nation support concept to enable rapid deployment in the case of Scenario Six-type mass atrocity crimes.
41. With regard to strategic lift capabilities, the AUC and RECs/RMs enter into pre-negotiated just-in-time contracts with several preapproved contractors.

42. The AU and RECs/RMs invest in strategic and operational communication and information systems to enhance the sharing of information and command and control.

Concluding recommendation: Rethinking the link between the African Standby Force and African Union operations

43. The Panel has been struck by the significant increase in African peace operations capacity since the launch of the ASF project, as reflected in the peace operations undertaken by the AU and RECs/RMs over this period, and the contributions from Africa to UN peacekeeping operations. Each of these missions involved planning, mandating, deploying, managing and supporting efforts, and many were also withdrawn or handed over and liquidated. Together, they represent a significant demonstration of capacity and experience. In most of these missions, the ASF PLANELMs at the continental and REC/RM levels have been involved in the planning and management of the missions, and the ASF regional centres of excellence have been involved in the training, preparation and evaluation of these missions. The Panel thus finds that the artificial distinction between the ASF and AU operations cannot be upheld, and that the ASF project is already significantly impacting on African and UN peace operations.
44. The Panel recommends that all AU peace operations efforts be understood as constituting an integral part of the ASF pillar of the APSA, and that the ASF be used as the overarching framework for African peace support operations. Hence, post-2015, all AU peace operations should be regarded as ASF operations.

Introduction

1. The 20th Ordinary Session of the AU Heads of State and Government, held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 27 to 28 January 2013, stressed the need for the early operationalisation of the ASF, including its RDC, within the framework of the APSA, and requested the AUC to submit a progress report on the challenges encountered prior to the 21st Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the Union, to be held in Addis Ababa in May 2013.
2. On the basis of this directive, the 'Report of the Chairperson of the Commission on the Operationalisation of the Rapid Deployment Capability of the African Standby Force and the Establishment of an African Capacity for Immediate Response to Crises' was submitted to the 9th Ordinary Meeting of the African Chiefs of Defence Staff, held in Addis Ababa on 29 April 2013, and to the STCDSS meeting, held on 30 April 2013. The STCDSS directed that 'the Commission, in collaboration with its member states and relevant regional economic communities (RECs) and regional mechanisms (RMs), conduct a comprehensive and physical assessment of the ASF, including its RDC, in order

to fully implement the decision of the 20th Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the Union and to present a report to the next meeting of the STCDSS to be convened in the last quarter of 2013'.

3. Pursuant to this directive, the chairperson of the AUC appointed an Independent Panel of Experts to conduct a comprehensive assessment of the ASF. The Panel consisted of a multidisciplinary team of peace operations experts, headed by Professor Ambassador Ibrahim Gambari (Nigeria). Other members of the Panel were its deputy chair, Dr Cedric de Coning (South Africa); a military expert, Brigadier General Robert Kibochi (Kenya); a civilian and gender expert, Ambassador Soad Shalaby (Egypt) and a police expert, Commissioner Paul Sondo (Burkina Faso).
4. The Panel was assisted by a Secretariat, provided by the PSOD of the AUC, which included police, civilian and military experts, as well as an officer responsible for logistics and administration. The PLANELMs of the regional standby arrangements were also invited to nominate a representative each to support the work of the Panel, and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and East African Standby Force Coordination Mechanism (EASFCOM) were represented in the missions of the Assessment Panel to ECOWAS, EASFCOM and the North African Regional Capability (NARC) (see Annex C).
5. The assessment was conducted between July and December 2013. During this period, the Panel visited the AUC three times and met with all the PLANELMs of the RECs/RMs. The Panel also consulted with AU member states, UNOAU and a large number of partners.

Background

6. According to Article 13 (1) of the Protocol Relating to the Establishment of the Peace and Security Council, 'in order to enable the PSC to perform its responsibilities with respect to the deployment of peace support missions and interventions pursuant to Articles 4(h) and (j) of the Constitutive Act, an African Standby Force (ASF) shall be established. Such a force shall be composed of standby multidisciplinary contingents, with civilian and military components in their countries of origin ready for rapid deployment at appropriate notice'.
7. To provide a common basis for the establishment of the ASF and to implement the provisions of the protocol, a Policy Framework for the Establishment of the African Standby Force and Military Staff Committee (MSC) (hereafter the ASF Policy Framework) was adopted by the 3rd Meeting of African Chiefs of Defence Staff, held on 15 and 16 May 2003, and approved by the 3rd Ordinary Session of the Assembly of the African Union, held from 6 to 8 July 2004 (Assembly/AU/Dec.35(III)Rev.1).
8. The ASF Policy Framework specifies the concept of the ASF, as well as major stages in its operationalisation. Subsequent meetings of the African chiefs of defence staff and heads of security and safety services, as well as the STCDSS, have provided supplementary guidance on how best to operationalise the ASF. Three roadmaps were developed to guide the operationalisation:
 - i. Roadmap I, adopted in March 2005, covering the period June 2006 to March 2008, resulted in the preparation and adoption of the core documents of the ASF, including on doctrine; logistics; standard operating procedures (SOPs); training and evaluation; and command and control, communication and information systems (C3IS). The PLANELMs were also established in all the regions during this phase.
 - ii. Roadmap II, adopted in April 2008, covered the period April 2008 to December 2010. It was aimed at identifying measures to be undertaken to resolve outstanding issues from Roadmap I, and to consolidate progress made. Roadmap II culminated in Exercise AMANI AFRICA, one main objective of which was the evaluation of progress and the validation of the ASF.
 - iii. Roadmap III, adopted in December 2010, covers the period December 2010 to December 2015. It is aimed at building on the work and lessons from roadmaps I and II, including the Exercise AMANI AFRICA cycle. Roadmap III aims to address specific areas of enhancement for the ASF, including advocacy and outreach, structures and management capabilities, political decision-making and mission planning processes, operational concepts, logistics, and legal and financial frameworks. Roadmap III is also to take into account new challenges, including the role of the ASF in humanitarian action, natural disasters and relief operations, maritime safety and security.

9. The ASF Policy Framework and the Roadmap for the Operationalisation of the ASF called for the establishment of an RDC capable of intervening within 14 days, in cases of genocide and gross human rights abuses under ASF Scenario Six. The RDC was framed as part of the regional standby forces and, as such, would be constituted from lead elements of the regional standby forces. At the 2nd Ordinary Meeting of the STCDSS, held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, on 27 and 28 March 2008, it was decided that the RDC would be an integral part of the regional standby forces; it being understood that this capacity would be deployed at the entry point, as a precursor to the deployment of a larger mission. Roadmap III of the ASF recommended that the RDC be tested, evaluated and operationalised by 2012. This objective could not be attained.
10. The AMANI AFRICA I training cycle was designed to validate the AU processes for employing the ASF within the broad framework of the APSA. It culminated in a command post exercise (CPX) that was conducted in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 20 to 29 October 2010, with the support of the European Union (EU). The CPX was based on the deployment of the ASF in the context of an AU multidimensional peace support operation, and focused on the validation of policies and processes at strategic level, for the employment of the ASF within the APSA framework. It provided an opportunity to identify gaps as they related to the AU's ability to plan and manage complex and multidimensional peace support operations, as well as recommendations for addressing the challenges. Pursuant to this, the AU (with the support of the EU) decided to initiate a second AMANI AFRICA training cycle (AMANI AFRICA II), which will culminate in a field training exercise (FTX) in 2014. The objective of the FTX will be to 'validate the capacity of the African Union to grant a mandate for the use of a rapid deployment capability, as an initial operation for Scenario Six and lead in the process, a fully-fledged multidimensional peace operation (Scenario Five).
11. This assessment of the progress of operationalising the ASF is thus conducted in the midst of Roadmap III of the ASF programme of work. There are approximately 18 to 24 months until the ASF, including its RDC, is scheduled to achieve FOC in 2015.

Aims, scope, methodology and assumptions

12. The aims of the present assessment, within the context of the ASF Policy Framework, Roadmaps I to III and related decisions and policies, are as follows:
 - i. to ascertain the amount of progress made in the operationalisation of the ASF, including the RDC
 - ii. to identify key challenges encountered in this regard
 - iii. to make appropriate recommendations on the way forward, within the context of the APSA.

13. The assessment employed a range of methodologies, including a questionnaire that was sent to the REC/RM PLANELMs prior to the visit by the Panel. The Panel received briefings from the AUC and REC/RM PLANELMs, and also consulted representatives of the AUC, RECs/RMs, AU member states and partners on key gaps and challenges. Furthermore, the Panel reviewed all relevant documentation.
14. The Panel has based the scope of the assessment on certain key assumptions. It noted that although the AUC and RECs/RMs were all well aware of the goal of achieving FOC by 2015, what FOC actually entailed had not been clearly defined. In the absence of a clear definition, the Panel had to generate a working understanding of FOC. In this process it was guided by the ASF Policy Framework, Roadmaps I to III and the objectives of the AMANI AFRICA cycle. On this basis, the Panel adopted a working understanding of FOC – that the FOC of the ASF should be understood in the context of the six scenario time frames envisaged in the ASF Policy Framework, as:
 - i. the ability of the AUC to mandate, plan, manage, support and liquidate a peace operation at the strategic level
 - ii. combined with the ability of the AUC, or a designated REC/RM, to plan, deploy, manage, support and liquidate a peace operation at the operational level, and
 - iii. the ability of member states to generate the necessary military, police and civilian capacities against given operational readiness criteria.
15. With regard to time frames, the Panel realised that it also was not clear whether FOC should be achieved by early, mid- or late 2015. The Panel assumed that 31 December 2015 is the date by which the FOC of the ASF will be attained.
16. Informed by this working understanding of FOC, the Assessment Panel has framed its review of progress achieved to date around four areas deemed critical for determining FOC:
 - i. **Mandating and decision-making:** includes political decision-making, legal framework, mandating authority, the division of roles and responsibilities between the UN, AU and RECs/RMs, and the respective roles of the PSC, chairperson of the AUC and PLANELMs in the planning, management and liquidation of AU peace operations.
 - ii. **PLANELMs:** the structure, composition and responsibilities of PLANELMs, brigade headquarters and logistical depots; force structure and generation processes; ability of PLANELMs to keep track of and verify pledged capabilities as per tables of organisation and equipment; and the ability of PLANELMs to develop contingency plans, oversee training and conduct exercises.
 - iii. **Pledged capabilities:** the extent to which regions hold the requisite military, police and civilian pledged capabilities, as per tables of organisation and equipment; whether these capabilities are being trained and exercised; and

whether their operational readiness is being verified; as well as the processes by which member states make the pledged capabilities available to the AUC or RECs/RMs.

- iv. **Mission support:** sustainment of the mission; strategic lift capability (utilising road, rail, air and maritime networks); financing; unit-level self-sustainability; critical mission infrastructure and logistics, logistical depots, deployment stocks and reimbursements.

Observations, findings and recommendations

17. On the basis of the missions, the Assessment Panel undertook to the Southern African Development Community (SADC), ECOWAS, EASFCOM and NARC and the meetings held with the AUC, Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS), AU member states and partners, as well as a thorough review of the ASF documentation, the Panel offers the following observations, findings and recommendations:

Mandating and decision-making

18. The Assessment Panel observes that the UN Charter, AU Constitutive Act and the legal instruments at the REC/RM level provide a set of legal guidelines for the mandating and deployment of ASF operations. From these, it appears that an AU peace operation that is mandated to use force, and which makes use of the regional standby forces of a REC/RM, will require authorisation at four levels: the UN, AU, the concerned REC/RM and respective T/PCCs. The Panel further notes that some member states are legally required to obtain parliamentary approval prior to the deployment of their forces on peace operations. These legal requirements ensure that ASF operations will have the necessary political credibility and legitimacy. However, the time needed for convening the various statutory bodies at all four levels of decision-making will have consequences for the speed with which the AU can respond to a crisis. In particular, the Assessment Panel finds that meeting the 14-day deployment window envisaged under Scenario Six of the ASF Policy Framework, which provides for a rapid response to mass atrocity crimes, would be challenging – if not impossible – to meet, if authority must first be sought at all four of these levels. **The Panel recommends that the AUC, RECs/RMs and member states meet to consider how the mandating processes envisaged in their respective legal instruments can be harmonised and streamlined, and to develop specific procedures for coordination among the various levels, to ensure that the necessary authorisations can be obtained as quickly as possible, to respond urgently and robustly to mass atrocity crimes.**
19. The Assessment Panel notes that there is a Memorandum of Understanding on Cooperation in the Area of Peace and Security between the African Union and the Regional Economic Communities and Coordinating Mechanisms of

the Regional Standby Brigades of Eastern Africa and Northern Africa (2008). However, the Assessment Panel finds that this MoU is too generic and does not adequately clarify the specific roles and obligations of the AU and RECs/RMs when cooperating in ASF operations. For instance, the experience of the AUC and ECCAS in the planning of the handover from the Mission for the Consolidation of Peace in the Central African Republic (MICOPAX) to the African-led International Support Mission to the Central African Republic (AFISM-CAR) showed that the current MoU does not provide a legal and procedural basis for the transfer of authority from a REC/RM to an AU mission, or *vice versa*. Similarly, the experiences of the AUC and ECOWAS in the planning of the African-led International Support Mission to Mali (AFISMA) highlighted the lack of clarity regarding the respective roles and responsibilities of the AU and, in this case, ECOWAS, given the absence of an explicit MoU to guide such interaction. **The Panel recommends that the AUC and the RECs/RMs develop and enter into an additional MoU on the roles and responsibilities of the AU and the RECs/RMs on the mandating, planning, deployment, management, support and liquidation of ASF operations.**

20. At the level of the African continent, the PSC has the authority to mandate peace operations, whilst the AU Assembly authorises interventions pursuant to Article 4(h) of the Constitutive Act. The AUC is responsible for operationalising the decisions of the PSC and AU Assembly. Within the AUC, the PSOD is responsible for planning, deploying, managing, supporting and liquidating ASF operations. The Panel notes the need for improvement in cooperation and coordination between the PSOD and other relevant divisions and departments of the AUC, including the Peace and Security Department (PSD), Department of Political Affairs (DPA), OLC, Administration and Human Resources Management (AHRM) Department, Gender Directorate and the bureaux of the deputy chairperson and the chairperson. **The Panel recommends that the AUC develops and/or adapts internal guidance documents on the roles and responsibilities of the various divisions and departments of the AUC in support of the mandating, planning, management, support and liquidation of ASF operations, to ensure an effective and coherent strategic headquarters function in support of a holistic approach to ASF operations.**
21. Although much has been done to develop relevant policies and guidance, the AUC still lacks some key policies and procedures, especially concerning the planning, mandating and decision-making of ASF operations. For instance, while a draft *aide-mémoire* on the AU's planning and decision-making process has been developed, it has yet to be endorsed by the STCDSS. The Panel recommends the urgent adoption of the *aide-mémoire* and full implementation of its procedures. **The Panel further recommends a review of key policies and procedures related to the mandating, planning and decision-making of ASF operations; if any critical gaps are identified, remedies should be developed and adopted by 2015.**

22. The Panel notes that steps have been taken to make the decision-making bodies that guide the ASF more multidimensional. For instance, Roadmap III envisages expanding the Military Staff Committee provided for in the APSA to include civilian and police members, and the annual meetings of the African chiefs of defence staff and the heads of security and safety services and the STCDSS have been broadened to include police and civilian representatives. However, the Panel observes that, in practice, these meetings remain dominated by representatives of the military. **To ensure ownership and awareness of the ASF among the relevant police and civilian bodies of member states, the Panel recommends that the AUC, in cooperation with the RECs/RMs, convenes a special meeting of African chiefs of police in 2014 to consider all aspects related to the role of police in the ASF and in its operations. The Panel also recommends that the AUC, in cooperation with the RECs/RMs, convenes a meeting of relevant civilian member state ministries in 2014 to consider all aspects related to the civilian dimension of the ASF and ASF operations; in particular, the roll-out and operationalisation of the ASF civilian standby roster in 2014.**

Planning elements

23. The Panel finds that most regional standby arrangements are designed and staffed at levels that are unsustainable without outside partner support. In the context of the AU's strategy for resource mobilisation from within, **the Panel recommends that the AUC and RECs/RMs review the ASF Policy Framework and structures provided therein, with a view to adjusting the number of structures provided for as well as their internal composition, to ensure that the ASF can be self-sustainably resourced from within Africa.**
24. With regard to the AUC, the Panel notes that the present structure of the PSOD needs to be improved to reflect its role as the nucleus of the strategic headquarters for ASF operations, as recommended in the Seminar on the Restructuring of the AUC Strategic Headquarters, held in Abuja, Nigeria, between 12 and 14 July 2011, and Roadmap III. The ASF cannot achieve FOC without a functional strategic headquarter capability at the AUC that can plan, manage, support and liquidate ASF operations. **The Panel recommends that the Abuja recommendations relating to the structure of the PSOD be approved and fully implemented as soon as possible, and no later than mid-2014.**
25. Although all ASF PLANELMs are taking steps to develop a multidimensional peace operations capability, the Panel notes that progress has been uneven, and civilian and police capacities have not received as much attention as military capacities. **The Panel recommends that the PSOD and each REC/RM review their staffing and structures, and take concerted steps to ensure that they have the minimum necessary police and civilian staff and components in place, in line with the ASF Policy Framework. The Panel also recommends that the PSOD appoints a military, police and civilian advisor, so that each of**

these dimensions are clearly represented in the top management structure of the PSOD. These should not necessarily be new posts, but should be the most senior military, police and civilian officers in the PSOD, second only in seniority to the head of the PSOD and the chief of staff of the ASF. Furthermore, the Panel recommends that the AUC and RECs/RMs review the gender composition of their PLANELMs, and take steps to ensure that all their components reflect gender balance. In particular, the PLANELMs need to ensure that they have planners with gender expertise, so that they can generate plans which take the gender dimension into account.

26. The Panel observes that continental and regional standby arrangements have all faced recruitment and staffing challenges, and that it has proved difficult to staff the PLANELMs, force headquarters and logistic depots with personnel with the relevant experience and expertise. To date, most PLANELMs have relied on personnel seconded from member states, resulting in a high rotation of personnel and, subsequently, lack of continuity. **The Panel recommends that PLANELM staff at the AUC and RECs/RMs be recruited or seconded on longer-term contracts, and selected on the basis of merit and experience.**
27. With respect to communication and coordination between the AU and RECs/RMs, all PLANELMs appear to be making good use of the regional liaison officers to the AU, as well as the AU liaison officers to the regions. However, the Panel notes that no dedicated ASF and peace operation liaison capacity exists between the PLANELM and the AU PSOD. Instead, communication is based on personal relations and the initiative of individuals. The Panel finds that more strategic leadership and guidance from the AUC, better information-sharing and more consistent coordination of policies, programmes and planning for the establishment and deployment of the ASF are needed. **The Panel recommends that the AUC, and especially the PSOD, in its role as continental PLANELM, significantly increases its communication and outreach to the RECs/RMs; for instance through regular meetings between the chiefs of staff of the PLANELMs and the head of the PSOD. The Panel also recommends the immediate appointment of an ASF chief of staff dedicated to the operationalisation of the ASF, as this position will enhance the capacity of the PSOD to effectively communicate with the RECs/RMs.**
28. The Panel finds that sufficient work has not been undertaken to date to clarify the roles and responsibilities of the AU PSOD and the regional PLANELMs in relation to the operationalisation of the ASF. The AUC often assumes that the RECs/RMs will initiate certain actions on their own, whilst the RECs/RMs expect the AUC to provide leadership and guidance. **The Panel recommends that the roles and obligations of the AUC and RECs/RMs be clarified, specifically in relation to the operationalisation of the ASF, including the coordination systems and procedures among them. If deemed necessary, such an agreed set of roles and responsibilities can be included in the MoU previously recommended for ASF operations. The Panel further recommends that**

ASF structures at the AU strategic level be aligned with those at the regional levels, taking into account the operational realities in the latter.

29. The Panel notes that the RDC of the ASF was under particular scrutiny in 2013. The ASF RDC is a key crisis response capability that is meant to stabilise an emergency situation as rapidly as possible. The Panel finds that the RDC concept has not been fully and coherently developed in all regions. The regions have interpreted and developed the concept differently, with some adopting a standalone model whereas others have opted for a multinational framework. Further, the Panel observed that apart from EASFCOM, the other regions have not established deployable headquarters to facilitate a rapid response to crises. **The Panel recommends that every region develop a standby deployable headquarters as part of its RDC and ASF capabilities.**
30. In the Report of the Chairperson of the Commission on the Operationalisation of the Rapid Deployment Capability of the African Standby Force and the Establishment of an African Capacity for Immediate Response to Crisis, prepared for the 6th Ordinary Session of the STCDSS, the chairperson argued that the crisis in Mali highlighted the need for a transitional formula, while the ASF and its RDC are being fully operationalised. Subsequently, at its 22nd session, held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in May 2013, the AU Assembly decided in principle to immediately establish, as a transitional arrangement and pending the full operationalisation of the ASF and its RDC, an ACIRC.
31. The Panel observes that the decision to establish the ACIRC has caused concern among some member states, some ASF staff at the AUC and RECs/RMs, and among some partners. The concerns have mostly been about how the ACIRC relates to the ASF, and that the ACIRC initiative would divert attention away from the effort needed to ensure full operationalisation of the ASF by 2015. However, the Panel has been assured by the chairperson of the AUC and other senior AUC staff and member states involved in the ACIRC initiative that this is an interim arrangement, not meant to replace, or in any way detract from, the AU's commitment to the ASF. This position was also confirmed in the *communiqué* issued at the end of the consultative meeting of chiefs of defence staff of countries that pledged resources to ACIRC, which took place in South Africa on 5 November 2013.
32. The Panel observes that the ASF and the ACIRC are currently pursued on parallel tracks, and recommends that more be done to ensure complementarity of ACIRC and ASF initiatives, especially in the context of the full operationalisation of the RDC concept. In this context, the Panel notes that the lead-nation concept is provided for in the ASF Policy Framework for rapid response to mass atrocity crimes, as envisaged in Scenario Six, and that the national or standalone RDC concept should be considered an example of an RDC model compatible with both the ASF and ACIRC concepts. **The Panel recommends that the AUC takes steps to harmonise and integrate the ACIRC concept into the ASF concept as an additional and interim tool for further enhancing the AU's**

capacity to respond rapidly to Scenario Six-type mass atrocity crimes, and that it be synchronised with the ASF's national or standalone RDC model.

Pledged capabilities

33. The Assessment Panel has observed that all regions have been able to secure pledges for uniformed (military and police) personnel. However, across all regions, PLANELMs have indicated that they are uncertain about the predictability of the pledges made by member states. The Panel also noted that there is no legal binding agreement between the RECs/RMs and their respective T/PCCs in terms of the fulfilment of pledged capabilities. The Panel finds that, in the absence of such agreements, the PLANELMs are not in a position to verify their region's pledged capabilities, and thus cannot make a reasonable judgement as to their operational readiness. **The Panel recommends that the RECs/RMs enter into legal agreements with their member states that clarify the respective roles and obligations of the PLANELMs and T/PCCs, in terms of pledges and with regard to deployments.**
34. Regarding verification, the Panel observed that only a few regions have attempted to verify pledged capabilities, by physically inspecting some of the components. A key gap concerning verification is the lack of guidance and standards on verification from the AU. For instance, equipment presented at the time of verification may not be dedicated exclusively for ASF purposes – this was found to be the case for specialised peace operations equipment for FPU, such as armoured personnel carriers. **The Panel recommends that the AUC, together with the RECs/RMs, develops generic tables of equipment for military, police and civilian components, where these have not been developed, and that this initiative be coupled with the development of verification mechanisms, procedures and guidance, which need to be put in place by the end of 2014.**
35. The Panel observed that although the civilian component is generally regarded as the least-developed component of the ASF, there have been several positive developments. A Civilian Policy Framework has been in place since 2006 at continental level, and the East African Standby Force (EASF) and SADC have also adopted regional civilian policy frameworks. All PLANELMs now have two or more civilian staff, and the PSOD now has seven civilian officers. **The Panel finds the civilian component of the ASF to be the most gender-balanced, and notes that steps have been taken in the Civilian Policy Framework and the design of the ASF roster to ensure gender mainstreaming. The civilian staffing table for ASF operations has been developed, together with job descriptions and vacancy announcements for each position. These will be used to recruit personnel to the ASF standby roster once it becomes operational in 2014. The Panel finds that the civilian standby roster is a critical element in ensuring that the ASF will achieve FOC by the end of 2015, and it recommends that the AUC takes all steps necessary to ensure**

that the civilian standby roster is rolled out as soon as possible, and then staffed by each region, by the first quarter of 2015.

36. The Panel has observed an increase in the number of civilians in AU peace operations, spurred on largely by the civilian policy framework, civilian staffing tables and job descriptions developed for the ASF. However, the Panel also notes that the UN and some partners have been reluctant to support the civilian components in the African Union Mission in Somalia (AMISOM) and AFISMA, due to concerns that the civilians in AU missions would duplicate the roles of some of the UN offices in the same countries. Despite these reservations, the Panel finds that the UN and partners understood the need for ASF operations to be multidimensional, and that they support the principles behind an integrated or comprehensive approach to peace operations. **The Panel thus recommends that the AUC and RECs/RMs develop additional guidance on the role of civilians in high-intensity operations, including in RDC deployments, so that they can better articulate how civilian peacekeepers contribute to achieving mission mandates in these contexts.**
37. With regard to pledged police capabilities, the Panel observes that while some RECs do have pledged capabilities for individual police experts, others do not. Only three of the regional standby arrangements have pledged FPU capabilities. The Panel notes that there is no ASF agreed or approved assessment and selection procedure in place for pledged police capabilities, and that very limited verification of the pledged police capabilities has been undertaken to date. The Panel finds the pledges unclear with respect to the command and leadership capacities of the pledged police (FPUs and individual experts). In some regions, it is unclear whether the gendarmerie pledged were part of police or military pledges, because in some member states the gendarmerie falls under the ministry of defence and is separate from the police. **The Panel recommends that the AUC and RECs/RMs develop ASF assessment, selection and verification criteria and procedures, and that these be used to ensure that all regions have the agreed number of individual and FPU capacities in place. The Panel also recommends that a standardised police command and leadership structure be developed for ASF operations. Once approved, pledged capabilities should reflect these command and leadership capabilities.**
38. With regard to training, the Panel observes that all regions have training regimes in place and have developed training centres of excellence (TCE). The training centres have established an APSTA, which has an MoU (2008) with the PSOD regarding the role of the APSTA in coordinating ASF training, standardisation of doctrine, sharing of best practices and the dissemination of lessons learned. However, the Panel finds gaps in aligning the training offered to the specific operational roles and needs of ASF operations, especially with regard to police and civilian roles. For instance, in cases where the police mandate includes responsibility for institutional capacity-building, as in AMISOM, the pre-deployment training must be tailor-made to focus on operational mentoring,

strategic advisory and policy development including, and especially police reform and restructuring, and training of national police and other law enforcement agencies of the host country. The Panel further notes that EASFCOM, ECCAS, ECOWAS and SADC have engaged in a series of training initiatives in the form of planning courses, map exercises, CPXs and FTXs, and these exercises have formed part of the AMANI AFRICA training and evaluation cycle. However, no certification scheme has been developed by the AU for the evaluation and certification of ASF training courses and exercises, and the AU has not certified any training courses to date. **The Panel recommends that the AU finalise the ASF TNA based on a demand-driven analysis and, once it is approved, that the training centres take steps to align their curricula with the stated requirements of the ASF. The Panel further recommends that the AU develops baseline training standards, coupled with a verification and certification regime, with the support of the APSTA.**

Mission support

39. The Panel finds that mission support is the least-developed dimension of the ASF. As mission support is a critical enabler of ASF operations, shortcomings in this area have very serious implications for FOC. In the view of the Panel, it will not be possible for the ASF to achieve FOC by 2015 unless concerted effort is made to address these critical gaps. The Panel also notes that the AUC and some RECs/RMs have had limited mission experience in the area of integrated mission support, as the UN, EU and other partners have always taken responsibility for this aspect in past and current operations. The mission support aspect is also very difficult to exercise beyond planning, because of cost and other practical considerations. The AU and RECs/RMs have had some experience with procurement, claims, human resources, etc. but these have not been captured systematically. **The Panel recommends that the PSOD, in partnership with other relevant departments and divisions of the AUC, such as the OLC, AHRM Department (including Procurement) and Finance, undertake a lessons learned project aimed at capturing the key mission support lessons from AU operations to date, so that these may inform the revision and expansion of the ASF mission support concept.**
40. The Panel finds that the existing ASF support manual and ASF logistics concept do not adequately address the types of human resources, systems, processes and equipment needed at the level of the AUC, for it to serve as an effective strategic headquarters for AU peace operations. Nor does it adequately address the mission support needs of a mission headquarters, especially relating to the support needs of mission management, and the military, police and civilian personnel deployed at the mission and sector headquarters of ASF operations. Furthermore, the Panel observed that the AUC lacks the mechanisms, systems and processes needed to bring together support functions such as human resources, finance, supply, procurement, engineering and communications, to support AU operations. The

existing functions have been developed to support the daily functioning of the AUC, not its peace operations. When called upon to support AU operations, the capacities of these existing functions in the AUC were found to be inadequate, and the procedures and systems that were designed for the AUC did not fit well with the needs of field operations. All AUC personnel the Panel interviewed in this regard identified the need for additional capacity, as well as the development of policies and procedures specifically aimed at addressing the needs of field operations. Whilst some were in favour of developing a dedicated mission support capacity within the AUC, similar perhaps to the UN's Department of Field Support, others were in favour of expanding the capacity of the existing AUC legal, finance, administration and human resources departments to ensure they are able to serve the AU's peace operation needs. **The Panel recommends that the ASF mission support concept be reviewed and expanded so that it can enable the AUC and RECs/RMs to identify: (i) the human resources they need at the strategic headquarters, (ii) the systems, structures and procedures the AUC and RECs/RMs need to develop, in addition to what may already exist, and (iii) the kind of stocks and equipment the AUC and RECs/RMs need to have in strategic reserve, or for which they need just-in-time procurement contracts and arrangements.** Particular attention needs to be paid to the support needs of the mission and sector headquarters, and the military staff, officers, and military observers, police officers, civilian experts and mission management working at these headquarters.

41. The Panel strongly supports the AU's emphasis on developing its own resources, including for peace operations. However, when it comes to ASF operations, the Panel finds that some degree of external partner support would need to be factored into the mission support models of most ASF operations. This means that personnel with the necessary expertise to plan and engage with partners and contractors will need to form an important part of any AUC or REC/RM human resources capacity for mission support. For instance, the Panel has observed that all the peace operations the AU has undertaken to date have benefited from combinations of bilateral support, UN support and trust fund-type contributions. In some cases, the AU is given the funds and must then procure the goods or enter into service contracts, whereas in other cases goods are procured and contracts entered into on behalf of the AU. Regardless of the model used in a particular mission, the AU and RECs/RMs must ensure that they have the necessary capacity to engage with the support offered in such a way that it is need-driven, flexible and responsive to changing dynamics, and that it enables the achievement of the mission's mandate and goals. When the ASF mission support concept is reviewed and expanded, as recommended in the previous paragraph, those responsible should consider all the different support models ASF operations may regularly encounter, as well as the personnel, systems and procedures the AUC would need for each model, so that the AUC can develop a flexible mission

support concept that enables it to work with its own resources, as well as with a range of external support models.

42. The Panel observes that the current ASF support manual and ASF logistics concept depend heavily on logistical depots and the strategic deployment stocks these should contain. However, the Panel finds that the costs of establishing and maintaining a continental hub (and several regional logistical depots) have proved to be unrealistic and unsustainable. The Panel thus questions the centrality of the logistical depots model in the ASF mission support concept. **Instead, the Panel recommends that the AUC and RECs/RMS explore a just-in-time procurement model that relies on preapproved but dormant contracts for the strategic lift, stocks and equipment that may be needed for mission start-up. For those limited areas deemed essential to maintain ready standby stocks, e.g. strategic communications, the Panel recommends that the AU enters into negotiations with the UN to make use of its logistical depot in Kampala, Uganda.**
43. For rapid deployment in the context of Scenario Six, which provides for deployment in 14 days, the Panel finds that the only support concept that could meet such a time frame would be a lead-nation concept. **The Panel recommends that the AUC develops a lead-nation support concept to enable rapid deployment in the case of Scenario Six-type mass atrocity crimes.**
44. With regard to strategic lift capability, individual member states possess some capabilities, but only a limited number have been pledged. Major powers may also be willing to provide some strategic lift, but this will always be on a case-by-case basis and thus cannot form the basis of a mission support concept or plan. **The Panel finds that without prejudice to accessing this capacity in some member states of the AU, the most predictable source of strategic lift that a mission support concept and plan can rely on would be private sector contractors, and it recommends that the AUC and RECs/RMs enter into pre-negotiated just-in-time contracts with several preapproved contractors.**
45. The Panel observed that the AU and RECs/RMs lack effective strategic communication capabilities for both routine and operational purposes. This capability gap is a major drawback to the ASF's ability to share information and the conduct of operations in the field. **The Panel recommends that the AU and RECs/RMs invest in strategic and operational communication and information systems to enhance the sharing of information and command and control.**

Overall findings and recommendations

46. The Panel offers two main sets of recommendations. The first relates to measures needed for achieving FOC by 2015, and the second pertains to the analysis of past operations by the AU and RECs and a strategic review of the future of ASF operations.

Achieving full operational capability by 2015

47. Despite significant progress towards operationalising the ASF, significant shortcomings, gaps and obstacles still remain. The Assessment Panel is of the opinion that at the current pace and scope of effort, it is unlikely that FOC will be achieved by the end of 2015.
48. Therefore, to achieve FOC by 2015, major effort will be needed over the next 18 to 24 months. Such effort should amount to a final concerted push to achieve FOC and be focused on those key areas that, if left unaddressed, would make it impossible to achieve FOC. It also implies that those aspects *not* critical to achieving FOC by 2015 should not be prioritised during this period – in turn necessitating a realignment of the work programmes of the AUC, RECs/RMs and partners. The Panel has made recommendations on what such an effort should entail and achieve – summarised for easy reference in Annex A. Annex B contains an ASF Action Plan: 2014–15, which is based on these recommendations.
49. The Panel is of the opinion that the NARC region will not be able to achieve FOC due to significant disruptions that the ASF project suffered there as a result of the Arab Spring and the ongoing uncertainty in Egypt, Libya and other countries in North Africa. However, most countries in the region have considerable national capacities that can be mobilised for peace support operations, including strategic airlift. The region also has a centre of excellence in the form of the Cairo Regional Centre for Training on Conflict Resolution and Peacekeeping in Africa (CCCPA). The Panel thus recommends that the AUC remains closely engaged with the NARC PLANELM, CCCPA and individual member states in the region, to ensure that they remain engaged in the ASF project.
50. The Panel also noted that apart from AMANI II, scheduled for late 2014, there is currently no process prescribed for how the AUC and RECs/RMs will verify whether FOC has been achieved by 31 December 2015. The Panel recommends that the AUC, together with the RECs/RMs, develops a collective verification process, and that this verification process should be scheduled for the second half of 2015, with a view to generating a finding on FOC by 31 December 2015. The finding should be presented to the Assembly of Heads of State and Government scheduled for January 2016.

Funding of African Standby Force operations

51. With regard to the funding of ASF operations, the Panel is of the opinion that the most significant constraint to the AU's peace operations, and its ability to respond rapidly to an unfolding crisis, is the inability of AU member states to fund their own operations. The AU cannot make its own independent decisions regarding the mandate, scope, size and duration of its peace operations as long as it is dependent on external partners to cover the costs of its peace operations. The Panel thus strongly supports the emphasis the AU places on developing its own resources, including for peace operations. The Panel notes the report of

the High-Level Panel on Alternative Sources of Financing the African Union, and the steps the AU is taking to consider and implement its recommendations. The Panel was impressed with the way in which the ECOWAS community levy enabled it, for instance, to self-finance its mission to Guinea-Bissau. The Panel thus recommends that AU member states develop similar self-financing resource mobilisation options to strengthen the AU Peace Fund and similar funds at the REC/RM level. At the same time, and as mentioned earlier, the Panel recommends that the AUC and RECs/RMs take steps to reduce the cost of the ASF by right-sizing its concept, structures and policies, such as the PLANELMs (para. 23) and the mission support concept (paras. 40–43), with a view to redesigning the ASF into a leaner just-in-time standby capability that can be self-sustainably resourced from mainly African sources.

Strategic review

52. When the ASF was established, the AU had not yet undertaken operations of its own on a scale that could provide it with an understanding of its own role and comparative advantages in peace operations. As such, the ASF was developed on the basis of assumptions derived from UN multidimensional peacekeeping experiences of the 1990s. Since then, the AU and several RECs/RMs have mandated, planned, deployed, managed and liquidated peace operations in Burundi, Darfur and Mali. In addition to the United Nations–African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID), the first and only hybrid peace operation in the world jointly mandated and run by the two organisations, the AU is currently responsible for one of the largest peace operations in the world in Somalia. In December 2013, the authority for the peace operation in Central African Republic will transfer from ECCAS to the AU. As a result of these mission experiences, the AU, regions and member states involved have, over the past decade, developed their own body of knowledge on African-led peace operations. The Panel is of the opinion that the existing ASF Policy Framework should be reviewed against these experiences and adapted, to better align it with the realities and evolving model of African peace operations.
53. The Panel recommends that African heads of state and government commission a high-level panel to undertake a strategic review of African peace operations – past, present and future. This high-level panel should assess the state of African peace operations and relations with the UN and key partners, and provide strategic direction for the future of African peace operations and the ASF for the period 2015–25. Such a strategic review should be undertaken in the context of the AU's holistic approach to conflict resolution and the Agenda 2063 process. The high-level panel should be convened no later than mid-2014, and should be tasked with presenting its report to the Assembly by mid-2015, so that a new strategic vision for African peace operations and the ASF can be put in place, to inform the future of the ASF beyond 2015.

Concluding recommendation: Rethinking the link between the African Standby Force and African Union operations

54. The Panel has been struck by the significant increase in African peace operations capacity since the launch of the ASF project, as reflected in the peace operations undertaken by the AU and RECs/RMs over this period, and the contributions from Africa to UN peacekeeping operations. In total, approximately 40 000 uniformed and civilian personnel were mandated to serve in AU peace operations in 2013 (approximately 71 000, if UNAMID is taken into account as well). In addition, African contributions to UN peacekeeping operations have increased steadily during this period – from a little over 10 000 per annum in 2003, when the ASF project was launched, to approximately 35 000 per annum by 2013. This means that in 2013, more than 75 000 African peacekeepers served in African and UN peace operations.
55. Since 2003, the AU and RECs/RMs have deployed 10 peace operations: Burundi (African Mission in Burundi – AMIB) 2003–04; Liberia (ECOWAS Mission in Liberia – ECOMIL) in 2003; Sudan (African Union Mission in Sudan – AMIS I and II) 2004–07 and the hybrid UNAMID since 2008; Somalia (AMISOM) since 2007; Central African Republic (MICOPAX) since 2008; and Mali (AFISMA) January–June 2013. The AU will take over responsibility from ECCAS for AFISM–CAR in December 2013. Each of these missions involved planning, mandating, deploying, managing and supporting efforts, and many were also withdrawn or handed over and liquidated. Together they represent a significant demonstration of capacity and experience. In most of these missions, the ASF PLANELMs at the continental and REC/RM levels have been involved in the planning and management of the missions, and the ASF regional centres of excellence have been involved in the training, preparation and evaluation of these missions.
56. Another indicator of the peacekeeping capacity that has been developed since 2003 is the number of regional centres of excellence and other organisations that offer peace operations training and research. These centres and organisations have organised themselves under the auspices of the APSTA, which also serves as the African chapter of the International Association of Peacekeeping Training Centres. Several partners are supporting these African training centres, and many partners have also launched training initiatives of their own. The quality and professionalism these centres have achieved in the process, and the large number of military, police and civilian personnel that have been trained as a result of these initiatives, are indicative of the overall effort that has been invested in building African peace operations capacity since the ASF project was launched in 2003. This effort has been spearheaded by the ASF, and the progress recorded is due largely to the momentum achieved by the ASF. The regional centres of excellence

have also served as hubs of expertise and knowledge development, and have hosted workshops and seminars that have contributed greatly to the development of ASF policies, doctrines and procedures.

57. Despite these achievements, the Panel notes the repeated criticism in some quarters that the ASF has been ineffectual, because it has not been utilised since the project started in 2003. The Panel is of the opinion that this negative view derives from the artificial gap between the ASF – seen as a potential but unused capacity – and actual AU and REC/RM peace operations. The Panel views this gap as artificial because the 75 000 African peacekeepers deployed in 2013 come from the same member states that have pledged contributions to the ASF, which demonstrates that they have been able to deploy these capacities when needed. The 10 peace operations deployed by the AU and RECs/RMs since 2003 show that the ASF investment in planning and related capacities at the AUC and RECs/RMs has significantly increased Africa's ability to mandate, plan, manage, support and liquidate missions. These capacities need to be further enhanced, as reflected in this report, but it should be recognised that ASF capacities continue to be directly involved in the planning and management of current peace operations on the African continent. There is also no AU peace operations doctrine that is distinct from the ASF doctrine and related policies and SOPs that have been developed as part of the ASF project. Lastly, the training centres that have been established as a result of the ASF project have been directly involved in the training, preparation and evaluation of personnel for current operations. The Panel thus finds that the artificial distinction between the ASF and AU operations cannot be upheld, and that the ASF project is already significantly impacting on African and UN peace operations.
58. To address these negative views and overcome the perceived gap between the ASF and current operations, the Panel recommends that the ASF be recognised as the overall framework for African peace support operations. The Panel thus recommends that all AU peace operation efforts be understood as being an integral part of the ASF pillar of the APSA, and that the ASF be used as the overarching framework for African peace support operations. Hence post-2015, all AU peace operations should be regarded as ASF operations.

Annex A: Summary of recommendations

Mandating and decision-making

The Panel recommends that:

1. The AUC, RECs/RMs and member states meet to consider how the mandating processes envisaged in their respective legal instruments can be harmonised and streamlined, and to develop specific procedures for coordination among the various levels, to ensure that the necessary authorisations can be obtained as rapidly as possible when faced with the need to respond urgently to mass atrocity crimes.
2. The AUC and the RECs/RMs develop and enter into an additional MoU on the roles and responsibilities of the AU and the RECs/RMs on the mandating, planning, deployment, management, support and liquidation of ASF operations.
3. The AUC develops and/or adapts internal guidance documents on the respective roles and responsibilities of the various divisions and departments of the AUC in support of the mandating, planning, management, support and liquidation of ASF operations, to ensure an effective and coherent strategic headquarters function in support of a holistic approach to ASF operations.
4. The AU's integrated planning *aide-mémoire* be urgently adopted, and its procedures fully implemented. The Panel further recommends a review of key policies and procedures related to the mandating, planning and decision-making of ASF operations. If any critical gaps are identified, remedial measures must be developed and adopted by 2015.
5. The AUC, in cooperation with the RECs/RMs, convenes a special meeting of African chiefs of police in 2014 to consider all aspects related to the role of police in the ASF and in AU peace operations.
6. The AUC, in cooperation with the RECs/RMs, convenes a meeting of relevant civilian member state ministries in 2014 to consider all aspects related to the civilian dimension of the ASF and AU peace operations; in particular the roll-out and operationalisation of the ASF civilian standby roster in 2014.

Planning elements

The Panel recommends that:

7. The AUC and RECs/RMs review the ASF Policy Framework and the structures provided in it, with a view to adjusting the number of structures provided for as well as their internal composition, to ensure that the ASF can be self-sustainably resourced from within Africa.
8. The Abuja recommendations relating to the structure of the PSOD be approved and fully implemented as soon as possible, and no later than mid-2015.

9. The PSOD and all RECs/RMs review their staffing and structures, and take the relevant steps to ensure that they have the minimum necessary police and civilian staff and components in place, in line with the ASF Policy Framework.
10. An ASF chief of staff be appointed, who reports to the head of the PSOD, to be dedicated to ensuring the operationalisation of the ASF, as this position will enhance the capacity of the PSOD to oversee the development of the ASF and to communicate effectively with the RECs/RMs.
11. The PSOD appoints military, police and civilian advisors to the head of the PSOD, so that each of these dimensions are clearly identified and represented in the top management structure of the PSOD. These should not necessarily be new posts, but should be the most senior military, police and civilian officers in the PSOD. The head of the PSOD and the chief of staff of the ASF have multidimensional responsibility for AU peace operations and the ASF, and thus cannot be regarded as representing a specific dimension or component.
12. The AUC and RECs/RMs review the gender composition of their PLANELMs, and take steps to ensure that all their components include men and women. In particular, the PLANELMs need to ensure that they have planners with gender expertise, so that they can generate plans that take gender considerations into account.
13. The PLANELM staff at the AUC and RECs/RMs be recruited or seconded on longer-term contracts, and selected on the basis of merit and experience.
14. The AUC, and especially the PSOD, in their role as continental PLANELM, significantly increase their communication and outreach to the RECs/RMs; for instance, through regular meetings between the chiefs of staff of the PLANELMs and the head of the PSOD.
15. The roles and obligations of the AUC and RECs/RMs be clarified, specifically in relation to the operationalisation of the ASF, including the coordination systems and procedures among them. If deemed necessary, such an agreed set of roles and responsibilities could be included in the MoU previously recommended for ASF operations.
16. Every region develops a standby deployable headquarters as part of its RDC and ASF capabilities.
17. The AUC takes steps to harmonise and integrate the ACIRC concept into the ASF concept, as an additional tool for further enhancing the AU's capacity to respond rapidly to Scenario Six-type mass atrocity crimes, and that it be synchronised with the ASF's national or standalone RDC model.

Pledged capabilities

The Panel recommends that:

18. The RECs/RMs enter into legal agreements with their member states that clarify the respective roles and obligations of the PLANELMs and the T/PCCs, in terms of pledges and with regard to deployments.
19. The AUC, together with the RECs/RMs, develops generic tables of equipment for military, police and civilian components, where these have not been developed, and that this initiative be coupled with the development of verification mechanisms, procedures and guidance.
20. The AUC takes all steps necessary to ensure that the civilian standby roster is rolled out as soon as possible, and then staffed by each region, by 2015.
21. The AUC and RECs/RMs develop additional guidance on the role of civilians in high-intensity operations, including in RDC deployments, so that they can better articulate how civilian peacekeepers contribute to achieving mission mandates in these contexts.
22. The AUC and RECs/RMs develop ASF assessment, selection and verification criteria and procedures for police pledges, and that these be used to ensure that all regions have the agreed number of individual and FPU capacities in place.
23. A standardised police command and leadership structure be developed for ASF operations, and that once approved, pledged capabilities reflect these command and leadership capabilities.
24. The AU finalises the ASF TNA on the basis of a demand-driven analysis and, once it is approved, the training centres take steps to align their curricula with the stated requirements of the ASF.
25. The AU should also develop baseline training standards, coupled with a verification and certification regime, with the support of the APSTA.

Mission support

The Panel recommends that:

26. The PSOD, in partnership with other relevant departments and divisions of the AUC – such as the OLC, the AHRM department (including Procurement) and Finance – undertakes a lessons learned project aimed at capturing the key mission support lessons learned from AU operations to date, so that these lessons can inform the revision and expansion of the ASF mission support concept.
27. The ASF mission support concept be reviewed and expanded, so that it can enable the AUC and RECs/RMs to identify: (i) the human resources they need at the strategic headquarters, (ii) the systems, structures and procedures the AUC and RECs/RMs need to develop, in addition to what may already exist, and (iii) the kind of stocks and equipment the AUC and RECs/RMs need to have in

strategic reserve, or for which they need just-in-time procurement contracts and arrangements.

28. The AUC and RECs/RMS explore a just-in-time procurement model that relies on preapproved but dormant contracts for the strategic lift, stocks and equipment that may be needed for mission start-up. For those limited areas deemed essential to maintain ready standby stocks, e.g. strategic communications, the Panel recommends that the AU enters into negotiations with the UN to make use of its logistical depot in Kampala, Uganda.
29. The AUC develops a lead-nation support concept to enable rapid deployment in the case of Scenario Six-type mass atrocity crimes.
30. With regard to strategic lift capabilities, the AUC and RECs/RMs enter into pre-negotiated just-in-time contracts with several preapproved contractors.
31. The AU and RECs/RMs invest in strategic and operational communication and information systems to enhance the sharing of information and command and control.

Achieving full operational capability by 2015

32. To achieve FOC by 2015, significant effort will be needed over the next 18 to 24 months. Such effort should amount to a final concerted push to achieve FOC and be focused on those key areas that, if left unaddressed, would make it impossible to achieve FOC.
33. The Panel finds that the NARC region is unlikely to achieve FOC by 2015, and recommends that the AUC remains closely engaged with the NARC PLANELM, CCCPA and individual member states in the NARC region, to ensure that they remain engaged in the ASF project.
34. The Panel recommends that the AUC, together with the RECs/RMs, develops a collective verification process, and that this process should be scheduled for the second half of 2015, with a view to generating a finding on FOC by 31 December 2015. The finding should be presented to the Assembly of Heads of State and Government, scheduled for January 2016.

Funding of ASF operations

The Panel recommends that:

35. The AU member states develop self-financing resource mobilisation options to strengthen the AU Peace Fund and similar funds at the REC/RM level.
36. The AUC and RECs/RMs take steps to reduce the cost of the ASF by right-sizing the concept, structures and policies, such as the PLANELMs and the mission support concept, with a view to redesigning the ASF into a leaner just-in-time standby capability that can be self-sustainably resourced from mainly African sources.

Strategic review

37. The Panel recommends that African Heads of State and Government commission a high-level panel to undertake a strategic review of African peace operations and the ASF. This panel should assess the experience and current state of African peace operations and relations with the UN and key partners, and provide strategic direction for the future of African peace operations for the period 2015–25. Such a strategic review should be undertaken in the context of the AU's holistic approach to conflict resolution and the Agenda 2063 process. The high-level panel should be convened no later than mid-2014, and should be tasked with presenting its report to the Assembly by mid-2015, so that a new strategic vision for African peace operations can be in place to inform the future of the ASF beyond 2015.

Concluding recommendation: Rethinking the link between the ASF and AU operations

38. The Panel recommends that all AU peace operation efforts be understood as constituting an integral part of the ASF pillar of the APSA, and that the ASF be used as the overarching framework for African peace support operations. Hence post-2015, all AU peace operations should be regarded as ASF operations.



Annex B: African Standby Force Action Plan 2014–2015

Activity	Key recommendation to attain FOC by 2015	Required action	Time frame	Desired output
Mandating and decision-making	Harmonisation of legal frameworks and decision-making procedures between the AU, RECs/RMs and member states (MS) to speed up the time it takes to authorise operations	AUC to review, and gaps addressed	2014	Decision by Summit clarifying legal and procedural decision-making frameworks for authorising AU peace support operations
	Develop and enter into an additional MoU on the roles and responsibilities of the AU and the RECs/RMs on the mandating, planning, deployment, management, support and liquidation of ASF operations	AUC and the RECs/RMs to negotiate additional MoU	2014	MoU between AUC and RECs/RMs
	AUC to develop/adapt internal guidance documents on the respective roles and responsibilities of the various divisions and departments of the AUC in support of the mandating, planning, management, support and liquidation of ASF operations	AUC departments and divisions to meet to develop/adapt guidance notes on internal roles and divisions regarding peace operations	January to June 2014	Guidance document that clarifies roles and responsibilities, and ensures effective and coherent strategic headquarters functioning in support of a holistic approach to ASF operations
	Adopt the AU's integrated planning <i>aide-mémoire</i> and fully implement its procedures	STCDSS to adopt AUC to implement, including training	STCDSS to consider in January 2014 AUC to fully implement by June 2014	Fully implemented integrated planning procedure

Activity	Key recommendation to attain FOC by 2015	Required action	Time frame	Desired output
Mandating and decision-making	Review of key policies and procedures related to the mandating, planning and decision-making of ASF operations. If any critical gaps are identified, remedial measures must be developed and adopted by 2015	AUC to review, and gaps addressed	Review by June 2014 Gaps addressed by January 2015	
	Convene a special meeting of African chiefs of police to consider all aspects related to the role of police in the ASF and in AU peace operations	PSOD to convene in cooperation with RECs/RMs and member states	2014	African chiefs of police provide guidance on police roles in ASF and peace support operations
	Convene meeting of relevant civilian member state ministries in 2014 to consider all aspects related to the civilian dimension of the ASF and AU peace operations	PSOD to convene, in cooperation with RECs/RMs and member states	2014	Member state ministries responsible for generating civilian peacekeepers provide guidance on civilian roles in ASF and peace support operations
PLANELMs	Review of ASF Policy Framework	AUC, RECs/RMs and MS review panel to realign the ASF Policy Framework with realities	January–July 2014	An ASF policy that will deliver a lean, capable and self-sustainable ASF
	Abuja recommendations relating to the structure of the PSOD to be approved and fully implemented	STCDSS to adopt AUC to implement	STCDSS to consider in January 2014 AUC to implement by June 2014, and fully staffed by June 2015	Fully functional strategic headquarters capable of strategic planning, management of deployed missions and contingency planning for future missions

Activity	Key recommendation to attain FOC by 2015	Required action	Time frame	Desired output
PLANELMS	<p>PSOD and all RECs/RMs review their staffing and structures, and take concerted steps to ensure that they have the minimum necessary police and civilian staff and components in place, in line with the ASF Policy Framework</p>	<p>AUC and RECs/RMs to review civilian and police staffing and realign with ASF Policy Framework</p>	<p>Review: January–June 2014 Minimum staff in place by October 2014</p>	<p>Fully functional police and civilian components at AU and REC/RM PLANELMS</p>
	<p>Appointment of an ASF chief of staff</p>	<p>Head of the PSOD to appoint</p>	<p>January–February 2014</p>	<p>Clearly identify components and focal points, enhanced management structure, more multi-dimensionality</p>
	<p>AUC and RECs/RMs review gender composition of their PLANELMS</p>	<p>PSOD and RECs/RMS</p>	<p>Review: March 2014 Steps taken to improve: August 2014</p>	<p>PLANELMS must employ both genders in all components PLANELMS must be able to generate plans that take gender considerations into account</p>
	<p>PLANELM staff recruited or seconded on longer-term contracts, and selected on the basis of merit and experience</p>	<p>AUC and RECs/RMs</p>	<p>2014</p>	<p>Improve quality of staff, focusing on merit and experience-based recruitment Improve continuity and reduce high turnover</p>
	<p>AUC/PSOD significantly increase their communication and outreach to the RECs/RMs</p>	<p>AUC and PSOD increase communication, e.g. regular meetings between the chiefs of staff of the PLANELMs and the head of the PSOD</p>	<p>January–June 2014</p>	<p>Enhanced coherence and coordination, unity of effort</p>

Activity	Key recommendation to attain FOC by 2015	Required action	Time frame	Desired output
PLANELMs	Integration of ACIRC and ASF/RDC concepts	Establish working group by the AUC to harmonise the concepts Present recommendations to STCDSS	Working group: January–June 2014 Recommendations: Summit July 2014 and STCDSS January 2015	A harmonised RDC for rapid response to crisis
Pledged capabilities	MoUs between RECs/RMs and member states on mutual obligations re-pledged capabilities	Negotiations between RECs/RMs and member states	January–June 2014	An MoU that clarifies obligations of member states and RECs/RMs regarding pledged capabilities, e.g. verification procedures
	Develop generic tables of equipment for military, police and civilian components, where these have not been developed, coupled with the development of verification mechanisms, procedures and guidance	PSOD and RECs/RMs	July–December 2014	Enhanced preparation, pledging and verification of pledged capabilities
	Civilian standby roster	PSOD and RECs/RMs to roll out, populate and train persons on roster	Roll-out: January–July 2014 Populated: December 2014 Training: 2014 and 2015	Fully functional civilian standby roster

Activity	Key recommendation to attain FOC by 2015	Required action	Time frame	Desired output
Pledged capabilities	Develop additional guidance on the role of civilians in high-intensity operations, including in RDC deployments	PSOD and RECs/RMs to develop guidance	2014	Improved understanding of the roles of civilian peacekeepers contribute to achieving mission mandates in high-intensity operations
	Develop standardised police command and leadership structures for ASF pledges and operations	PSOD and RECs/RMs to develop	2014	Once approved, pledged capabilities need to reflect these command and leadership capabilities
	Develop ASF assessment, selection and verification criteria and procedures for police pledges	PSOD and RECs/RMs to develop	2014	Ensure that all regions have the agreed number of individual and FPU capacities in place
	Finalise the ASF TNA and implement	PSOD to finalise, and then take steps to ensure training is aligned with TNA	January–June 2014	ASF training to reflect TNA: demand-driven not supply-driven
	Develop baseline training standards, coupled with a verification and certification regime	PSOD and APSTA	2014	ASF training courses that are verified and certified to meet AU standards
	The establishment of deployable headquarters by RECs/RMs to provide platforms for rapid response to a crisis	RECs/REMs with AU support	January–June 2014	A functional standby headquarters to enhance response to a crisis

Activity	Key recommendation to attain FOC by 2015	Required action	Time frame	Desired output
Mission support	Capture key mission support lessons learned from AU operations to date	AUC departments and divisions	January–April 2014	Inform the revision and expansion of the ASF mission support concept
	Review and expand ASF mission support concept	AUC and PSOD to review, expand and implement	Review: April–June 2014 Expanded concept: July–October 2014 Implement: October 2014–June 2015	A functional mission support capability within the PSOD
	Explore and develop just-in-time procurement model that relies on preapproved but dormant contracts for the strategic lift, stocks and equipment needed for mission start-up	AUC and PSOD	2014	A functional just-in-time procurement system
	Explore modalities of working with the UN on sharing logistics depots	PSOD negotiate with UN with view to utilising UN logistics depots in AU peace support operations	2014	Agreement with UN to enable most urgent strategic pre-deployment stocks are maintained at existing UN depots
	Develop a lead-nation support concept to enable rapid deployment in the case of Scenario Six-type mass atrocity crimes	PSOD to develop	2014	A realistic mission support concept for Scenario Six-type missions
	The implementation of strategic communications between the PSOD and regional capabilities and deployed missions	AUC	January–December 2014	A strategic communication and information system capability to enhance command and control of deployed missions

Activity	Key recommendation to attain FOC by 2015	Required action	Time frame	Desired output
The funding of ASF operations	Develop self-financing resource mobilisation options to strengthen the AU Peace Fund and similar funds at the REC/RM level	AUC, RECs/RMs and MS	April–October 2014	Ability to self-finance ASF operations
	Reduce the cost of the ASF by redesigning the concept, structures and policies into a leaner just-in-time standby capability	AUC, RECs/RMs and MS	January–December 2014	Less costly, more self-sustainable ASF
Strategic review	Commission a high-level panel to undertake a strategic review of African peace operations and the ASF	AU Summit decision AUC appoints and supports	Commission: January 2014 AUC appoints: January–March 2014 Work: July 2014–March 2015 Submit: May 2015	A new strategic vision for African peace operations and ASF in place, to inform the future of the ASF beyond 2015

Annex C: Secretariat and planning elements observers who supported the Independent Panel of Experts

Name	Function/organisation
PLANELM observers	
Colonel Ola Falade	Military Planner, ESF, ECOWAS
Brigadier General Negash Dagnew Ayele	Joint Chief of Staff, PLANELM, EASFCOM
Colonel Tabellout Rabah	NARC Liaison Officer to the AU, AUC
Secretariat	
Colonel Mike Chipoyi	Combat Engineer Planner, AU PSOD
Dr Jide Okeke	Senior Civilian Planning Officer, AU PSOD
Ms Yvonne Akpasom	Civilian Planning and Liaison Officer, AU PSOD
Commissioner Crowd Chirenje	Senior Police Ops Officer, AU PSOD
Dr Walter Lotze	Civilian Planning and Liaison Officer, AU PSOD
Ms Sandra Oder	Senior Policy Officer, AU PSOD
Colonel Fred Houghton	ASF Consultant, AU PSOD
Commissioner Chege Gathogo	Deputy Head, Plans and Operations Unit, AU PSOD
Ms Leah Barasa	ASF Assessment Coordinator, Consultant
Ms Selamawit Dominique	Secretary, AU PSOD
Ms Genet Tekle	Administrative Assistant, AU PSOD



The report of the Independent Panel of Experts on the assessment of the African Standby Force and its rapid deployment capability is submitted pursuant to the decision by the Assembly of African Union Heads of States and Government during its 20th Ordinary Session held in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, from 27 to 28 January 2013. The summit requested the African Union Commission to identify progress made and challenges encountered, with a view to propose recommendations that would allow for the full operationalisation of the African Standby Force by 2015.

Contact

African Union Commission
Peace and Security Department
Peace Support Operations Division
Policy Development Unit