

Dialogue on the Responsibility to Protect: European perspectives

Conference Report: Discussion Draft

Day 1: International Conference
Salle Arpège-Victoire, 9eme, Paris

Day 2: Fondation de la Salle, 7eme, Paris

25 June 2008: “Dialogue on the Responsibility to Protect: European perspectives”

Panel 1: **Eric Chevallier**, Special Advisor to the French Foreign Minister
Gareth Evans, President and CEO of the International Crisis Group

Chair: **Luc Lamprière**, Executive Director Oxfam France –Agir Ici

1. Welcoming Remarks

Eric Chevallier, Special Advisor to the French Foreign Minister

Luc Lamprière welcomed all speakers and participants, and introduced **Eric Chevallier**, who provided opening remarks on behalf of French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner who, at the last minute, was unable to attend. Mr. Chevallier explained that R2P is the heir of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, of the *droit d'ingérence*: it is still young and fragile and must be understood as a full spectrum of actions to prevent, react and rebuild in instances of mass atrocities. He underlined that today 119 countries are contributing to various peace keeping operations, “western countries” being a minority of them. Although the term must not be reduced to military intervention, the possibility of forceful intervention must be carefully and collectively examined according to the five criteria laid out in the 2001 International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) report. The recommended criteria are: just cause threshold, right intention, last resort, proportional means, and reasonable prospects of success. Mr. Chevallier also reminded that R2P must not be seen as a Western concept. Indeed, not only is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by all States, but the historic engagements made at the 2005 World summit were notably carried by African voices.

Mr. Chevallier argued that Bernard Kouchner’s invocation of R2P in the recent Burmese context had not been counter-productive, as it has furthered the discussion on what the norm entailed and how to apply it. He argued that civilians were suffering from the consequences of political decisions, not just from the cyclone, which made the situation applicable to the 2005 World Summit agreement on the R2P. Most importantly, he explained that speaking of R2P did not prevent France from delivering aid to the disaster area. Mr. Chevallier spoke of the French presidency of the EU (starting July 1st) as a great opportunity for France to take an active part in creating consensus to defend the application of R2P. He also insisted that all countries, especially in the global south, must be mobilized to claim ownership of R2P, emphasizing the role of civil society in this process and the value-added of partnerships and coalitions.

2. Keynote Address

Gareth Evans, President and CEO of the International Crisis Group

Before welcoming Gareth Evans, **Luc Lamprière** introduced R2P in the European and French context. He mentioned that the French presidency of the EU offers an important opportunity to revive the engagement that European countries made in 2005, for instance by pushing for the inclusion of the concept in the upcoming revision of the European Security Strategy (ESS). At the national level in France, R2P has entered the public discourse of the presidency and is included in the recent white paper on defense and national security. The upcoming white paper of the foreign ministry offers similar opportunities.

Gareth Evans gave a keynote address on the origins of R2P in the development of human rights since the mid-19th century, including the important intellectual contribution of Bernard Kouchner in the 1990s in mobilizing around the concept of *droit d'ingérence*. Mr. Evans suggested that the concept of ‘right to

intervene' of the 1990s rallied the Global North but excluded the Global South. The semantic and conceptual foundation with 'sovereignty as responsibility' switched the debate to protection, not intervention, from the point of view of the individuals.

Progress since 2005

While the 2005 World Summit signaled a historic achievement, considerable work remains to be done for R2P to become accepted and recognized by all actors. Mr. Evans mentioned three main challenges to the advancement of the norm:

1. Conceptual misunderstandings: it must be made clear that:
 - a. The term is not another name for humanitarian and military intervention;
 - Indeed, the ICISS report and the 2005 Summit Document make clear that R2P is about taking effective *preventive* action, and at the earliest possible stage by a wide range of actions short of military intervention
 - b. R2P does not in extreme cases necessarily mean the use of coercive military force;
 - In fact, extreme cases do not necessarily mean that force should be applied. All five criteria from the ICISS report must be applied to judge whether military intervention should be considered.
 - c. R2P does not apply only to weak countries
 - While the reality is that some countries will be too powerful for military action to be likely to do more good than harm against them (re: ICISS criteria to legitimize intervention), no country however big or powerful is immune from collective pressure and the wide range of tools available besides military intervention.
 - d. R2P does not cover all human security issues such as health threats, climate change or cluster bombs, but is restricted to genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and war crimes;
 - The whole point of the new language of the R2P is to generate an effective, consensual response in extreme, conscious shocking cases in a way that 'right to intervene' and 'human security' did not. Protecting the integrity of R2P as embraced in 2005 is vital to making the concept operational.
 - The debate after the Burmese cyclone displayed the confusion for many (including R2P proponents) at what R2P entailed. Nonetheless, proving that the lack of response from the Burmese government led to crimes against humanity could have legitimized calling for a reaction under R2P. Still, this debate did *NOT* entail that R2P can nor should be triggered by natural disasters.
 - e. The invasion of Iraq must be set as a classic example of how *not* to apply the R2P norm.
 - The clearest way to show this is by using the ICISS criteria. For instance, the threat of imminence of mass atrocities threshold was not satisfied, indicating that military action would have not been legitimate under R2P.
2. Institutional preparedness –Assuming there is an understanding of the need to act, there is a necessity to ensure that there will be physical capacity to do so within international institutions, governments, and regional organizations –whether preventively or reactively, and whether through political, diplomatic and economic or legal, policing and military measures.
3. Political preparedness –There is a need to generate political will and to have in place the mechanisms and strategies to ensure effective political responses as R2P situations arise.

Mr. Evans mentioned the crucial role of NGOs in mobilizing advocacy, most specifically in clarifying the concept to avoid misunderstandings and to move forward on discussions regarding the criteria for military intervention.

c/o Institute for Global Policy, 708 Third Avenue, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10017
tel: 212.599.1320, fax: 212.599.1332, email: info@responsibilitytoprotect.org
www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

Panel 2: **Bernard Miyet**, Former UN Undersecretary General for the Department of Peacekeeping Operations 1997-2000
Tom Weiss, Interim Executive Director for the Global Centre on the Responsibility to Protect

Chair: **William Pace**, Executive Director of WFM-Institute for Global Policy

The second panel presented the origins of the norm and their current challenges. **Bernard Miyet** outlined the evolution of humanitarian interventions in the context of his role in the UN and later in the OSCE. Mr. Miyet focused his speech on the evolution of humanitarian and peacekeeping interventions by international and regional bodies in the context of his role at the UN at the OSCE. He highlighted that organizations need both democratic legitimacy and physical capacity to launch proper responses on the ground to mass atrocities. Mr. Miyet mentioned the potential of the UN Charter, despite the nature of the Security Council, to make significant progress on protecting civilians. He recalled that an OSCE mission was sent to Chechnya in the 90s with the consent of Russia but also spoke of the challenges around the 'right of intervention' as he saw it in the UN and the OSCE, such as the impossible mandates that international organizations are expected to deliver on. Finally, he mentioned the importance of the media and civil society in pressuring for intervention, as seen in the small arms and ICC campaigns.

Tom Weiss mentioned that the concept of R2P had advanced very quickly considering the extent of the debate on protection started in the late 80s. Mr. Weiss described the added-value of R2P He distinguished between three groups of countries at the UN, in respect to their position on the Responsibility to Protect: the supporters, the opponents and the skeptics. He asked civil society to carefully tailor their advocacy for each group, keeping in mind the need to protect the integrity of the norm. Conscious of the recent setbacks in institutional advancements of R2P, Mr. Weiss recommended that civil society develop concrete long-term strategies in all regions. Mr. Weiss also spoke of the new Global Centre on the Responsibility to Protect and its focus on research and advocacy.

William Pace gave an overview of international developments on human rights, including major advances over the past few years, such as the Human Rights Council, the Peacebuilding Commission and the International Criminal Court. Mr. Pace explained how many of the major reforms of the UN in the last fifteen years relate specifically to the failure of the United Nations and Member States to prevent genocide and large-scale crimes against humanity. The ad hoc tribunals, the strengthening of peace enforcement and peacekeeping mechanisms, the new International Criminal Court, and R2P were significant initiatives to strengthen the international legal order. However, the major achievements of the Summit, like the commitment to a Responsibility to Protect and the creation of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Human Rights Council, were limited to a few framework paragraphs, each requiring years of follow-through and negotiation for proper and effective implementation. Despite some advances since the World Summit, remaining efforts to implement these commitments, in addition to setbacks to the wider acceptance of R2P including the backsliding of some governments on their prior support such as South Africa, indicate the pressing need to unify civil society efforts. Mr. Pace shared how seemingly impossible advancements in international cooperation are in fact possible with the help of a concerted effort on behalf of civil society, based on his experience as the convener of the Coalition for the International Criminal Court (CICC).

In addition, he spoke about the context around the endorsement of R2P in paragraphs 138-139 of the World Summit Outcome Document, and how R2P had been a result of negotiations with many elements of the ICISS report left out, such as the criteria limiting intervention and the Responsibility to Rebuild. Mr. Pace also reminded that governments from the global South had been crucial in these negotiations in support of R2P, including Argentina, Rwanda and South Africa. Seeing the recent institutional setbacks in the advance of R2P, the need for a coherent global civil society strategy is evident. He explained the

c/o Institute for Global Policy, 708 Third Avenue, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10017
tel: 212.599.1320, fax: 212.599.1332, email: info@responsibilitytoprotect.org
www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

efforts of WFM-IGP with partners and support from Human Rights Watch, Refugees International, Oxfam and International Crisis Group to consult with civil society on the eventual creation of a coalition on R2P (discussed on the 2nd day-see below).

Session 3: **Luis Peral**, European Union Institute for Security Studies
Ariane Arpa, Executive Director of Intermon Oxfam in Spain
Lotte Leicht, Head of Human Rights Watch EU advocacy
Hugues Moret, Director of Cabinet of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Human Rights

Chair: **Jean-Marie Fardeau** Paris Office Director at Human Rights Watch.

The third panel focused on civil society perspectives on R2P and the European Union. **Luis Peral** spoke of the strong commitment of the EU to the protection of civilians, and the overlaps between R2P and the human security agenda. He argued that if Member States were reluctant to use specific R2P wording, it should not prevent R2P measures (preventive, reactive, rebuilding) from being implemented under the broader protection agenda. Such measures should definitely include more “positive conditionality”, which has not been applied consistently yet. He also stressed the need to strengthen the civilian components of peace keeping operations. **Ariane Arpa** called on the EU to integrate civilian protection in the upcoming revision of the 2003 European Security Strategy. She also suggested that the EU should support regional organizations and offer more coherence vis-à-vis R2P in defense, diplomatic and economic policies.

Finally, **Lotte Leicht**, head of HRW EU advocacy, outlined suggestions for how the EU should think about operationalizing R2P. Focusing on early-warning, early preparedness, conflict management and then post-conflict rebuilding, she provided numerous recommendations, including:

- Identifying early-warning indicators which can then be used publically by EU Special Envoys in statements and reports for increased transparency and better communication with Brussels on preventive warnings;
- Strengthening the capacity and building expertise and knowledge within the EU on sanctions, incentives, and punitive measures
- Better and more systematic enforcement of human rights clauses in cooperation agreement between EU and various countries and / or regional organizations
- Increased information-sharing with the International Criminal Court since the EU has a Memorandum with the ICC
- Systematically apply targeted sanction. The EU has a great role in becoming at the forefront of research and expertise on sanction and their best utilization.
- Live up to the EU commitment of strengthening AU capacity and cooperation.

Hugues Moret joined the panel to deliver the final key note speech on France’s position and strategy on R2P. Concerning the French presidency of the EU, Mr. Moret offered recommendations on how to advance the debate on R2P, including the need to clarify and reaffirm the relevance of the concept in Europe by insisting on a debate on R2P with all 27 Member States. He confirmed that France will aim to include R2P in the revised European Security Strategy, and also announced that France was to include R2P nationally in the upcoming foreign policy white paper. He concluded by saying that civil society has a crucial role to play in taking ownership of the norm and mainstreaming it into the media and academia in order to address the lack of debates on R2P.

26 June 2008: Enhancing civil society activity and capacity on R2P

1. Context: the development of the norm and the formation of WFM-IGP's Responsibility to Protect –Civil Society Initiatives

William Pace, Executive Director of the Institute for Global Policy and Sapna Chhatpar, R2P-CS Project Manager at the Institute for Global Policy.

Mr. Pace introduced the context around the development of the R2P concept. He noted that the events of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 had hindered the initial reception of R2P as expressed by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) in 2001. Despite this political context, a commitment to an international Responsibility to Protect was made in the Outcome Document of the U.N. World Summit in 2005, thanks in large part to Southern leadership from countries such as Rwanda, South Africa, Argentina, Chile, Guatemala, and Mexico, who insisted on a meaningful commitment to R2P. Despite some advances since the World Summit, remaining efforts to implement these commitments, in addition to setbacks to the wider acceptance of R2P including the backsliding of some governments on their prior support such as South Africa, indicate the pressing need to unify civil society efforts. Mr. Pace shared how seemingly impossible advancements in international cooperation are in fact possible with the help of a concerted effort on behalf of civil society, based on his experience as the convener of the Coalition for the International Criminal Court (CICC).

Thus WFM-IGP, in cooperation with Human Rights Watch, Oxfam International, Refugees International and International Crisis Group, identified the need to consult civil society worldwide to increase awareness on R2P and establish a global coalition of civil society groups in support of R2P. Beginning in September 2007, the World Federalist Movement – Institute for Global Policy (WFM-IGP) embarked on a new initiative to consult with civil society worldwide about R2P, and thus organized roundtables in cooperation with partners on the ground in Thailand, Canada, Argentina, Uganda, South Africa, France and Ghana. The initiative aimed at

- 1) Increasing understanding of R2P and how it applies to conflicts in the region
- 2) Exploring how to strengthen regional and international mechanisms to support R2P
- 3) Forging partnerships with NGOs who are interested in joining in a core group in building an NGO network.

2. Building a global coalition on R2P

William Pace and Sapna Chhatpar gave an introduction to a draft concept paper for building a global coalition, based on prior consultative meetings with NGOs worldwide. Mr. Pace gave an outline and asked for input on the draft work plan, including the following elements:

- § Purpose and function of a global coalition
- § Coalition structure and governance
- § Priorities for a global coalition and priorities in the region

M. Pace explained that the goals of a Coalition could be the following:

1. To promote understanding of the Responsibility to Protect among civil society, governments, policy-makers and the public.
2. To hold governments accountable on their commitment to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing.
3. To guard against the misapplication of the norm so it is not misused or abused by governments, regional organizations or international organizations.

4. To ensure that responsibility to protect is restricted to genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing, as articulated in the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document.
5. To facilitate strategic cooperation for advocacy within the NGO community, and also between NGOs and parliamentarians, governments, regional organizations and the United Nations.

In the discussion that ensued, participants offered the following concerns and recommendations:

1. **R2P Coalition and humanitarian organizations:** the Coalition must ensure broad representation of organizations to its membership and limit what it will do in its name to avoid compromising humanitarian NGOs who may not be able to take positions on conflict-specific issues. Advocacy could conduct country-specific advocacy on a sign-on basis.
2. **Think-tanks** should be considered in the coalition's membership as a great asset for raising-awareness and educating about R2P.
3. **Access to information and materials on R2P** through a global Coalition emphasizing that preventive action is a value-added for all groups, including those who do not take position on R2P situations.
4. **Clarifying the norm** is a priority by building consensus within NGOs in liaison with research institutes and like-minded policy-makers.
5. **Spreading awareness** by extending the R2P discourse to the media is important to build wider support on the norm. This will include translating the norm to a clear and **simple message** for advocacy.
6. **Holding governments accountable** to their commitment on R2P will be a major function of a network on R2P by reminding officials of their engagement and advocating for the use of R2P language at the international, regional, and national levels. Participants called for an International Secretariat to act like a watchdog in monitoring whether states are acting upon their commitment.
7. **Effective coordination** must ensure that working on R2P complements, without duplicating, existing efforts on human-security issues.

2nd session: **Civil Society Presentations: Advancing R2P**

This panel was chaired by **Elise Ford** from Oxfam International-Brussels, who introduced the following speakers and their presentations about their organization's work on R2P and the challenges they see for promoting R2P in the region. The recommendations they made to civil society advocacy on R2P can be found after the summary of their presentations.

1. **Neil Campbell**, Director of Advocacy for International Crisis Group (Brussels)

Mr. Campbell spoke of the R2P-related work that ICG has been doing in conflict prevention and early-warning, with a strong presence in the field. Mr. Campbell reiterated the challenges facing R2P as expressed by Gareth Evans (see day-1 above) and how this was translated in ICG's institutional strategy for conducting R2P advocacy. ICG understands the need to protect the integrity of the norm, limiting its application to genocide, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing and genocide, and thus is careful of mentioning the norm in its reports to very clear cases. To combat the afore-mentioned challenges, Mr. Campbell a strategy including working at both high-level and bottom-up level to combat these challenges, and to direct advocacy to individuals at the European level who are active and receptive to R2P.

2. **Caroline Baudot**, Director of Crisis Action (France)

Ms. Baudot explained Crisis Action's role in organizing thematic/conflict-specific conferences related to R2P such as setting up meetings on early-warning in emerging crises to develop joint reactions and recommendations. She spoke of the current duality of R2P, where the norm needs to be reinforced by being increasingly invoked, but controversies and lack of clarification of the concept prevent

organizations from referring to it. For that reason, Crisis Action uses R2P as an ‘invisible concept’, advocating for the responsibility prevention and reaction to the crimes R2P-addresses yet avoiding any reference to the norm.

3. Nils Carstensen, Senior Advisor at DanChurchAid (Denmark)

Mr. Carstensen explained his organization’s work in alleviating suffering and addressing root causes of conflicts at the local level. Using church leaders to bring forth advocacy and setting up workshops with ministries are examples of their work on protection of civilians. He explained that their strategies included using workshops to educate key actors on concepts such as R2P, and were good examples of how to find entry points for advocacy without the risk misusing the term.

4. Mark Burgess, Director at the World Security Institute in Brussels

Mr. Burgess described the role that a think-tank organization in addressing R2P-relevant topics, without taking an institutional position on the concept. He explained that think-tanks such as the World Security Institute could have an important role in clarifying the scope of the norm and address its misperceptions through research, publications and research.

5. Recommendations for civil society work to advance R2P

In their presentations and the discussions that followed, participants mentioned the following recommendations to further R2P:

Strategies at the EU:

1. Target the revision of the European Security Strategy to include R2P;
2. Push for EU members to produce a document expressing support for R2P, including the endorsement of the criteria around intervention laid out in ICISS and a statement against the use of veto in the Security Council in R2P situations;
3. Advocate for EU member-states to adopt R2P in their legislations;
4. Lobby around the adoption of an EU code of conduct on arms exports.

Activities

- Develop a toolbox of all non-military tools available at the international, regional and nation level to guide advocacy ;
- Provide a mapping of countries based on their support, opposition or skepticism to the norm and develop different approaches for each category;
- Create technical talking points and materials on what the European Union and national governments can do to increase early warning and early reaction;
- Organize meetings and workshops for regional and national institution representatives to educate on R2P and offer specific strategies on how to apply the norm;
- Push for the enforcement of preventive measures such as developing early-warning indicators to be used in public reports of Special Envoys;
- Ensure a close relationship between research institutions, experts on R2P at the international, regional and local level and civil society;
- Explicitly use the term R2P when conducting advocacy on country-specific situations i.e Darfur; highlighting the prevention aspect of the norm;
- Include voices from the Global South and actively engage people in the field when developing strategies.

Next steps:

c/o Institute for Global Policy, 708 Third Avenue, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10017
tel: 212.599.1320, fax: 212.599.1332, email: info@responsibilitytoprotect.org
www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

This roundtable was a first meeting of NGOs on how to carry R2P forward in Europe and to discuss methods of organizing for more effective advancement of the norm. While there were no concrete decisions on how to move forward collectively, NGOs agreed on the need for more discussions on what R2P means and how it can be incorporated into NGOs mandates. Participants expressed interest in convening another civil society meeting on R2P in Europe after consulting with their organizations/communities.

Participants also recognized the need for a loose network of NGOs on R2P at the global level to exchange information, access material, use alert systems on situations when R2P needs to be invoked and lobby effectively for action.

LIST OF ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS:

Day-one participants:

Firstname	Name	Organization
Antonia	Achache	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Anders	Amelung	Ambassade Danemark
Michael	Arnaud	French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Marion	Arnaud	World Federalist Movement
Caroline	Baudot	Crisis action
Marlin Berge	Birath	Centre d'étude et de prospection stratégique (CEPS)
Cécile	Brissier	BATIK International
Mark	Burgess	World Security Institute
Camilla	Buzzi	Norwegian Church Aid
Nils	Cartensen	Dan Church aid
Jorgen	Cederberg	DAS Eur. Policy bureau
Anna	Chaplin	Human Rights Watch
Sapna	Chatpar	World Federalist Movement
Amélie	Chayer	ICBL
Laetitia	Cohendet	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Charlotte	Crockett	European Centre for Conflict Prevention
Katherine	Derderian	Médecins Sans Frontières Belgique
Carole	Dromer	MDM
Isabelle	Dubuis	Info Birmanie
Caroline	Eriksen	Human Rights Watch
Jean-Marie	Fardeau	Human Rights Watch
Elise	Ford	Oxfam International
Sébastien	Fourmy	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Henrik	Frojmark	Church of Sweden
Alice	Guitton	French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Damien	Helly	EU Institute for security studies
Tatiana	Isnard	Master Droit et relations internationales et européennes
Paul	Jacobs	Human Rights Watch
Annette	Jansen	Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation
Katalin	Korossy	Hungarian Embassy - Paris
Suying	Lai	Oxfam Novib
Luc	Lampriere	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Gabriella	Lazzoni	Académie Diplomatique Internationale

c/o Institute for Global Policy, 708 Third Avenue, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10017
tel: 212.599.1320, fax: 212.599.1332, email: info@responsibilitytoprotect.org
www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

Enzo	Le Fevre Cervini	Eur. Prog.for the prevention of deadly conflicts and genocide
Emmanuelle	Le Roy	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Kerstin	Loehr	Oxfam Great Britain
Consuelo	Lopez Zuriaga	Intermon - Oxfam
Marie-France	Manrique	IRNC
Sandrine	Marlot	Académie Diplomatique Internationale
Mélanie	Marx	Interpreter
Yann	Mens	Alternatives inernationales
Camille	Mercier	Interpreter
Samir	Mostefaï	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Christine	Ngo Wenang	Human Rights Watch
Christina	Paqazoglou	World council of churches, (CCIA)
Greg	Puley	Oxfam International
Hélène	Thiollet	Sciences-Po
Lagos	Toth	Hungarian Embassy – Paris
Sander	Van Amelsvoort	Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ton	Van Den Brandt	Amnesty international Netherlands
Nicolas	Vercken	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Guillaume	Villardier	TV5 / freelance
Madeleine	Walter	Interpreter
Fabrice	Weissman	Médecins Sans Frontières
Ying	Yee	British Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ariane	Arpa	Intermon – Oxfam
Eric	Chevallier	French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Gareth	Evans	International Crisis Group
Lotte	Leicht	Human Rights Watch
Bernard	Miyet	SACEM
Hugues	Moret	French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
William	Pace	World Federalist Movement
Luis	Peral	European Union Institute for Security Studies
Tom	Weiss	Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect

Day 2 Participants:

Marion	Arnaud	World Federalist Movement
Caroline	Baudot	Crisis action
Zobel	Behalal	CCFD
Elin	Bengsston	Centre d'étude et de prospective stratégique
Marlin	Berge Birath	Centre d'étude et de prospective stratégique
Karine	Bonneau	FIDH
Mark	Burgess	World Security Institute
Camilla	Buzzi	Norwegian Church Aid
Neil	Campbell	International Crisis group
Nils	Cartensen	Dan Church aid
Yves	Casalis	Secours Catholique/Caritas France
Sapna	Chatpar	World Federalist Movement
Amélie	Chayer	ICBL (International Campaign to Ban landmines)
Laetitia	Cohendet	Oxfam France - Agir ici

c/o Institute for Global Policy, 708 Third Avenue, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10017
tel: 212.599.1320, fax: 212.599.1332, email: info@responsibilitytoprotect.org
www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

Charlotte	Crockett	European Centre for Conflict Prevention
Anne	Desmaret	Médecins du Monde
Carole	Dromer	Médecins du Monde
Cécile	Dubernet	Institut Catholique de Paris/ Peace Brigades International
Isabelle	Dubuis	Info Birmanie
Jean-Marie	Fardeau	Human Rights Watch
Elise	FORD	Oxfam GB
Henrik	Frojmark	Church of Sweeden
Thomas	Gonnet	Action Contre la Faim
Annette	Jansen	ICCO (Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation)
Suying	Lai	Oxfam-Novib
Enzo	Le Fevre Cervini	Madariaga - College of Europe Foundation
Consuelo	Lopez Zuriaga	Intermon - Oxfam
Marie France	Maurique	Institut de recherche sur la résolution non-violente des conflits (IRNC)
Christine	Ngo Wenang	Human Rights Watch
William	Pace	World Federalist Movement
Christina	Papazoglou	World council of churches, Commission of churches on international alleirs (CCIA)
Scott	Stedjan	Oxfam America
Ton	Van Den Brandt	Amnesty international Netherlands
Nicolas	Vercken	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Marie	Vincent	Madariaga - College of Europe Foundation
Tom	Weiss	Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect

Dialogue on the Responsibility to Protect: European perspectives

Conference Report: Discussion Draft

Day 1: International Conference
Salle Arpège-Victoire, 9eme, Paris

Day 2: Fondation de la Salle, 7eme, Paris

25 June 2008: “Dialogue on the Responsibility to Protect: European perspectives”

Panel 1: **Eric Chevallier**, Special Advisor to the French Foreign Minister
Gareth Evans, President and CEO of the International Crisis Group

Chair: **Luc Lamprière**, Executive Director Oxfam France –Agir Ici

1. Welcoming Remarks

Eric Chevallier, Special Advisor to the French Foreign Minister

Luc Lamprière welcomed all speakers and participants, and introduced **Eric Chevallier**, who provided opening remarks on behalf of French Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner who, at the last minute, was unable to attend. Mr. Chevallier explained that R2P is the heir of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, of the *droit d'ingérence*: it is still young and fragile and must be understood as a full spectrum of actions to prevent, react and rebuild in instances of mass atrocities. He underlined that today 119 countries are contributing to various peace keeping operations, “western countries” being a minority of them. Although the term must not be reduced to military intervention, the possibility of forceful intervention must be carefully and collectively examined according to the five criteria laid out in the 2001 International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) report. The recommended criteria are: just cause threshold, right intention, last resort, proportional means, and reasonable prospects of success. Mr. Chevallier also reminded that R2P must not be seen as a Western concept. Indeed, not only is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by all States, but the historic engagements made at the 2005 World summit were notably carried by African voices.

Mr. Chevallier argued that Bernard Kouchner’s invocation of R2P in the recent Burmese context had not been counter-productive, as it has furthered the discussion on what the norm entailed and how to apply it. He argued that civilians were suffering from the consequences of political decisions, not just from the cyclone, which made the situation applicable to the 2005 World Summit agreement on the R2P. Most importantly, he explained that speaking of R2P did not prevent France from delivering aid to the disaster area. Mr. Chevallier spoke of the French presidency of the EU (starting July 1st) as a great opportunity for France to take an active part in creating consensus to defend the application of R2P. He also insisted that all countries, especially in the global south, must be mobilized to claim ownership of R2P, emphasizing the role of civil society in this process and the value-added of partnerships and coalitions.

2. Keynote Address

Gareth Evans, President and CEO of the International Crisis Group

Before welcoming Gareth Evans, **Luc Lamprière** introduced R2P in the European and French context. He mentioned that the French presidency of the EU offers an important opportunity to revive the engagement that European countries made in 2005, for instance by pushing for the inclusion of the concept in the upcoming revision of the European Security Strategy (ESS). At the national level in France, R2P has entered the public discourse of the presidency and is included in the recent white paper on defense and national security. The upcoming white paper of the foreign ministry offers similar opportunities.

Gareth Evans gave a keynote address on the origins of R2P in the development of human rights since the mid-19th century, including the important intellectual contribution of Bernard Kouchner in the 1990s in mobilizing around the concept of *droit d'ingérence*. Mr. Evans suggested that the concept of ‘right to

intervene' of the 1990s rallied the Global North but excluded the Global South. The semantic and conceptual foundation with 'sovereignty as responsibility' switched the debate to protection, not intervention, from the point of view of the individuals.

Progress since 2005

While the 2005 World Summit signaled a historic achievement, considerable work remains to be done for R2P to become accepted and recognized by all actors. Mr. Evans mentioned three main challenges to the advancement of the norm:

1. Conceptual misunderstandings: it must be made clear that:
 - a. The term is not another name for humanitarian and military intervention;
 - Indeed, the ICISS report and the 2005 Summit Document make clear that R2P is about taking effective *preventive* action, and at the earliest possible stage by a wide range of actions short of military intervention
 - b. R2P does not in extreme cases necessarily mean the use of coercive military force;
 - In fact, extreme cases do not necessarily mean that force should be applied. All five criteria from the ICISS report must be applied to judge whether military intervention should be considered.
 - c. R2P does not apply only to weak countries
 - While the reality is that some countries will be too powerful for military action to be likely to do more good than harm against them (re: ICISS criteria to legitimize intervention), no country however big or powerful is immune from collective pressure and the wide range of tools available besides military intervention.
 - d. R2P does not cover all human security issues such as health threats, climate change or cluster bombs, but is restricted to genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and war crimes;
 - The whole point of the new language of the R2P is to generate an effective, consensual response in extreme, conscious shocking cases in a way that 'right to intervene' and 'human security' did not. Protecting the integrity of R2P as embraced in 2005 is vital to making the concept operational.
 - The debate after the Burmese cyclone displayed the confusion for many (including R2P proponents) at what R2P entailed. Nonetheless, proving that the lack of response from the Burmese government led to crimes against humanity could have legitimized calling for a reaction under R2P. Still, this debate did *NOT* entail that R2P can nor should be triggered by natural disasters.
 - e. The invasion of Iraq must be set as a classic example of how *not* to apply the R2P norm.
 - The clearest way to show this is by using the ICISS criteria. For instance, the threat of imminence of mass atrocities threshold was not satisfied, indicating that military action would have not been legitimate under R2P.
2. Institutional preparedness –Assuming there is an understanding of the need to act, there is a necessity to ensure that there will be physical capacity to do so within international institutions, governments, and regional organizations –whether preventively or reactively, and whether through political, diplomatic and economic or legal, policing and military measures.
3. Political preparedness –There is a need to generate political will and to have in place the mechanisms and strategies to ensure effective political responses as R2P situations arise.

Mr. Evans mentioned the crucial role of NGOs in mobilizing advocacy, most specifically in clarifying the concept to avoid misunderstandings and to move forward on discussions regarding the criteria for military intervention.

c/o Institute for Global Policy, 708 Third Avenue, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10017
tel: 212.599.1320, fax: 212.599.1332, email: info@responsibilitytoprotect.org
www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

Panel 2: **Bernard Miyet**, Former UN Undersecretary General for the Department of Peacekeeping Operations 1997-2000
Tom Weiss, Interim Executive Director for the Global Centre on the Responsibility to Protect

Chair: **William Pace**, Executive Director of WFM-Institute for Global Policy

The second panel presented the origins of the norm and their current challenges. **Bernard Miyet** outlined the evolution of humanitarian interventions in the context of his role in the UN and later in the OSCE. Mr. Miyet focused his speech on the evolution of humanitarian and peacekeeping interventions by international and regional bodies in the context of his role at the UN at the OSCE. He highlighted that organizations need both democratic legitimacy and physical capacity to launch proper responses on the ground to mass atrocities. Mr. Miyet mentioned the potential of the UN Charter, despite the nature of the Security Council, to make significant progress on protecting civilians. He recalled that an OSCE mission was sent to Chechnya in the 90s with the consent of Russia but also spoke of the challenges around the 'right of intervention' as he saw it in the UN and the OSCE, such as the impossible mandates that international organizations are expected to deliver on. Finally, he mentioned the importance of the media and civil society in pressuring for intervention, as seen in the small arms and ICC campaigns.

Tom Weiss mentioned that the concept of R2P had advanced very quickly considering the extent of the debate on protection started in the late 80s. Mr. Weiss described the added-value of R2P He distinguished between three groups of countries at the UN, in respect to their position on the Responsibility to Protect: the supporters, the opponents and the skeptics. He asked civil society to carefully tailor their advocacy for each group, keeping in mind the need to protect the integrity of the norm. Conscious of the recent setbacks in institutional advancements of R2P, Mr. Weiss recommended that civil society develop concrete long-term strategies in all regions. Mr. Weiss also spoke of the new Global Centre on the Responsibility to Protect and its focus on research and advocacy.

William Pace gave an overview of international developments on human rights, including major advances over the past few years, such as the Human Rights Council, the Peacebuilding Commission and the International Criminal Court. Mr. Pace explained how many of the major reforms of the UN in the last fifteen years relate specifically to the failure of the United Nations and Member States to prevent genocide and large-scale crimes against humanity. The ad hoc tribunals, the strengthening of peace enforcement and peacekeeping mechanisms, the new International Criminal Court, and R2P were significant initiatives to strengthen the international legal order. However, the major achievements of the Summit, like the commitment to a Responsibility to Protect and the creation of the Peacebuilding Commission and the Human Rights Council, were limited to a few framework paragraphs, each requiring years of follow-through and negotiation for proper and effective implementation. Despite some advances since the World Summit, remaining efforts to implement these commitments, in addition to setbacks to the wider acceptance of R2P including the backsliding of some governments on their prior support such as South Africa, indicate the pressing need to unify civil society efforts. Mr. Pace shared how seemingly impossible advancements in international cooperation are in fact possible with the help of a concerted effort on behalf of civil society, based on his experience as the convener of the Coalition for the International Criminal Court (CICC).

In addition, he spoke about the context around the endorsement of R2P in paragraphs 138-139 of the World Summit Outcome Document, and how R2P had been a result of negotiations with many elements of the ICISS report left out, such as the criteria limiting intervention and the Responsibility to Rebuild. Mr. Pace also reminded that governments from the global South had been crucial in these negotiations in support of R2P, including Argentina, Rwanda and South Africa. Seeing the recent institutional setbacks in the advance of R2P, the need for a coherent global civil society strategy is evident. He explained the

c/o Institute for Global Policy, 708 Third Avenue, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10017
tel: 212.599.1320, fax: 212.599.1332, email: info@responsibilitytoprotect.org
www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

efforts of WFM-IGP with partners and support from Human Rights Watch, Refugees International, Oxfam and International Crisis Group to consult with civil society on the eventual creation of a coalition on R2P (discussed on the 2nd day-see below).

Session 3: **Luis Peral**, European Union Institute for Security Studies
Ariane Arpa, Executive Director of Intermon Oxfam in Spain
Lotte Leicht, Head of Human Rights Watch EU advocacy
Hugues Moret, Director of Cabinet of the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs and Human Rights

Chair: **Jean-Marie Fardeau** Paris Office Director at Human Rights Watch.

The third panel focused on civil society perspectives on R2P and the European Union. **Luis Peral** spoke of the strong commitment of the EU to the protection of civilians, and the overlaps between R2P and the human security agenda. He argued that if Member States were reluctant to use specific R2P wording, it should not prevent R2P measures (preventive, reactive, rebuilding) from being implemented under the broader protection agenda. Such measures should definitely include more “positive conditionality”, which has not been applied consistently yet. He also stressed the need to strengthen the civilian components of peace keeping operations. **Ariane Arpa** called on the EU to integrate civilian protection in the upcoming revision of the 2003 European Security Strategy. She also suggested that the EU should support regional organizations and offer more coherence vis-à-vis R2P in defense, diplomatic and economic policies.

Finally, **Lotte Leicht**, head of HRW EU advocacy, outlined suggestions for how the EU should think about operationalizing R2P. Focusing on early-warning, early preparedness, conflict management and then post-conflict rebuilding, she provided numerous recommendations, including:

- Identifying early-warning indicators which can then be used publically by EU Special Envoys in statements and reports for increased transparency and better communication with Brussels on preventive warnings;
- Strengthening the capacity and building expertise and knowledge within the EU on sanctions, incentives, and punitive measures
- Better and more systematic enforcement of human rights clauses in cooperation agreement between EU and various countries and / or regional organizations
- Increased information-sharing with the International Criminal Court since the EU has a Memorandum with the ICC
- Systematically apply targeted sanction. The EU has a great role in becoming at the forefront of research and expertise on sanction and their best utilization.
- Live up to the EU commitment of strengthening AU capacity and cooperation.

Hugues Moret joined the panel to deliver the final key note speech on France’s position and strategy on R2P. Concerning the French presidency of the EU, Mr. Moret offered recommendations on how to advance the debate on R2P, including the need to clarify and reaffirm the relevance of the concept in Europe by insisting on a debate on R2P with all 27 Member States. He confirmed that France will aim to include R2P in the revised European Security Strategy, and also announced that France was to include R2P nationally in the upcoming foreign policy white paper. He concluded by saying that civil society has a crucial role to play in taking ownership of the norm and mainstreaming it into the media and academia in order to address the lack of debates on R2P.

26 June 2008: Enhancing civil society activity and capacity on R2P

1. Context: the development of the norm and the formation of WFM-IGP's Responsibility to Protect –Civil Society Initiatives

William Pace, Executive Director of the Institute for Global Policy and Sapna Chhatpar, R2P-CS Project Manager at the Institute for Global Policy.

Mr. Pace introduced the context around the development of the R2P concept. He noted that the events of September 11, 2001 and the subsequent U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 had hindered the initial reception of R2P as expressed by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) in 2001. Despite this political context, a commitment to an international Responsibility to Protect was made in the Outcome Document of the U.N. World Summit in 2005, thanks in large part to Southern leadership from countries such as Rwanda, South Africa, Argentina, Chile, Guatemala, and Mexico, who insisted on a meaningful commitment to R2P. Despite some advances since the World Summit, remaining efforts to implement these commitments, in addition to setbacks to the wider acceptance of R2P including the backsliding of some governments on their prior support such as South Africa, indicate the pressing need to unify civil society efforts. Mr. Pace shared how seemingly impossible advancements in international cooperation are in fact possible with the help of a concerted effort on behalf of civil society, based on his experience as the convener of the Coalition for the International Criminal Court (CICC).

Thus WFM-IGP, in cooperation with Human Rights Watch, Oxfam International, Refugees International and International Crisis Group, identified the need to consult civil society worldwide to increase awareness on R2P and establish a global coalition of civil society groups in support of R2P. Beginning in September 2007, the World Federalist Movement – Institute for Global Policy (WFM-IGP) embarked on a new initiative to consult with civil society worldwide about R2P, and thus organized roundtables in cooperation with partners on the ground in Thailand, Canada, Argentina, Uganda, South Africa, France and Ghana. The initiative aimed at

- 1) Increasing understanding of R2P and how it applies to conflicts in the region
- 2) Exploring how to strengthen regional and international mechanisms to support R2P
- 3) Forging partnerships with NGOs who are interested in joining in a core group in building an NGO network.

2. Building a global coalition on R2P

William Pace and Sapna Chhatpar gave an introduction to a draft concept paper for building a global coalition, based on prior consultative meetings with NGOs worldwide. Mr. Pace gave an outline and asked for input on the draft work plan, including the following elements:

- § Purpose and function of a global coalition
- § Coalition structure and governance
- § Priorities for a global coalition and priorities in the region

M. Pace explained that the goals of a Coalition could be the following:

1. To promote understanding of the Responsibility to Protect among civil society, governments, policy-makers and the public.
2. To hold governments accountable on their commitment to protect populations from genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing.
3. To guard against the misapplication of the norm so it is not misused or abused by governments, regional organizations or international organizations.

4. To ensure that responsibility to protect is restricted to genocide, war crimes, crimes against humanity and ethnic cleansing, as articulated in the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document.
5. To facilitate strategic cooperation for advocacy within the NGO community, and also between NGOs and parliamentarians, governments, regional organizations and the United Nations.

In the discussion that ensued, participants offered the following concerns and recommendations:

1. **R2P Coalition and humanitarian organizations:** the Coalition must ensure broad representation of organizations to its membership and limit what it will do in its name to avoid compromising humanitarian NGOs who may not be able to take positions on conflict-specific issues. Advocacy could conduct country-specific advocacy on a sign-on basis.
2. **Think-tanks** should be considered in the coalition's membership as a great asset for raising-awareness and educating about R2P.
3. **Access to information and materials on R2P** through a global Coalition emphasizing that preventive action is a value-added for all groups, including those who do not take position on R2P situations.
4. **Clarifying the norm** is a priority by building consensus within NGOs in liaison with research institutes and like-minded policy-makers.
5. **Spreading awareness** by extending the R2P discourse to the media is important to build wider support on the norm. This will include translating the norm to a clear and **simple message** for advocacy.
6. **Holding governments accountable** to their commitment on R2P will be a major function of a network on R2P by reminding officials of their engagement and advocating for the use of R2P language at the international, regional, and national levels. Participants called for an International Secretariat to act like a watchdog in monitoring whether states are acting upon their commitment.
7. **Effective coordination** must ensure that working on R2P complements, without duplicating, existing efforts on human-security issues.

2nd session: **Civil Society Presentations: Advancing R2P**

This panel was chaired by **Elise Ford** from Oxfam International-Brussels, who introduced the following speakers and their presentations about their organization's work on R2P and the challenges they see for promoting R2P in the region. The recommendations they made to civil society advocacy on R2P can be found after the summary of their presentations.

1. **Neil Campbell**, Director of Advocacy for International Crisis Group (Brussels)

Mr. Campbell spoke of the R2P-related work that ICG has been doing in conflict prevention and early-warning, with a strong presence in the field. Mr. Campbell reiterated the challenges facing R2P as expressed by Gareth Evans (see day-1 above) and how this was translated in ICG's institutional strategy for conducting R2P advocacy. ICG understands the need to protect the integrity of the norm, limiting its application to genocide, crimes against humanity, ethnic cleansing and genocide, and thus is careful of mentioning the norm in its reports to very clear cases. To combat the afore-mentioned challenges, Mr. Campbell a strategy including working at both high-level and bottom-up level to combat these challenges, and to direct advocacy to individuals at the European level who are active and receptive to R2P.

2. **Caroline Baudot**, Director of Crisis Action (France)

Ms. Baudot explained Crisis Action's role in organizing thematic/conflict-specific conferences related to R2P such as setting up meetings on early-warning in emerging crises to develop joint reactions and recommendations. She spoke of the current duality of R2P, where the norm needs to be reinforced by being increasingly invoked, but controversies and lack of clarification of the concept prevent

organizations from referring to it. For that reason, Crisis Action uses R2P as an ‘invisible concept’, advocating for the responsibility prevention and reaction to the crimes R2P-addresses yet avoiding any reference to the norm.

3. Nils Carstensen, Senior Advisor at DanChurchAid (Denmark)

Mr. Carstensen explained his organization’s work in alleviating suffering and addressing root causes of conflicts at the local level. Using church leaders to bring forth advocacy and setting up workshops with ministries are examples of their work on protection of civilians. He explained that their strategies included using workshops to educate key actors on concepts such as R2P, and were good examples of how to find entry points for advocacy without the risk misusing the term.

4. Mark Burgess, Director at the World Security Institute in Brussels

Mr. Burgess described the role that a think-tank organization in addressing R2P-relevant topics, without taking an institutional position on the concept. He explained that think-tanks such as the World Security Institute could have an important role in clarifying the scope of the norm and address its misperceptions through research, publications and research.

5. Recommendations for civil society work to advance R2P

In their presentations and the discussions that followed, participants mentioned the following recommendations to further R2P:

Strategies at the EU:

1. Target the revision of the European Security Strategy to include R2P;
2. Push for EU members to produce a document expressing support for R2P, including the endorsement of the criteria around intervention laid out in ICISS and a statement against the use of veto in the Security Council in R2P situations;
3. Advocate for EU member-states to adopt R2P in their legislations;
4. Lobby around the adoption of an EU code of conduct on arms exports.

Activities

- Develop a toolbox of all non-military tools available at the international, regional and nation level to guide advocacy ;
- Provide a mapping of countries based on their support, opposition or skepticism to the norm and develop different approaches for each category;
- Create technical talking points and materials on what the European Union and national governments can do to increase early warning and early reaction;
- Organize meetings and workshops for regional and national institution representatives to educate on R2P and offer specific strategies on how to apply the norm;
- Push for the enforcement of preventive measures such as developing early-warning indicators to be used in public reports of Special Envoys;
- Ensure a close relationship between research institutions, experts on R2P at the international, regional and local level and civil society;
- Explicitly use the term R2P when conducting advocacy on country-specific situations i.e Darfur; highlighting the prevention aspect of the norm;
- Include voices from the Global South and actively engage people in the field when developing strategies.

Next steps:

c/o Institute for Global Policy, 708 Third Avenue, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10017
tel: 212.599.1320, fax: 212.599.1332, email: info@responsibilitytoprotect.org
www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

This roundtable was a first meeting of NGOs on how to carry R2P forward in Europe and to discuss methods of organizing for more effective advancement of the norm. While there were no concrete decisions on how to move forward collectively, NGOs agreed on the need for more discussions on what R2P means and how it can be incorporated into NGOs mandates. Participants expressed interest in convening another civil society meeting on R2P in Europe after consulting with their organizations/communities.

Participants also recognized the need for a loose network of NGOs on R2P at the global level to exchange information, access material, use alert systems on situations when R2P needs to be invoked and lobby effectively for action.

LIST OF ROUNDTABLE PARTICIPANTS:

Day-one participants:

Firstname	Name	Organization
Antonia	Achache	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Anders	Amelung	Ambassade Danemark
Michael	Arnaud	French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Marion	Arnaud	World Federalist Movement
Caroline	Baudot	Crisis action
Marlin Berge	Birath	Centre d'étude et de prospection stratégique (CEPS)
Cécile	Brissier	BATIK International
Mark	Burgess	World Security Institute
Camilla	Buzzi	Norwegian Church Aid
Nils	Cartensen	Dan Church aid
Jorgen	Cederberg	DAS Eur. Policy bureau
Anna	Chaplin	Human Rights Watch
Sapna	Chatpar	World Federalist Movement
Amélie	Chayer	ICBL
Laetitia	Cohendet	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Charlotte	Crockett	European Centre for Conflict Prevention
Katherine	Derderian	Médecins Sans Frontières Belgique
Carole	Dromer	MDM
Isabelle	Dubuis	Info Birmanie
Caroline	Eriksen	Human Rights Watch
Jean-Marie	Fardeau	Human Rights Watch
Elise	Ford	Oxfam International
Sébastien	Fourmy	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Henrik	Frojmark	Church of Sweden
Alice	Guitton	French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Damien	Helly	EU Institute for security studies
Tatiana	Isnard	Master Droit et relations internationales et européennes
Paul	Jacobs	Human Rights Watch
Annette	Jansen	Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation
Katalin	Korossy	Hungarian Embassy - Paris
Suying	Lai	Oxfam Novib
Luc	Lampriere	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Gabriella	Lazzoni	Académie Diplomatique Internationale

c/o Institute for Global Policy, 708 Third Avenue, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10017
tel: 212.599.1320, fax: 212.599.1332, email: info@responsibilitytoprotect.org
www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

Enzo	Le Fevre Cervini	Eur. Prog.for the prevention of deadly conflicts and genocide
Emmanuelle	Le Roy	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Kerstin	Loehr	Oxfam Great Britain
Consuelo	Lopez Zuriaga	Intermon - Oxfam
Marie-France	Manrique	IRNC
Sandrine	Marlot	Académie Diplomatique Internationale
Mélanie	Marx	Interpreter
Yann	Mens	Alternatives inernationales
Camille	Mercier	Interpreter
Samir	Mostefaï	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Christine	Ngo Wenang	Human Rights Watch
Christina	Paqazoglou	World council of churches, (CCIA)
Greg	Puley	Oxfam International
Hélène	Thiollet	Sciences-Po
Lagos	Toth	Hungarian Embassy – Paris
Sander	Van Amelsvoort	Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ton	Van Den Brandt	Amnesty international Netherlands
Nicolas	Vercken	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Guillaume	Villardier	TV5 / freelance
Madeleine	Walter	Interpreter
Fabrice	Weissman	Médecins Sans Frontières
Ying	Yee	British Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Ariane	Arpa	Intermon – Oxfam
Eric	Chevallier	French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Gareth	Evans	International Crisis Group
Lotte	Leicht	Human Rights Watch
Bernard	Miyet	SACEM
Hugues	Moret	French Ministry of Foreign Affairs
William	Pace	World Federalist Movement
Luis	Peral	European Union Institute for Security Studies
Tom	Weiss	Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect

Day 2 Participants:

Marion	Arnaud	World Federalist Movement
Caroline	Baudot	Crisis action
Zobel	Behalal	CCFD
Elin	Bengsston	Centre d'étude et de prospective stratégique
Marlin	Berge Birath	Centre d'étude et de prospective stratégique
Karine	Bonneau	FIDH
Mark	Burgess	World Security Institute
Camilla	Buzzi	Norwegian Church Aid
Neil	Campbell	International Crisis group
Nils	Cartensen	Dan Church aid
Yves	Casalis	Secours Catholique/Caritas France
Sapna	Chatpar	World Federalist Movement
Amélie	Chayer	ICBL (International Campaign to Ban landmines)
Laetitia	Cohendet	Oxfam France - Agir ici

c/o Institute for Global Policy, 708 Third Avenue, 24th Floor, New York, NY 10017
tel: 212.599.1320, fax: 212.599.1332, email: info@responsibilitytoprotect.org
www.responsibilitytoprotect.org

Charlotte	Crockett	European Centre for Conflict Prevention
Anne	Desmaret	Médecins du Monde
Carole	Dromer	Médecins du Monde
Cécile	Dubernet	Institut Catholique de Paris/ Peace Brigades International
Isabelle	Dubuis	Info Birmanie
Jean-Marie	Fardeau	Human Rights Watch
Elise	FORD	Oxfam GB
Henrik	Frojmark	Church of Sweeden
Thomas	Gonnet	Action Contre la Faim
Annette	Jansen	ICCO (Interchurch Organisation for Development Cooperation)
Suying	Lai	Oxfam-Novib
Enzo	Le Fevre Cervini	Madariaga - College of Europe Foundation
Consuelo	Lopez Zuriaga	Intermon - Oxfam
Marie France	Maurique	Institut de recherche sur la résolution non-violente des conflits (IRNC)
Christine	Ngo Wenang	Human Rights Watch
William	Pace	World Federalist Movement
Christina	Papazoglou	World council of churches, Commission of churches on international alleirs (CCIA)
Scott	Stedjan	Oxfam America
Ton	Van Den Brandt	Amnesty international Netherlands
Nicolas	Vercken	Oxfam France - Agir ici
Marie	Vincent	Madariaga - College of Europe Foundation
Tom	Weiss	Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect