

**CIVIL SOCIETY MEETING  
ON  
THE RESPONSIBILITY TO  
PROTECT**

**FINAL REPORT**

**March 28, 2003  
Geneva, Switzerland**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. Executive Summary</b> .....	3
<b>II. Background</b> .....	3
The Responsibility to Protect.....	5
Next Steps and the Role of NGOs.....	6
<b>III. Purpose of the Meeting</b> .....	6
<b>IV. Key Points</b> .....	6
General Reactions to the ICISS Report.....	6
Overview of Inter-Governmental Plans to Take R2P Forward.....	8
Challenges and Opportunities in Taking R2P Forward.....	9
Potential Roles for Civil Society in “Operationalizing” the Report .....	10
Other Relevant Work on These Issues.....	11
<b>V. Conclusion</b> .....	11
<b>Annexes</b>	
Meeting Participants.....	12
Documents Distributed.....	13
Summary of ICISS Report.....	16

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This roundtable meeting in Geneva Switzerland on March 28, 2003 was co-organized by the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) and the World Federalist Movement-Institute for Global Policy (WFM-IGP). It was one of several meetings being held for the purpose of stimulating discussion, in particular among human rights and humanitarian organizations, of the Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) entitled *The Responsibility to Protect*. The meetings are designed not only seek the views of key civil society organizations about the Report, but also to draw out ideas about potential roles of civil society in ensuring that governments respond earlier and more effectively to emerging crises involving the potential for large scale loss of life.

As has been the case at other roundtables, participants were in agreement that the ICISS Report is a very useful document and deserving of NGO support. The participants focused in particular on the welcome shift in terminology away from “humanitarian intervention”, and the emphasis on the need for prevention while addressing the difficult question of what to do when preventive measures fail to avert conflict. Several critiques were also set out, generally relating to the challenge of applying concepts that are presented as straightforward in the Report, such as the threshold of when an international response to an emerging crisis is warranted.

Following a presentation of the plans of the Government of Canada and other interested governments in promoting norms around the Responsibility to Protect, and ‘operationalizing’ these norms through Security Council response to emerging conflicts, participants discussed the challenges in taking the Report’s recommendations forward and potential civil society roles in this process. Key challenges highlighted by participants include the current international political climate, the resultant hesitancy on the part of governments and NGOs to discuss military intervention, and the difficulty in applying the complex and controversial concepts in the report.

In considering a role for NGOs in this process, participants emphasized that governments have already made many promises related to the prevention of conflict and protection of civilians agenda. The challenge therefore is not to determine what needs to be done, but to ensure that governments, through the United Nations, regional inter-governmental bodies and individually, fulfill their commitments. This is a question both of political will and of capacity, each of which give rise to important roles for civil society groups.

## II. BACKGROUND

“...Hardly a day goes by where we are not presented with evidence of the intimidation, brutalization, torture and killing of helpless civilians in situations of armed conflict. Whether it is mutilations in Sierra Leone, genocide in Rwanda, ethnic cleansing in the Balkans or disappearances in Latin America...[r]ebel factions, opposition fighters and Government forces continue to target innocent civilians with alarming frequency.”

Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on the Protection of  
 Civilians in Armed Conflict, S/199/957, 8 September 1999

Much was written towards the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century regarding the changing nature of conflict, with widespread recognition of its increasing toll on innocent people: children, women and men not involved in the conflict. Mass murder, widespread rape and forced sexual slavery, the recruitment of child soldiers, the use of civilian populations as human shields, torture, disappearances, forced displacement and the use of chemical weapons are only a few of the unspeakable atrocities committed by governments, rebel groups and others in the past decades.

Awareness of these issues has led to some important developments. These include, among others, the adoption of Security Council resolutions on the protection of civilians in armed conflict and on women and peacekeeping; the strengthening of international humanitarian, human rights and refugee law; the creation of enforcement mechanisms such as the ad hoc tribunals for Rwanda and the Former Yugoslavia and the historic International Criminal Court; the adoption of a treaty banning the use of anti-personnel landmines and a protocol protecting the rights of children in armed conflict; and a greater emphasis on the prevention of conflict.

The willingness on the part of sovereign nations to create and abide by new international norms, laws and standards is having an important effect on the ability of the international community to respond in meaningful ways to humanitarian crises. Nevertheless, these norms are still emerging and some remain controversial. In particular, questions surrounding the right of one nation to intervene militarily in response to a humanitarian crisis in another nation are still widely debated. At the same time, the failure of the international community to respond to mass atrocities has also been deeply criticized.

“‘Humanitarian intervention’ has been controversial both when it happens, and when it has failed to happen. Rwanda in 1994 laid bare the full horror of inaction. The United Nations (UN) Secretariat and some permanent members of the Security Council knew that officials...were planning genocide; UN forces were present...and credible strategies were available to prevent, or at least greatly mitigate, the slaughter which followed. But the Security Council refused to take the necessary action.... Kosovo-where intervention *did* take place in 1999-...raised major questions about the legitimacy of military intervention in a sovereign state.”

*The Responsibility to Protect*, Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, December 2001, p.1

A predominant challenge to non-consensual military intervention is that some of such interventions have in fact been undertaken to allow the intervening nation to pursue self-interested foreign policy objectives; other concerns include the failure to first exhaust non-military options, unequal attention to countries and regions on the basis of their strategic importance to the strongest military powers, a disproportionate use of force and the commission of other serious crimes during the operations.

Some of the most difficult questions surrounding this issue arise from the need to balance respect for the sovereignty of individual states with the perceived responsibility of the international community to intervene when the rights of individuals, in particular the right to life, are being

threatened on a massive scale. UN Secretary General Kofi Annan highlighted this debate in his Millennium Report to the General Assembly, yet noted that “no legal principle - not even sovereignty - can ever shield crimes against humanity.”

In presenting the Millennium Report to the General Assembly in September 2000, the Secretary General repeated a call he had made during the 54<sup>th</sup> General Assembly in 1999 for UN Member States to take on the task of finding this balance and developing guidelines for the response of the international community to threats of large scale loss of life.

### ***The Responsibility to Protect***

In response, the Canadian government established the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), with the support of several major foundations. A series of roundtable discussions in different regions with representatives from governments, inter-governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations, universities, research institutes and think tanks led to a report which attempts to reframe the debate. The report is based on the notion that it is the responsibility of a sovereign nation to protect the dignity and basic rights of its own citizens, and that it is the responsibility of the international community to react “where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it.” Thus the Commission proposes a change in terminology from the right of ‘humanitarian intervention’ to the ‘responsibility to protect’.

One of the central aspects of the ICISS Report is its conclusion that the responsibility to protect comprises more than the responsibility to react under the circumstances mentioned above; equally important is the ‘responsibility to prevent’, addressing both root causes and direct causes of internal crises, and the ‘responsibility to rebuild’. An emphasis is placed on prevention as the most important aspect of the responsibility to protect, while the Report stresses that military intervention should always be a last resort, with the least intrusive and coercive means used as possible.

While chapters are devoted to the types of measures that constitute prevention, reaction and rebuilding, the Report is primarily focused on questions of intervention. Principles for military intervention are proposed, including the ‘just cause threshold’, precautionary principles (right intention, last resort, proportional means and reasonable prospects), right authority (with a strong emphasis on the UN Security Council), and operational principles. Questions about the role of the Security Council and what happens when it fails to act are examined, with another chapter devoted to the operational dimensions of military intervention.

The ICISS Report is available at [www.ciise-iciss.gc.ca/report-e.asp](http://www.ciise-iciss.gc.ca/report-e.asp), including a Synopsis of the Report, and a one-page overview is provided in Annex C to this meeting report. Please also visit [www.wfm.org](http://www.wfm.org) for a more extensive summary of the ICISS Report and an opportunity to provide your feedback.

### ***Next Steps and the Role of Non-Governmental Organizations***

The Government of Canada and other interested governments have now embarked on an effort to gain support for the general principles set out in the ICISS Report and the development of mechanisms for their implementation. In particular, it appears that emphasis will be placed, *inter alia*, on: the development of new norms to reframe the debate from a right of humanitarian intervention to a responsibility to protect; and questions of how to operationalize the Responsibility to Protect through the Security Council. A detailed summary of the strategic direction of this process from an inter-governmental perspective was provided at the Geneva meeting by an official from the Canadian government, and can be found on p.7 of this report.

As part of the effort to involve NGOs in the process of promoting these important concepts and developing effective mechanisms to ensure their implementation, the Government of Canada held roundtable meetings with NGOs to discuss the future of the ICISS Report. Having received an affirmation that NGOs are likely to be interested in promoting and operationalizing the concepts in the Report, Canada approached the World Federalist Movement-Institute for Global Policy (WFM-IGP) to solicit its support. A request was made that WFM-IGP play an active role in involving NGOs and other civil society actors in these next phases.

It is our view that as governments begin to look at the concepts and recommendations in the ICISS Report, NGOs have a critical role to play in helping to determine whether and how to carry specific ideas forward, and in supporting their effective implementation. Their input will also help to ensure that other existing frameworks are considered, and ideas not included in the Report are brought to the table. In addition, NGO involvement in the evolution of norms that will move the international community beyond their reservations about the right to so-called 'humanitarian intervention' will be critical in reframing the debate.

### **III. PURPOSE OF THE MEETING**

The meeting in Geneva, Switzerland on March 28, 2003, co-hosted by the International Council of Voluntary Agencies (ICVA) and WFM-IGP, was one of several roundtable discussions about the ICISS Report, and involved approximately sixteen participants (see Annex A).

The purpose of the meeting, as set out in the background note that accompanied the invitation, was "to ensure that NGOs are included in the process of discussing reactions to the ICISS Report and determining a potential role for civil society in 'operationalizing' the concept of the Responsibility to Protect. It is also hoped that the organizations represented at this meeting will be interested in following-up on the ideas generated."

### **IV. KEY POINTS**

#### ***General Reactions to the ICISS Report***

As has been the case at similar consultation meetings in North America, participants indicated general support for the Report, welcoming that it re-engages governments and organizations in the debate about how best to respond to serious humanitarian crises involving large scale loss of life.

Specific comments about the Report focused in particular on its basic principles. Emphasized at this meeting were the change in language from “humanitarian intervention” and the “right to intervene” to the “responsibility to protect”; the need for the rights conferred on a sovereign nation to be balanced with a responsibility to protect; and the emphasis on prevention.

Some participants noted that their organizations had initial concerns that such a report was being developed, for fear that it would reinforce the concept of so-called “humanitarian intervention”, legitimizing the use of force as the most appropriate response. One participant did express the view that the Report was too focused on armed intervention and made too rapid a shift from preventive measures to military responses. Others said that despite their concerns, appropriate weight had been given to measures short of military intervention, and that the Report’s handling of the difficult question of what to do when preventive measures failed was important and useful. There was a general sense that the Report helps to clarify the responsibility of governments in conflict prevention, and one participant noted that while protection and prevention are at times portrayed not as two sides of the same coin but as mutually exclusive concepts, the Report helps to show how these are inter-related.

Interestingly, one participant in particular expressed the interest of his organization in exploring the applicability of the concept of the Responsibility to Protect to other issues, for example to social and economic rights. Some work has already been done on this, and a paper will be issued shortly.

Participants also made important critiques of the Report, with the strongest relating to the threshold for international response to emerging crises. One participant raised the question of the difficulties that will be encountered in attempting to apply the threshold in the Report to determine when a response is necessary or justifiable. Another raised the concern that attempting to pinpoint which crises are the most serious and deserving of attention will be counterproductive for many organizations. This was echoed by a participant who said the Report implies there are “normal” armed conflicts and “extreme” armed conflicts, with the concern being that lower standards of humanitarian law will be acceptable for the “normal” situations, and that all available resources will be diverted to the extreme situations.

One of the other critiques is that the ICISS Report is “too tidy”, in the sense that it implies there can be consensus on the application of principles for military intervention. The participant felt that while there can be consensus about the principles, their application will always be controversial and challenging. Different governments, NGOs and individuals will have differing views and will even holding contradictory perspectives themselves; this will be exacerbated by the different vantage points that people have when a conflict is emerging.

Another more specific critique was with respect to structural adjustment reforms, where the participant felt that the Report ignores the now commonly accepted reality that it is essential to have the involvement and endorsement of a national government to undertake any meaningful reform.

### ***Overview of Inter-governmental Plans to Take R2P Forward***

The meeting was attended by a representative of the Canadian mission to the United Nations in Geneva. The representative provided an overview of the plans of the Canadian government to promote the concept of the Responsibility to Protect and to put it into operation, and this was supplemented by WFM representatives who have attended several meetings at which Canada's plans have been presented.

First, one participant noted that Canada has a normative interest in taking the Report forward in part because it accepts the automatic jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) while many countries do not; a case was brought against Canada for its role in the NATO intervention in Kosovo. This situation, coupled with Canada's commitment to the human security agenda, created a strong interest in contributing to the development of clear norms and rules around military intervention.

It was explained that there are two aspects to Canada's plans with regard to the ICISS Report. The first is operational, focusing on both the Security Council and regional organizations with the objective of ensuring earlier responses to emerging conflicts. The second aspect of the work emphasizes normative development, including norms related to the use of force in response to a so-called "humanitarian intervention". These efforts will be focused on the UN General Assembly but will also examine the responsibilities of individual states. In order to achieve these goals, Canada is developing a group of "friends" among UN member states.

As a first step, Canada introduced a technical resolution on the Responsibility to Protect in the UN General Assembly in the fall of 2002, but significant resistance to the resolution was encountered, in particular among countries that form part of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM). This was after efforts had been made to scale down the resolution significantly, such that the final version asked only that the UN Secretary General facilitate dialogue on these issues.

There are plans to come back to the General Assembly with another resolution, which is likely to be more substantive, yet many more bilateral and multilateral discussions will first be required. It is the view of the Government of Canada that this process could take years.

Currently, roundtables are being held in various regions and at the UN missions New York. Emphasis is being placed on reaching out to elected members of the UN Security Council, and on ways to make use of the existing Human Security Network which involves twelve member countries and one observer. Canada is also looking for the support of NGOs for assistance in this process.

NGOs in attendance advised that Canada be extremely careful about undertaking any full-scale effort to get agreement on principles for military intervention as this "could backfire terribly". It was stressed that it is very important to have a period of evaluating the appropriate strategy, perhaps focusing first on the regional level, for example on Africa where the issue of military

intervention has been addressed in regional documents. It is the view of WFM for example, based on its consultations to date, that the best approach is to focus on the prevention of conflict/protection of civilians aspects of the Report, and to allow discussion of the appropriate circumstances for military intervention to flow from there. It was also pointed out that Canada is the parent of the new diplomacy model of creating a friends group of like-minded countries and entering into a relationship with civil society and international organizations to take forward a major issue; a strategy will evolve naturally through this process as each set of actors outlines its role.

### ***Challenges and Opportunities in Taking R2P Forward***

Participants emphasized the importance and relevance of the Report in the current international political climate, while also expressing concerns that the good ideas coming out of the Report will be ‘highjacked’. One participant expressed the view that the Iraq war will put the entire concept of protection at risk, as people will now have a visceral reaction to any proposed form of intervention. Another pointed out that a general cynicism about the motivations of government as a result of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq will prevent people from hearing the true debate.

Many emphasized that the concepts in the ICISS Report are not new, but the challenge is to determine how to put them into operation. It was expressed that determining how to respond to such events will always be difficult because the choices always involve loss of life and thus evoke passionate positions. In addition, while there is considerable agreement about the tests that should be used to determine whether an intervention is right or wrong, there will always be considerable disagreement about the application of these principles to a particular situation.

Two other key points were raised with respect to the current international political climate. The first is that conflicts are now being redefined, with a new notion of ‘self-defense’ interventions, alliances between militias and governments (such as in Afghanistan), new weapons, and new questions about command responsibility, and it is important to consider how these changes affect the concepts in the Report. The second is that on a much larger scale, the role of multilateral institutions is changing, and this is being exacerbated by the attempt of the US government to equate its national political and economic interests with the global interest; this “profoundly confuses any discussion and polarizes the debate”.

With regards to operationalising protection, it was noted that humanitarian agencies have particular responsibilities in this respect. For several years, a number of initiatives have been undertaken within the humanitarian community to define this responsibility. One structural problem with regards to the protection of internally displaced person (IDPs) was noted. The responsibility for the coordination of the protection response to IDPs lies in most situations with the UN Resident Coordinator, who often has a UNDP background. At the same time, since UNDP has very close relations with the national government, there may little room to advocate for the improvement of the protection response, in particular when the government itself is responsible for causing the displacement.

Despite the recognition of these challenges, it was agreed that other situations like Rwanda are unfortunately virtually inevitable, and it is not an option to refuse to consider the question of how to respond more effectively to such crises.

### ***Potential Roles for Civil Society in “Operationalizing” the Report***

Participants noted at the outset that it is important not to assume that ‘NGOs’ are a cohesive group. For example, humanitarian organizations have a code of conduct that commits them to neutrality and impartiality, and this makes it difficult for them to call for or endorse particular responses to a crisis as their main concern is to ensure that they can respond to the needs of all parties. The way this is interpreted, however, varies even among humanitarian organizations.

It was noted that many humanitarian organizations called for an armed intervention in Zaire (now the Democratic Republic of Congo) in November 1996 when Kabila’s troops were advancing and the refugee camps in eastern Zaire closed from the rest of the world. Since then it seems that there has been a general retreat from playing such an advocacy role in favor of intervention.

There was some discussion about the potential for advocacy at earlier stages, for example to call for diplomatic responses to an emerging conflict or the use of other preventive measures. Some participants expressed the view that this kind of activity is also prohibited by the principle of neutrality, while others said that such roles are contemplated in international law. The example provided was a provision in the Geneva Conventions that calls for fact finding missions. Humanitarian organizations including the ICRC do not usually consider such aspects of the Conventions; some participants felt that these organizations could call for the use of this and other mechanisms and measures for prevention and protection while remaining well within these mandates. There was agreement that humanitarian organizations are not in violation of the principle of neutrality when they indicate to governments the humanitarian consequences that would result from the various options available to them.

For development agencies these questions may be more straightforward, and there is an effort to get development groups to work conflict resolution into their mandates.

The discussion resulted in general consensus that there are different roles for different types of organizations to play, and the most important thing is to understand the various mandates, respect them, and learn to work in as coordinated a manner as possible. At the same time, there has often been a failure of groups focused on specific issues to consider their inter-connection with other issues. For example, disarmament components of international interventions are often overlooked, and disarmament advocates would not necessarily classify their work as protection (although they do make the link with prevention). Similarly, international justice advocates would not necessarily say they are working on conflict prevention.

In considering a concrete role for NGOs that would flow from the ICISS Report, there was a clear emphasis on the fact that governments have already made clear commitments regarding the prevention of conflicts and protection of civilians, thus the role of NGOs is to ensure that these

governments take their responsibilities and commitments more seriously. It was also noted that this is not always just a matter of political will but also of capacity at the national, regional and international levels. The Aide-Mémoire (see Annex B) was noted in particular as offering a useful overview of the commitments governments have made on the protection agenda, and may be a good starting point to consider accountability.

Additional suggestions included the following: ensuring that early warning work is used by the UN and governments; advocating for resources for true conflict prevention and for various types of intervention; and ensuring that financial commitments are made for reconstruction efforts before an intervention is authorized under Chapter 7 of the UN Charter.

The need to focus our efforts not only on international institutions but on regional bodies was emphasized throughout this discussion.

### ***Other Relevant Work on these Issues***

While there was insufficient time to draw fully on participants' knowledge of other relevant work, two activities were mentioned. The first was the production by ICHRP of a report entitled "Human Rights Crises: NGO Responses to Military Interventions", which reviews the various perspectives of human rights NGOs with regard to the question of military intervention. This was developed in parallel with the ICISS Report but was released afterward; it includes an annex that draws together the key findings in each report. The second set of activities highlighted was the early warning work being undertaken by organizations like FEWER. It was emphasized that the importance of this work cannot be overstated, while at the same time it is essential that this critical information be fed back to governments, NGOs and others.

## **V. CONCLUSION**

The co-organizers expressed their deep gratitude to the roundtable meeting participants for their valuable insight and for taking time to participate while the war in Iraq is creating extreme demands on their organizations.

The outcome of the roundtable meeting was very instructive for WFM-IGP. It is hoped that all who participated will carry this important discussion back to their organizations, as there are many important questions raised in the ICISS Report that could impact on organizational mandates and require time for reflection. WFM-IGP is committed to remaining in contact with all participants as we continue this consultation process and work to develop a role for civil society groups in ensuring that governments operationalize the key concepts in the ICISS Report. It is our hope that all participants will remain interested and involved in these critical issues.

## ANNEX A: MEETING PARTICIPANTS

### Co-Sponsors:

Ed Schenkenberg	International Council of Voluntary Agencies
William Pace	World Federalist Movement-Institute for Global Policy

### Participants:

Thomas Fetz	Canadian Mission to the United Nations, Geneva
Rory Mungoven	Human Rights Watch
Leah Levin	International Alert
Bertrand Kern	International Committee of the Red Cross
Alexandre Faite	International Committee of the Red Cross
Robert Archer	International Council on Human Rights Policy
Joseph Aguetant	International Rescue Committee
Abebe Hailu	Law consultant, Ethiopia
Jane Barry	Save the Children UK
Joel McClellan	Steering Committee on Humanitarian Response
David Atwood	Quaker UN Office
Rik Panganiban	World Federalist Movement
Lizzie Rushing	World Federalist Movement
Jayne Stoyles	World Federalist Movement

## ANNEX B: DOCUMENTS DISTRIBUTED

### UN Documents and Reports

S/2002/1300 Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on the protection of civilians in armed conflict (26 November 2002)  
<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/712/97/PDF/N0271297.pdf?OpenElement>

S/2001/331 Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on the protection of civilians in armed conflict (30 March 2001)  
<http://www.reliefweb.int/w/Rwb.nsf/s/873B87DFA5E78ABB85256A2B005DD129>

S/1999/957 Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council on the protection of civilians in armed conflict (8 September 1999)  
<http://www.reliefweb.int/library/documents/civilian.html>

S/RES/1460 – Security Council Resolution (30 January 2003)  
 On Children and Armed Conflict  
<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N03/231/16/PDF/N0323116.pdf?OpenElement>

S/RES/1441 – Security Council Resolution (8 November 2002)  
 On the situation between Iraq and Kuwait  
<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/682/26/PDF/N0268226.pdf?OpenElement>

S/RES/1379 – Security Council Resolution (30 August 2001)  
 On Children and Armed Conflict  
<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/651/10/PDF/N0165110.pdf?OpenElement>

S/RES/1366 - Security Council Resolution (20 November 2001)  
 On the Role of the Security Council in the Prevention of Armed Conflict  
<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N01/524/48/PDF/N0152448.pdf?OpenElement>

S/RES/1327 - Security Council Resolution (13 November 2000)  
 On the Implementation of the Report on the Panel of UN Peace Operations  
<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N00/745/04/PDF/N0074504.pdf?OpenElement>

S/RES/1325 - Security Council Resolution (31 October 2000)  
 On Women, Peace, and Security  
<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N00/720/18/PDF/N0072018.pdf?OpenElement>

S/RES/1296 - Security Council Resolution (19 April 2000)  
 On the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict  
<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N00/399/03/PDF/N0039903.pdf?OpenElement>

S/RES/1265 - Security Council Resolution (17 September 1999)

NGO Roundtable on Responsibility to Protect  
 Geneva, Switzerland, March 28, 2003  
 Final Report

On the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict

<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/267/94/PDF/N9926794.pdf?OpenElement>

S/RES/1261 - Security Council Resolution (30 August 1999)

On Children and Armed Conflict

<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N99/248/59/PDF/N9924859.pdf?OpenElement>

S/ PRST/2002/6 UN Security Council Presidential Statement Aide Memoire

On Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict Issues and Options

Includes: Primary Objectives, Issues for Consideration, and Precedents

<http://ods-dds-ny.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N02/288/93/IMG/N0228893.pdf?OpenElement>

A/55/305-S/2000/809

Report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, Comprehensive Review of the whole question of Peacekeeping Operations in all its aspects (21 August 2000)

[http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace\\_operations/](http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations/)

A/56/732 Implementation of the recommendations of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (Report of the Secretary-General – Comprehensive review of peacekeeping and all its aspects (21 December 2001)

[http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace\\_operations/](http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations/)

### **Other Articles, Reports, Speeches**

“Debating Humanitarian Intervention,” by Gareth Evans and Mohamed Sahnoun, Foreign Affairs, November/December 2002

“The Preventable Genocide” Executive Summary of the Report of the International Panel of Eminent Personalities to Investigate the 1994 Genocide in Rwanda

full report available at: [www.oau-oau.org](http://www.oau-oau.org)

Prevention of Armed Conflict SG Report Summary (Lenore Hickey, WFM, July 2001)

Statement by Ambassador Paul Heinbecker Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations to the 57<sup>th</sup> Session of the United Nations General Assembly on Item 44: Follow-up to the Outcome of the Millennium Summit and Item 10: Report of the Secretary-General on the work of the organization, New York, October 2002 [www.un.int/canada/s-15Oct2002Heinbecker.htm](http://www.un.int/canada/s-15Oct2002Heinbecker.htm)

Secretary-General Address to the “The Responsibility to Protect” report launch (NY)

15 February 2002 <http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2002/sgsm8125.doc.htm>

Excerpts from the American Society of International Law Proceedings of the 96<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting: “The Evolving Intervention Regime in Africa: From Basket Case to Market Place?” Jeremy Levitt, Washington, DC, March 2002

Foreword to Amnesty International Report 2000: "Soldiers In the Name of Human Rights,"  
Pierre Sane - Amnesty International Secretary-General, London, 2000

2001 ICISS Regional Consultations with NGOs

## ANNEX C: ICISS REPORT SUMMARY

*The following summary has been reproduced from a report of a seminar on the Operational Dimensions of Intervention, Project Ploughshares, September 5 and 6, Waterloo, Canada.*

The ICISS Report was released at the end of 2001, and focused on the issue of international intervention. The ICISS Commission responded to a call from the UN Secretary-General to “forge unity” around the questions plaguing the issue of intervention. The resulting Report reframes the debate around intervention in terms of an obligation to protect populations at risk, and away from the “right of states to intervene.” In doing so, the Report offers a new language with which to talk about some of the toughest issues facing us in today’s world.

The Report argues that state sovereignty entails certain responsibilities toward a state’s own population, and in particular, providing for the basic safety of its citizens. When a state fails in its duty and is not protecting (or indeed, is targeting) its citizens, the international community has a duty to come to their aid. The Report thus emphasizes a holistic view of intervention that includes prevention, reaction and rebuilding. More specifically, protecting civilians involves first implementing a range of actions to *prevent* atrocities and address the root causes of conflict.

When these actions fail, the Report obliges the international community to *react*, intervening militarily if necessary and only in extraordinary circumstances. In making this decision to react with military force, the Report emphasizes a series of precautionary principles, including the criteria of just cause (the threshold conditions), right intention, last resort, proportional means, reasonable prospects, and right authority. Its goal is to prevent “another Rwanda.”

Last, the Report calls upon the international community to help *rebuild* a country after an intervention. This phase involves assistance with the recovery, reconstruction, and reconciliation components of the transition to a more peaceful society. This holistic view of intervention in general suggests that protecting civilians and vulnerable populations is a fundamentally different question and operation than fighting a war.

The ICISS Report can be found on-line at: <http://www.ciise-iciss.gc.ca/report-e.asp>