

Building National Architectures for the Prevention of Mass Atrocities and Genocide

Building Capacity in the Security Sector to Prevent Atrocity Crimes

a) What are the challenges today of building national architectures?

- The issue of local ownership and participation – process/framework of local ownership may be cooked up by external actors, e.g. in Brussels. In order to bring the stakeholders to the table, what measures to be taken, and in a systematic way?
- How to establish check and balances for local ownership, when the capacity is lacking? Negotiating ownership is one, ensuring the capacity to discharge such ownership is another
- SSR is premised on a holistic picture but also needs to be tailored to local/specific needs – balancing is a challenge
- There needs to be programs that address needs of the soldiers in the transitional phase, to be integrated to society; without this transitional program, no place/incentive for soldiers. At the same time, we also needs programs for the people who transitioned to go through rehabilitation process. We are talking about 1-2+ years of such programs.
- There needs to be effective transfer of control, from military to civilian, teaching how to manage things; otherwise, impunity can linger on
- Ill-defined multiple roles for the military – they can get confused as to what to do
- SSR's connection with other efforts, such as DDR, but to find/define responsible roles for R of DDR is always a challenge. Good examples on effective DDR are from South Africa and Rwanda, and that was because of their high-level political will to ensure those needs were met

b) What have we learned about building national architectures?

- Today SSR is carried out widely in most DPKO mandates
- In terms of its conceptual place, SSR fits in the “guarantee of non-recurrence,” if we are to put in the swisspeace model of the Dealing with the Past
- SSR’s fundamental approach is to enhance local ownership
- 2 core objectives of SSR are to “effectiveness” and “accountability”
- 3 essential dimensions of SSR are political, holistic, and technical
- “Security” of SSR is concerned with human security; “Sector” of SSR is concerned with both state and non-state actors providing such functions/services as security, justice, governance; R of SSR is a reform accountable to the state and its people, effective, efficient, affordable, legitimate, and respectful of international commitments and standards
- One can see SSR like a tent/house in which multiple actors and sectors are placed under the public, executive, judicial and legislative oversight to deliver security and justice needs, cutting across multiple issues such as human rights, gender, financial management
- SSR will help create an environment that makes it possible to prevent atrocities
- SSR as a concept includes justice sector/reform, but a program of SSR in some country designed by some may not include justice sector – needs tailored approach but should still be comprehensible
- Local ownership is key, but we need the support from the top to allow/ensure local ownership to be sustainable. Local ownership is easy when top leaders are committed

c) What could be the contribution of GAAMAC to address these challenges?

- GAAMAC can have a DCAF-like program of sharing SSR in/as part of it
- GAAMAC to provide a space for human rights officers to interface with the international communities – e.g. IHL day in GAAMAC
- GAAMAC to make more use of an international code of conduct – such as Montreux Document
- GAAMAC to give an entry point for “knowledge and practice,” such as stakeholders to not only learn/sensitize laws of war but also observe/translate them into practice

- GAAMAC to facilitate high-level discussion agenda, such as line of communication of military leaders and other leaders at the ASEAN level
- GAAMAC to provide a capacity to see things from a holistic view – we should not look only at big problems or crises as we tend to tackle them in silo, but we should see big challenges holistically

d) Other specific and very relevant issue to be recorded?

- For regional linkages of SSR – needs regional organizations to play key roles
- To have a HR commission established by the government is a way to establish accountability from within; e.g. having an ombudsman is helpful in ensuring internal accountability within the armed forces – there are judicial process we can use to discharge soldiers in case of violations
- Effective and accountable SSR may mitigate atrocities, although it may not prevent atrocity entirely. It allows the society to grow.