

Journal of Contemporary European Research

Volume 9, Issue 5 (2013)

The European Union Building Peace Near and Afar: Monitoring the Implementation of International Peace Agreements

Máire Braniff *University of Ulster*

Citation

Braniff, M. (2013). 'The European Union Building Peace Near and Afar: Monitoring the Implementation of International Peace Agreements', *Journal of Contemporary European Research*. 9 (5), pp. 682-695.

First published at: www.jcer.net

Abstract

The European Union's (EU) support and contribution to international peace and security continues to develop with involvement in the Balkans, South Caucasus, Africa, Middle East and South Asia (Council of the European Union 2005). Within the broad range of civilian and military interventions under the Common Security and Defence policy (CSDP) there have been two monitoring missions that have emerged from peace agreements, in Aceh (2005-2006) and in Georgia (2008 to date). This article maps the evolution EU's role in international peace building by focusing on how this role is increasingly constructed by the scope of monitoring missions which it has embarked upon outside of its borders. A thematic analysis of literature is used to explore how the EU's monitoring role has evolved regarding the different degrees of intervention, time-frame and size of the monitoring mission which have resulted in a multi-level impact regarding societal transition. The article finds that political will, shadows of past and future missions and intergovernmental concerns dominates how the EU's monitoring missions unfurl, affecting the practice of monitors and other EU actors in local conflict settings and contemplates scenarios for future monitoring missions.

Keywords

European Union Foreign Policy; Monitoring Mission; Peacebuilding; Conflict resolution

Peace monitoring has increasingly featured on the EU's agenda and practical efforts to contribute to international peace. Monitoring agreements represent an opportunity for oversight and confidence-building measures. According to Richard Whitman and Stefan Wolff (2012) the EU has the capacity to act fund, coordinate and cooperate to contribute to peace and peace making internationally. Making peace suggests an element of bringing an end to violence, while building peace represents a longer-term shift in managing difference peacefully. In its role as a civilian peace monitor, it draws on each of these strengths which are born from a significant catalogue of successful and less successful activities internationally (Duke 2002; Faria 2004; Ortega 2001). As an example of 'active monitoring' the EU's engagement as a civilian actor in the aftermath of the signing of a peace accord illustrates how a confluence of key factors has contributed to the evolution and professionalization of civilian capacity to address security, peace mediation, conflict management and observation concerns. To manage a conflict is to manage disputes peacefully without recourse to violence (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall 2011: 40). The merit of having a European Security and Defence Policy operation capacity linked to diplomatic, structural and civilian measures facilitates the EU to become a more credible player (Whitman and Wolff 2012). Specifically, the EU's Instrument for Stability and Peace building Partnership have allowed the EU to build and acquire credibility and capacity to engage with a range of parties and actors, including those more marginalised, to the conflict leading to a transformation of the structures and relations of conflict within a peace process (Albin 2005).

This study adds to the underdeveloped scholarship which explores how the EU contributes to international peace making and building. While this article focuses on two case studies, it also raises key considerations for the wider consequences of the EU in international peace monitoring. Coordinating and funding local actors and agencies enables the EU to have a significant potential for impact on the local decisions that are made about how agreements are implemented. Making and building peace following international peace agreements is a challenge for local, national and international actors.

The politics and practice of building peace are often linked with the promise of reconciliation, peace, equality and prosperity. Here, adopting the language and terminology of Oliver Ramsbotham, Tom Woodhouse and Hugh Miall peacebuilding

'addresses structural issues and the long-term relationships among conflictants' (2011: 3). While traditionally, peacekeeping may have focused on lowering levels of destructive behaviour, the analysis here proposes that as monitors, the EU extends the remit of peace monitoring to include ambitions of peacebuilding. (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall 2011: 32). For John Paul Lederach, reconciliation is inherently paradoxical:

'In an overall sense, reconciliation promotes an encounter between the open expression of the painful past, on the one hand, and the search for the articulation of a long-term, interdependent future, on the other hand. Second, reconciliation provides a place for truth and mercy to meet, where concerns for exposing what has happened and for letting go in favour of renewed relationship are validated and embraced. Third, reconciliation recognises the need to give time and place to both justice and peace, where redressing the wrong is held together with the envisioning of a common, connected future.' (1997: 20).

The key purpose of this comparative analysis is to understand how the EU's role as peace monitor has moved from simply documenting, recording and reporting how the agreed points are being observed to a more absorbing presence engaging in mediation, socio-economic development and security considerations. In Aceh, the EU's collaborative mission, the AMM (Aceh Monitoring Mission), with Norway, Switzerland and seven of the ASEAN (Association of South East Asian Nations) to monitor the implementation of the Helsinki Memorandum of Understanding, represented a key departure in the EU's external relations activities. Firstly, the EU found itself operating in cooperation with another regional organization (ASEAN) in an area far from its neighbourhood. Secondly, the EU's intervention in Aceh represented an opportunity for the EU to redress criticisms of selectivity and widen its contribution to international peace-building. The mission commenced on 15 August 2005 and lasted until 15 December 2006, and oversaw the implementation of key aspects of the Memorandum of Understanding (2005), including decommissioning, demilitarisation, monitoring of human rights, supporting good relations between parties and observing legislative changes. This mission witnessed the EU engaging proactively at a central level in Aceh, but also through their mobile units, having a wider geographic remit. This geographic spread of the monitoring mission was similarly replicated in the EU's second monitoring mission in Georgia. The EU has been present under the EUMM (EU Monitoring Mission) since the 15 September 2008 following on from the Six Point Agreement (15 August 2008) which signalled a cessation of conflict between Georgia and Russia following a summer of war. On 1 October 2008, the EU deployed 200 monitors within Georgia to oversee the stabilisation, normalisation and confidence building in the aftermath of the agreement. Against the backdrop of the EU facilitated Geneva Discussions with Georgia and Russia, and the wider Neighbourhood policies and the EU Special Representative for the Caucasus, the EUMM represented a further deepening of EU engagement in the efforts to stabilise its neighbourhood. The mandate of this mission has focused on being a reporting mechanism to the EU member states and institutional actors, but also sought to normalise, stabilise and build confidence in the region by preventing a return to violent conflict. The mission's mandate has been extended beyond its original time-frame and continues to be operational today.

These two cases remind us that the EU's contribution to international peacebuilding is not simply confined to financial and technical assistance and peace mediation. The monitoring dimension of these missions offers an insight into the EU's behaviour in international peace mediation on the ground and at the front line of preventing the outbreak of violent conflict. The monitoring of international peace agreements, as in Aceh and Georgia, represent an important element within the ever-growing foreign policy toolkit. The article is structured in the following way. Firstly the article maps the role that monitoring plays within the advancing CSDP missions and considers what this means for the EU's contribution to peacebuilding. The second section charts the experiences of the EU as peace monitors in both Aceh and Georgia detailing the mandate and consequences of the missions utilising a range of policy statements and

documentary evidence. In the third and final section, the article closes by drawing upon literature and secondary analysis to examine theoretically how peace monitoring has changed and explores the implications arising.

ONE INSTRUMENT AMONG MANY

In the past, openings for making a contribution to peacebuilding have been afforded by the considerable breadth and depth of financial assistance combined with a rolling out of EU personnel usually in the form of Special Representatives, Delegation Staff and even Policing Missions. As Whitman and Wolff argue, 'the EU for the most part, seemed to have sufficient control and self-confidence in managing conflicts in its immediate neighbourhood' (Whitman and Wolff 2012: 3). Hence, when the EU rolls into town, it can tend to do so in a pretty substantive way. The lessons drawn from the experiences in the Balkans throughout the 1990s indicate that the 'EU has come a long way towards achieving some credibility as a conflict manager' (Whitman and Wolff 2010: 9).

Reaching agreements between parties who have formerly been engaged in direct conflict, war and violence is imbued with intransigence, hazard and vulnerabilities thus when points of contention are agreed the responsibilities for all actors in the aftermath carry moral, historical and structural weight. According to the UN Secretary General (2005), the success of mediating and implementing peace has been blemished by failures which have saw 'roughly half of all countries that emerge from war lapse back into violence within five years.' This resonates also with Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall when they stated: 'Winning the peace makes even greater demands than winning the war' (2011: 225). Scholarship has focused on the narratives and analysis of agreements that have failed to engender peace fuelling a dominant discourse of miscarried agreements (DeRouen and Bercovitch 2008; Licklider 1995; Luttwak 1999). Hence, it becomes vital to understand the contribution that the EU as a monitor of international peace agreements is making to the building of peaceful relationships and avoidance of political violence. According to Whitman and Wolff analysis of how the EU engages with local actors or third parties provides a 'crucial link between an analysis focused on EU capabilities and one that examines context-specific factors in relation to a particular conflict when seeking explanations for success or failure of particular conflict interventions' (Whitman and Wolff 2012: 10). As a monitor of peace agreements each of these missions undertaken are an expression of the EU's commitment to international peace building which provide insights into the construction and lifespan of mandates but more importantly the operational coherence of the EU at an intergovernmental and community level as well as cooperation between the EU and other actors on the ground. Christophe Hillion defines coherence 'beyond the assurance that the different policies do not legally contradict each other, [as] a quest for synergy and added value in the different components of EU policies' (2008:17). In the field of external relations, therefore this definition becomes increasingly valuable as monitoring missions represent a fragmentation of activities and geographic spread; yet, the added value and synergy remains in evidence given the overlap of personnel involved in all CSDP missions.

At its very core, the challenge of building peace among deeply divided societies has driven the integration project. It also has propelled the EU into puzzling contexts where an experimental (whilst arguably well-intended) approach to spreading peace and prosperity has evolved. In the 21st century, the EU has fashioned an approach to crisis management, conflict prevention, conflict resolution and peace building based on lessons learned from the devastating dissolution of Yugoslavia to broaden the scope of their engagements to beyond their immediate borders. Significant interventions in terms of financial, diplomatic, operational and logistical support have been witnessed on the African continent, Asia, the Middle East and the Caucasus. The mandate and remit of such interventions varied according to need, historical ties and political will; with an increasingly vast range of civilian capacity to assist international peace building, the

'Blue and White' of the EU unarmed monitors and observers are progressively visible internationally. For instance, in the EU's intervention in the Great Lakes, Aceh, Kosovo and the Caucasus brought a shift in external engagement but also the creation of the External Action Service, after the AMM, has fundamentally changed the decision taking and policy making landscape by centralising power, budget and operational capacity including that over decisions where to launch a mission and whether to continue a mission (Blockmans and Wessels 2009). This is not to suggest that coherence and strategy challenges have been resolved since the creation of the European External Action Service. For Whitman and Wolff this presents the EU with 'a formidable challenge in coordinating a significant number of institutional actors and policy domains within the Union' (2012: 5). As they go on to point out, 'capturing the practices of the Union as an actor seeking to engage in a comprehensive approach to security also poses significant analytical difficulties, in relation to accounting for successes and failure' (2012: 5). Despite the efforts to streamline and enhance the coherency of the EU's external relations and activities, challenges remain, due to the sheer diversity of ambitions and actors involved.

Yet as the post-9/11 and recession world continued, it has become apparent that increasingly intensive approaches to monitoring were favoured as opposed to engaging in a wide range of cases especially regarding the use of peace mediation as a means of driving local performance on the agreed peace (Youngs 2003). However, rather than exploring the scope and range of instruments available, this article is primarily concerned with how the EU meets the task of monitoring an agreed peace and how this role has evolved in light of recent monitoring missions that the EU has been involved in.

In 2005 and 2008 respectively, the EU played a key financial and diplomatic role in securing momentous agreements bringing an end to ethno-political conflict and war in Aceh and between Georgia-Russia. The ensuing monitoring role in both of these cases are revealing about the EU's efforts to build peace both near and afar. Often armed with the best of intentions, the EU's impacts often reap unintended impacts (Tocci 2003). In particular, the monitoring of agreed issues by the EU (and partners in case of Aceh) reminds us that civilian capacity in peace building is experimental and evolving. It causes multi-level impacts affecting how the EU can perceive and develop its role in international peace monitoring. As an unarmed mission, EU monitoring missions challenge traditional preconceptions about peace "keeping", "making" and "monitoring" operations (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall 2011). At another level, the role that the EU plays in peace monitoring affects local civil society capacity building and, more broadly, impacts upon historical and ethical judgements on territorial, identity and security concerns. While these considerations can be circumscribed within this immediate transitional phase, the resultant narrative emerging from these different policies weighs heavily on opportunities for peace and reconciliation. The embryonic active monitoring approach favoured by the EU has reflected a paradigmatic shift from the EU that monitoring is more than observation and reporting; it is a hands on approach, which indicates a willingness to be more robust in engagements. However, as this article argues caution should lay in the long-term impacts of this active monitoring, however well-intended the initiative especially given that often policy learning has failed to be institutionalised and adopted.

Cognisant in civilian approaches building, managing and transforming conflictual relationships that have borne out tremendous suffering, injury and death in deeply divided societies such as the Balkans the EU developed a range of capacities. These of course tend to run in tandem with the financially dexterous policies such as the Stabilisation and Association Process and in the case of Northern Ireland Peace programmes. In light of its experiences in the Balkans, the 2004 new members and in Northern Ireland the EU has increasingly enhanced its capacity and profile in international peace monitoring through the deployment of monitoring missions internationally (Manners 2002; Bretherton and Vogler 2006; Bacarani and Dellara 2004;

Coppetiers et al 2004; Diez 2002; Tocci 2007). According to Miall, Ramsbotham and Woodhouse peace monitoring operations usually function to help manage the transition from war to peace, as a humanitarian intervention, to defend democracy, to decolonise a territory or to support regime change (2011: 2020-203). As an unarmed mission, the EU monitors are challenged with the traditional mandates of peacekeepers which include normalisation and stabilisation and the processes associated with demobilisation, disarmament and reintegration. Hence the traditional phases of intervention, stabilisation and normalisation prevail (Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall 2011: 214). However, it is clear that with a valuable early warning system the EU can appreciate and therefore could respond more effectively to threats to peace and security both regionally and internationally (European Commission 2004). This is an evolving instrument: the EU's commitment to utilising diplomacy as a means of preventing and ending violent conflict was in evidence but certainly lacked coherency and strategy instead being pursued on an ad hoc and unreflective way lurching from one crisis to the next without a cohesive stratagem. Reflecting on the EU's historic approach in the Caucasus, Açakoca, Vanhauwaert, Whitman and Wolff affirm:

'Too often, the Union remains a fundamentally reactive player, without the political will, clear strategic vision and adequate capacity to engage in proactive and effective conflict prevention, management and settlement in this region.'
(2009: 37).

PEACE MONITORING: THE EU IN ACEH AND GEORGIA.

Continued involvement in international peace making and building lies at the core of the EU's international outlook and their role in Aceh and Georgia manifested out of this impetus to contribute to international peace and stability. The EU's engagement in international monitoring of peace agreements in Aceh and Georgia marked a new stage in the development of the EU as a world player. Its foray beyond its immediate and close neighbourhood to the Aceh-Indonesia conflict denotes a capacity and willingness to become more actively involved in securing peace and normalising relations between conflicted parties.

While the EU's engagement as a monitor in Georgia is more understandable given both the proximity, geo-strategic and historical relationship between the EU and the wider Caucasus region, their involvement in the territory of Aceh in Indonesia is perhaps more extraordinary. Initially, the EU became involved in the Aceh case through their support of mediation, under the premiership of former Finnish foreign minister Maarti Ahtisaari, which resulted in the Memorandum of Understanding agreed in Helsinki in 2005 (Braud and Gunaryadi 2005). Engagement in a joint monitoring mission with (five of the 12) ASEAN member states in 2005 was a direct consequence of the earlier support for the peace mediation (Schulze 2008). The EU's mandate as part of AMM included building good relations between the parties, investigating and monitoring the implementation of the agreement and 'demilitarisation, demobilisation and reintegration' processes. It had headquarters in Banda Aceh and then had sub-divisions in 11 district offices. The EU emerged as a likely candidate to take the reins in Aceh as the UN were deemed unsuitable following the previous flawed engagement in Timor-Leste and following mismanagement of the monitoring of a previous ceasefire. In addition, the GAM was unwilling to accept an straight ASEAN mission (Schulze 2008).

In Georgia however, the case for EU involvement was much more straightforward (Tocci 2008). Under the leadership of the French Presidency of the European Council, President Nicolas Sarkozy and Foreign Minister Bernard Kouchner, with the support of Finnish Foreign Minister Alexander Stubbs, saw the EU adopt a central role in mediating a the Six Point Plan which secured an end to hostilities in the Georgian-Russian 2008 war (Cordell and Wolff 2010: 45). Following the EU brokered Six Point Plan which brought an

end to the August 2008 war between Georgia and Russia, the EU has continued to have a significant role in the on-going peace negotiations at Geneva and the implementation of the Agreement on the ground. Since October 2008, the EU Monitoring Mission in Georgia (hereafter EUMM) has been in operation in territory adjacent to Abkhazia and South Ossetia with 200 unarmed EU personnel from all 27 EU member states deployed. The EUMM has a mandate of Stabilisation, Normalisation, Confidence Building and Objective Information. The original mandate was for 12 months, but this has been renewed three times and is currently operational with no exit strategy in sight. A key objective of the EUMM is to provide open and safe access across the Administrative Boundary Lines of Abkhazia and South Ossetia. The form, nature and mandate of any follow up mission to a peace agreement will undoubtedly emerge during the negotiation of any peace. Treading a troubled track the challenges facing any monitoring mission are not only potentially dangerous for the monitors themselves but also threaten to undermine the often delicate peace.

As active monitors, the AMM played a role on the ground in negotiating with local actors any disputes through the Commission on Security Arrangements and in the field. This indicated an important shift away from passive monitoring. Clearly, there is nothing subversive here; this was something negotiated from the outset. The mandate of the AMM was not pure monitoring and the AMM had instruments at its disposal to become more actively engaged. The meetings of the Commission on Security Arrangements were held weekly at the Banda Aceh headquarters, chaired by the EU's Pieter Feith and attended by senior representatives of GAM and the Indonesian government, police and military. Arguably the impact on short-term peace building was significant: through the structured working relationship between the EU and ASEAN and the continued communication between the parties and local actors through the Committee on Security Arrangements and District Committees on Security Arrangements security tensions were resolved and offset. With an eye to a longer term impact of this approach, crucial issues such as amnesty, reintegration of former combatants and decommissioning were dealt with initially in the immediate period under the direction of the AMM. Yet, while it is important to recognise the fundamental accomplishments and progress made under the AMM, it should also be acknowledged that the actions at this time bear an impression on how the conflict transforms and evolves in the future. While crucial steps for disarming and securing a territory are important concerns in the short term, the processes associated with reintegration, demobilisation and amnesties could perhaps be afforded plentiful consideration with transparent and visible local participation. Unable to fulfil the potential to strengthen capacity building and local ownership the monitoring mission dominated the arduous decision making (which has taken place at speed) detaching a strong sense of local ownership.

As a joint mission, the Aceh monitoring mission enhanced the way that the EU can be viewed as making a contribution to international peace building as it can be judged on its collaborative relationship with the ASEAN members. In practical terms the chain of command and visibility of personnel was a key component of how the EU delivered its side of the mission. All teams were multinational and it was a united mission, not composed of two separate elements. The mission was chaired by an EU representative and a Thai representative acted as deputy. It was a principle of the Deputy Head of Mission that the mission would be totally integrated with ASEAN, there were 6 ASEAN district officers, and 5 EU district officers. The added value of ASEAN for this mission lay in their connections and solid relationships with the Indonesian government.

Nathalie Tocci (2008) identified conditionality, social learning and passive enforcement as the central means through which the EU channelled its relationship with Georgia; while, regarding Abkhazia and South Ossetia, the EU's has had minimal relations and impact. Furthermore, Tocci goes on to say that the EU has neglected the Russian regional dimension to this instability which has 'handicapped its potential impact' (2008).

According to the EU Special Envoy, the main tasks challenged at the EUMM were as follows:

'As EU Special Representative for the crisis in Georgia, I will firstly, help to prepare for the international talks to be held under point six of the settlement plan of 12 August 2008, which are in particular to cover: i) arrangements for security and stability in the region; ii) the issue of refugees and displaced persons, on the basis of internationally recognised principles; iii) any other subject, by mutual agreement between the parties. Secondly, I will help to establish the EU's position and represent it, at my level, in those talks.' (Morel 2008).

Part of the mediated agreement, provisions were made for the 'opening of international talks on the security and stability arrangements of Abkhazia and South Ossetia'. The nature of the agreed provision was significant as interpretation could satisfy Georgian territorial claims yet raised the possibility that Georgian territorial integrity could be questioned. The absence of a long term commitment to Georgian territorial integrity in the August mediated Six Point Plan Following the introduction of the EUMM, international mediation by the United Nations (UN), EU and Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) on security and stability arrangements within South Ossetia and Abkhazia were launched in Geneva on 15 October 2008. Georgia, Russia and the United States were participants in this initiative also. A significant added pressure was that Russia recognised the independence of Abkhazia and South Ossetia on 26 August 2008.

Reflecting on the accelerated mediation conducted in the first fortnight of August, the European Council, at an extraordinary sitting on 1 September 2008, was 'pleased that the six point agreement achieved on 12 August on the basis of the EU's mediation efforts has led to a ceasefire, improved the delivery of humanitarian aid to the victims, and a substantial withdrawal of Russian military forces' (European Council 2008). Embedded in this enhanced approach to the conflict resolution process in the region, the EU committed to provide a monitoring mission, organised a donor conference and also introduced a Special Representative to the conflict.

The EUMM was operational since 2008 and its mandate has been extended until 14 September 2011. The mandate of the EUMM comprises of stabilisation, normalisation and confidence building in the region. However, a key challenge of the EUMM is that its mandate extends over the whole territory of Georgia, but the de facto authorities of Abkhazia and South Ossetia have denied access to the territories under their control. Yet, some high level access was granted to High Representative Javier Solana in 2008, which of course was progressed cautiously with an eye to the Russian relationship (Whitman and Wolff 2010: 10). In addition to the Geneva process, the EUMM provides an added value to the EU's mediation presence in this context, and having visibility on the ground contributes to an appreciation of the EU's presence, particularly highlighted since the cessation of the mandate of the United Nations and Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe in 2008. For Nicu Popescu, the monitoring mission in Georgia 'visit the Georgian military outposts once or twice a day, but their only effect in stabilising the situation is to psychologically and politically dissuade the parties from any potential hostilities' (2009: 461).

A further challenge faced by the EUMM is the lack of acceptance by Abkhazia, South Ossetia and Russia. Russia has sought to position itself as a unilateral partner in implementation and observation of the Six Point Plan, not a party to the conflict. Hence, they are on par with the EU. This manipulated presence has added to the difficulty of the EUMM establishing its role in the region. Crucially, the:

'current agendas of the immediate parties to the conflict at local and state level in both Abkhazia and South Ossetia created a situation in which the EU is of relatively marginal significance; their perceptions of what their own interests are

in relation to security, power and material gain have also meant that their willingness to move beyond the status quo and towards sustainable settlement is at best limited.’ (Popescu 2009: 462).

The rigidity of the EUMM mandate has the potential to create long-term difficulties for success of the EUMM. Since the EUMM does not have the mandate to deliver aid projects when monitoring the conditions of refugees, there is a gap between passive monitoring and active monitoring which is to the detriment of the EUMM mediation capacity. Furthermore, the omnipresent threat of ending the mandate remains a key risk (Popescu 2009: 47).

CHANGING THE FACE OF PEACE MONITORING?

In light of these two significant peace monitoring missions, is it credible to argue that a new phase of intensive and active EU monitoring has been ushered in? If so, the boundaries acceptable for traditional monitoring duties have been stretched, and the implementation of peace agreements conclusively and profoundly altered. In these two cases, it is clear the *modus operandi* of monitoring missions has been extended to include mediation, policy making and historical judgements which directly bear significance for the causes of peace and reconciliation in the afflicted societies. In each case active monitoring replaced a more passive form of monitoring, in the sense that EU personnel become involved in immediate action on policy, security and peace building initiatives (Bellamy 2005).

In Georgia, a degree of active monitoring is apparent but in a different way. The introduction of the Incident Prevention and Response Mechanism and the Geneva Discussions provided opportunities for the regional organisations to work together. Hence, the primary impact for how we understand the EU in peacebuilding is at the level of how the EU engages with other regional organisations. For example, while the mandate of the OSCE and UN expired, staff remained present in the region and retained offices in Georgia hence only field offices in Abkhazia and South Ossetia closed; the organisational deficiencies of not having a field presence in South Ossetia and Abkhazia hinder the capacities of the organisations to have a collective impact. However, these three key organisations continue to operate from Georgia and in Geneva, and thus continue to collaborate in the Geneva Discussions and also through the Incident Prevention and Response Mechanism. The EU has assumed the lead role in this theatre and suggestions of miscommunication, both unintended and intended between the organisations in the Incident and Prevention and Response Mechanism have been raised. For example, the intention being to assert a more independent role for the particular organisation has created miscommunication and rivalry on the ground between the institutions. Due to the traditional division of labour and different levels of engagement between the UN in South Ossetia and the OSCE in Abkhazia, the EU’s working relationship with the two actors has been complementary and cooperative. This has been possible to implement because of the long-standing financing role that the EU has played in supporting these two organisations throughout the 1990s (Tocci 2008).

Related to how the EU can be understood in international peacebuilding is the impact on the internal dynamics within monitoring missions and the wider European External Action Service. The variety of skill base and number of EU personnel deployed in both these cases was substantial which reflected an initial and admirable commitment by the EU to contribute to peace. The range of personnel suggests that in terms of policy making and taking, significant lessons could be learned by the EU to ensure that future missions are deployed in an appropriate, timely and effective fashion with primary concerns being: making any ethical, moral or historical judgement that can impact on how the societies deal with their violent past and the coordination of the plethora of EU voices. In Georgia, flanking the processes of engagement of the monitoring mission, the EU aimed to

contribute to a wider peacebuilding process through the Geneva Discussions. At the Geneva talks where the EU Special Representative to the conflict Pierre Morel acts as a co-chair for the discussions which cover arrangements for security and stability in the region, the issue of refugees and displaced persons and any other issue agreed by the parties.

The EU has a range of contactable offices and staff on the ground in the form of EU special representatives, commission delegations as well as member state embassies; therefore, it is possible to engage with parts of the EU. This diversity is also reflected in the enormous skill base of the monitors. However, despite this significant opportunity the political management of the EU actors on the ground can create significant challenges for monitoring missions. Diversity as an opportunity masks the embedded complexity of the EU decision making process. The challenge of engaging with a multiplicity of actors in the field mirrors the EU's institutionally divided EU approach to external relations. The assortment of personnel combined with a perceptibly convoluted decision making process embedded in the EU's approach to external relations must be overcome with the presentation of a unity in approach and presence. The policy implications from this study are clear: the EU must develop a contextualised and flexible approach to monitoring missions which deploy a range of transferable skills and practices across missions.

An important impact of the monitoring missions can be found at grassroots and civil society level. The wide-reaching aspect of the EU's capacity to inform and mould the processes of transition through their engagement in a conflict continues through the financial instruments that support initiatives beyond elite political processes. For example the European Commission funded a project which supports the socio-economic integration of internationally displaced persons and their host communities through engagement in active dialogue which features mediation as a main focus (Delegation of the European Commission to the European Union 2008). Yet, the organisational behaviour of the EU between its personnel and agencies on the ground embeds a significant multilevel influence on actors. Of course through the financial instruments the EU can seek to remedy any critique about local ownership: a degree of structured dialogue, feedback and engagement between the NGO community in the region and the EU agencies on the ground also will determine the validity and coherence of EU engagement with a view to considering the long term impacts of their behaviour and initiatives. Ultimately, in this case, the EU's engagement has been restricted and thus impact on the ethical and moral transition and methods of dealing with the past are heavily circumscribed by the isolationist stance of Abkhazia and South Ossetia.

The multilevel impact of the EU's engagement in peacebuilding as a monitor of peace agreements can be found in the EU's affection towards socially inclusive peacebuilding. At an EU level this tends to be most readily achieved through the financial programmes which fund projects aimed at engendering societal reconciliation. Of course this is underscored by the nature of EU programme delivery which often means that a network of Europeanised peace builders emerges at the cost of involving a broader scope of people. In Aceh, peace building relates to the question of human rights and transitional justice. In a way of circumventing an enduring and deep impression on the peace process the mandate of the AMM was to deal with human rights abuses that happened while the AMM was operational, not before. Hence, the AMM worked on the premise that transitional justice should be left to the Acehnese and Indonesians. Therefore, on this crucial aspect of transition the EU removed itself from a sensitive and long term political and psychological issue. Yet on the other hand, the Law on Self-Governance was an issue which was not under the direct authority of the AMM, plagued the work of the AMM during its tenure. Ultimately the Indonesian government was responsible for the implementation of Law on Self-Governance. While the limits to this interaction can be explained by a risk averse EU to engage in mediation processes elsewhere in the region, it also reflects the greater challenge of how the EU is perceived by ASEAN – as a donor –

and ASEAN do not match the institutional development of the EU even in this field of mediation. This obstacle persists despite the joint ambitions of the EU-ASEAN Summit in 2007 which stated a determination to deepen and broaden cooperation to promote peace, stability, progress and prosperity in the region (EU-Asean 2007).

CONCLUSION

Undoubtedly the face of peace monitoring has changed in light of the EU's recent endeavours both near and afar. The range of multilevel impacts emerging from a more hands on EU approach to peace monitoring in both these cases have suggested that the capacity for the EU to address the causes of peace and prevent a recourse to violence in the time that follows a peace agreement is immense. Despite different challenges in the immediate post-war situation in both cases, the reconstruction and normalisation mandate of the two operations required, as advocated by Ramsbotham, Woodhouse and Miall, 'coordinated endeavours across national agencies, across civil-military operational divides, and across domestic-multinational/multilateral partnerships' (2011: 224-225). Ultimately, socially inclusive peace building remains a staple of the EU's attempts to address the causes of peace. In both cases the potential for further engagement, support and promotion of non-state actors prevails, and opportunities may have been missed given the EU's proclivity for international peacebuilding actors such as Swiss Peace and International Alert. It remains a central argument of this piece that, as a monitor, the EU ventures into the sensitive fields that are steeped in political import: transitional justice, dealing with the past, amnesties, territorial integrity and reconciliation.

According to Smith and Smock (2008: 59), the purpose of external parties is to 'provide assurance, expertise, and experience in support of the implementation of peace settlements'. It is clear that the EU has been able, in its role as monitor, to add weight to deadlines, incentivise political parties and monitor events independently. Furthermore, as a monitor of international peace agreements, the EU has engaged with neighbouring states, reconstruction agencies, regional organisations and philanthropic organisations who have assisted with financial donations as well as expertise which are critical to the implementation phase. It is clear that the EU's modus operandi has extended beyond simply documenting and reporting what they observe regarding agreed peace to acting in a more supportive function. A key supportive function played by external actor such as the EU is to help parties overcome 'distrust in their adversary's intentions to implement agreements by instituting third-party verification mechanisms to ensure compliance' (Barnes and Griffith 2008: 17).

In the case of Aceh-Indonesia, the AMM were able to iron out any tensions, address concerns and calm any disputes in a mediation forum, the Committee on Security Arrangements, convened and supported by the Aceh Monitoring Mission. The evidence from the Aceh Monitoring Mission has shown that implementation of the agreement was made possible by the material incentives provided directly to former combatant GAM members in the form of remittances as well as to the wider public with flanking developmental assistance; echoes of the Balkans resound. For the EU, by supporting wider reform, reconciliation and reconstruction processes an external actor can make the implementation process much more viable (Barnes and Griffith 2008: 59). Here the EU, as a monitor, has become much more heavily involved in circumscribing the politics of healing, identity and recovery in this transitional phase and therefore the urgency of maintaining the implementation of an agreement casts a long shadow over the future nature of peacebuilding. The balance between local and external ownership is a delicate one. Sustaining the implementation of the agreement requires local initiative which can be displaced by an overprescribed remit of external actors. Implementation of peace agreements is fragile and it is vulnerable from the context and actors which frame it, which is often why it can result in recourse to violence. Yet, frailty in a process can be

circumvented with an open and transparent measurement and acknowledgement of what has been accomplished and what is yet to be done, traditionally the role of monitoring missions. Where the EU has been crucial in addressing the causes of peace and avoiding a return to violent conflict relates to how it has propped up the implementation period, which is especially important when local actors wrestle with the local and destabilising issues.

REFERENCES

- Açakoca, A., Vanhauwaert, T., Whitman, R. and Wolff, S. (2009). After Georgia: conflict resolution in the EU's Eastern Neighbourhood. *EPC Issue Paper* No. 57. April. Brussels: European Policy Centre.
- Albin, C. (2005). Explaining conflict transformation: How Jerusalem became negotiable. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* 18 (3): 339-355.
- Bacarani, E. and Dellara, C. (2004). European Union democracy and rule of law promotion in South Eastern Europe. *European Analysis*. Available at: <http://www.europeananalysis.com/articles/0501-rps2.pdf>. Accessed on 23 July 2013.
- Barnes, C. and Griffiths, A. (2008). Influencing Resolution: External Roles in Changing the Strategic Calculus of Conflict. *Conciliation Resources, Accord*, 19. Available at: http://www.c-r.org/sites/www.c-r.org/files/Accord%2019_3Influencing%20resolution_2008_ENG.pdf. Accessed on 23 July 2013.
- Bellamy, A. J. (2005). Who's keeping the peace? Regionalisation and Contemporary Peace Operations. *International Security*. 29 (4): 157-195.
- Blockmans, S. and Wessel, R. (2009). The EU and Crisis Management: With the Lisbon Treaty make the EU more effective?. *Journal of Conflict Security Law* 14 (2): 265-308.
- Braud, P. and Gunaryadi, G. (2005). The EU mission in Aceh: implementing peace. *Occasional Paper*. December. Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies.
- Bretherton, C. and Vogler, J. (2006). *The EU as a global actor*. London: Routledge.
- Coppieters, B., Emerson, M., Huyseune, M., Kovziridze, T., Noutcheva, G., Tocci, N., Vahl, M. (2004). *Europeanisation and Conflict Resolution: case studies from the European periphery*. Gent: Academia Press.
- Cordell, K. and Wolff, S. (2010). *Ethnic Conflict*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Council of the European Union (2005). *European Union in the World Working for Peace, Security and Stability*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Council of the European Union. (2008). 12594/2/08, Extraordinary Council Presidency Conclusions. 6 October. Brussels.
- Delegation of the EU to Georgia (2013). Project Fiche. Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/delegations/georgia/projects/list_of_projects/216426_en.htm. Accessed on 23 July 2013.
- DeRouen, K. and Bercovitch, J. (2008). Enduring internal rivalries: A new framework for the study of civil war. *Journal of Peace Research* 45 (1): 43-62.
- Diez, T. (2002). *The European Union and the Cyprus conflict: modern conflict, postmodern union*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Duke, S. (2002). *The EU in Crisis Management*. Maastricht: European Institute of Public Administration.
- EU ASEAN (2007). Joint Declaration of the EU-ASEAN at the Commemorative Summit. 22 November. Available at: http://eeas.europa.eu/asean/docs/joint_decl_summit07.pdf. Accessed on 23 July 2013.
- European Commission (2004). Taking Europe to the world-50 years of the European Commission's External Service. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Faria, F. (2004). Crisis Management in Sub-Saharan Africa. *Challiot Occasional Papers*. Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies.
- Hillion, C. (2008). Tous pour un, un pour tous! Coherence in the External Relations of the European Union, in: M. Cremona (ed.) *Developments in EU External Relations Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press: 10-36.
- Lederach, J. P. (1997). *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*. Washinton DC: United States Institute for Peace.

- Licklider, R. (1995). The Consequences of Negotiated Settlements in Civil Wars, 1945–1993. *The American Political Science Review* 89 (3): 681–693.
- Luttwak, E. (1999). Give war a chance. *Foreign Affairs* 78 (4): 36–44.
- Manners, I. (2002). Normative power Europe: A contradiction in terms?. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 40 (1): 235–258.
- Morel, P. (2008). Mission Statement of Pierre Morel on the crisis in Georgia. Available at <http://www.consilium.europa.eu/showpage.aspx?id=1523&lang=EN>. Accessed on 23 July 2013.
- Ortega M. (2001). Military Intervention and the European Union. *Challiot Occassional Papers*. Paris: European Union Institute for Security Studies.
- Popescu, N. (2009) EU and the Eastern Neighbourhood: Reluctant Involvement in Conflict Resolution, *European Foreign Affairs Review* 14 (4): 457–477.
- Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T. and Miall, H. (2011). Postwar reconstruction, in *Contemporary Conflict Resolution*. Cambridge: Polity: 198–225.
- Schulze, K. (2008). A sensitive mission: monitoring Aceh's agreement, in Aguswandi and J. Large (eds.) *Reconfiguring Politics: The Aceh-Indonesian Peace Agreement*. Accord available at: <http://www.c-r.org/our-work/accord/aceh/contents.php>. Accessed on 23 July 2013.
- Smith, A. L. and Smock, D. R. (2008) *Managing a mediation process*, United States Institute of Peace, Washington.
- Tocci, N. (2007). *The EU and Conflict Resolution: Promoting Peace in the Backyard*. London: Routledge.
- Tocci, N. (2008). The EU and Conflict Resolution in Turkey and Georgia: Hindering EU Potential Through the Political Management of Contractual Relations. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 46 (4): 875–897.
- UN Secretary General (2005). In Larger Freedom: Towards Development, Security and Human Rights for All, A/59/2005. Available at: <http://www.un.org/largerfreedom/contents.htm>. Accessed on 23 July 2013.
- United Nations, General Assembly (2000). Report of the Secretary-General on the implementation of the report of the Panel on United Nations peace operations. Available at http://www.un.org/peace/reports/peace_operations/docs/55_502e.pdf. Accessed on 23 July 2013.
- Whitman, R. and Wolff, S. (2010). The EU as a conflict manager? The case of Georgia and its implications. *International Affairs* 86 (1): 87–107.
- Whitman, R. and Wolff, S. (2012). *European Union as Global Conflict Manager*. London: Routledge.
- Youngs, R. (2003). Democratic institution-building and conflict resolution: emerging approaches. *International Peace-keeping* 11 (3): 526–543.