

**APCML / ICRC workshop**  
**Law enforcement in peace keeping operations:**  
**Training options for civilian policing**  
**7-9 May 2007**

**WORKING PAPER**

This workshop, co-hosted by the Asia Pacific Centre for Military Law (APCML) and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) Regional Delegation for the Pacific, took place over 2.5 days from 7-9 May 2007 at the University of Melbourne. The aim of the workshop was to identify training needs for civilian police (CIVPOL) preparing for international peacekeeping operations (PKO), both under UN mandates<sup>1</sup> and through regional arrangements such as the RAMSI mission in the Solomon Islands.<sup>2</sup>

Thirteen civilian police, among them one police Commissioner and other high-ranking officers, participated from nine countries in the Asia-Pacific region, namely: Australia, Fiji, Indonesia, Malaysia, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Samoa, Tonga and Vanuatu, as well as from the Secretariat of the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP). Together these participants represented 11 years of experience on PKO in Europe, the Americas, Africa, the Middle East and Asia. A number of participants also had substantial experience in the area of training of CIVPOL for PKO.

Participants were asked on Day 1 to list their expectations of the workshop. In response, they expressed a common desire to gain a better understanding of the training needs for CIVPOL bound for PKO in order to better prepare their officers for deployment. Participants also sought mechanisms for improved collaboration across the Asia-Pacific region in the preparation of CIVPOL for PKO, a common understanding of minimum training needs and greater consistency in pre-deployment training programmes across the region.

More specific objectives included the following: a wish to gain a better understanding of operations planning in the Asia-Pacific region; a request for training modules and guidance on coordination with other actors (what it means and how to do it properly); concrete and tangible ways of dealing with human rights violations by CIVPOL; ideas on the development of doctrine in international humanitarian law (IHL).

A number of presentations were made during the course of the workshop, with a view to fostering debate on topics such as the protection of civilians, the rule of law, interacting with others in the mission space and preparing for diverse mission environments. Complementing these presentations were group and plenary discussions where experiences were shared and issues were identified for further consideration.

---

<sup>1</sup> Asian countries represented at the workshop (Indonesia, Malaysia and the Philippines) are involved in UN CIVPOL missions. Three Pacific states - Fiji, Samoa and Vanuatu – currently contribute CIVPOL to UN missions, while others are considering moving into this area.

<sup>2</sup> Fifteen nations contribute CIVPOL to RAMSI, ie: Australia, Cook Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Nauru, New Zealand, Niue, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

## **1. KEY CHALLENGES FACING CIVPOL ON PKO**

Workshop participants were called upon to identify some key challenges facing CIVPOL from the Asia-Pacific region in relation to PKO and to consider possible ways to address these issues through training. The list of challenges was long (see Annex), and, following further discussion, was narrowed to five key matters that participants considered require greater attention in the preparation of police officers bound for PKO, or after their return:

1. lack of consistency in pre-deployment training between contributing CIVPOL forces from the region;
2. language and cultural dimensions of PKO;
3. coordination with other actors, especially within the security sector (police-military; police-police from different countries);
4. preparation of CIVPOL for situations not routinely faced in day-to-day policing;
5. re-integration and post-mission management, notably in the field of psychological support.

### **1.1 Lack of consistency in pre-deployment training between contributing CIVPOL forces from the region**

There was consensus among the workshop participants that the primary responsibility for ensuring that CIVPOL are properly prepared for international PKO rests with the national authorities (police and political authorities). The advantages of consistency in pre-deployment training - such as interoperability with mission partners or maintaining a certain minimum standard for all CIVPOL - were also undisputed. A quick tour-de-table of participants nevertheless showed enormous diversity in pre-deployment training programmes across the region, both in terms of the duration of training provided and the content. At one end of the spectrum, pre-deployment training provided by the Australian Federal Police International Deployment Group (IDG) for CIVPOL participating in RAMSI (including Pacific personnel)<sup>3</sup> lasts for 5-7 weeks, including both theoretical and practical components. At the other end of the spectrum, some small Pacific Island states were able to offer only 3-7 days of training prior to deploying CIVPOL to UN missions.

Pacific participants explained that shorter pre-deployment training periods are generally attributable to a lack of resources, compounded by the need often to condense training in order to fulfil requests for UN CIVPOL received at very short notice. A specific problem they have identified was a lack of access to information on the mission environment, including political, economic, cultural, security and health aspects, as well as the structure of the local police force and protected groups. The following proposals were made:

#### **a) Improve knowledge about existing pre-deployment training within the region**

The tour-de-table was, for many, the first opportunity for senior police officers to hear about the pre-deployment training offered by neighbouring countries. It was therefore suggested that a forum be established in which countries from the Asia-Pacific region could share information about their respective training programmes and competencies, perhaps under the auspices of the PICP (Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police) or ASEANAPOL (the Asian Police Chiefs Network).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> All pre-deployment training of RAMSI CIVPOL is conducted by the IDG.

<sup>4</sup> It was noted that ASEANAPOL has no Secretariat or fixed projects. It does, however, have a Training Committee, which works on the development of existing training programmes.

## **b) Explore partnership opportunities within the region**

Participants proposed that one way to address the resources gap would be to identify potential partnerships and external training opportunities within the region. Police from Pacific Island countries could, for example, seek sponsorship to participate in PKO training programmes conducted by Asian states and institutions such as the Asian Regional Forum (ARF).<sup>5</sup> It was also suggested that organisations such as the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), the Commonwealth Secretariat (ComSec), APCML and the ICRC could also be invited to contribute to pre-deployment training, to share their experience on topics such as the protection of civilians and human rights.

## **c) Better use of existing human resources**

On the lack of information about the mission environment, it was pointed out that developed countries, with ready access to the Internet and other resources, have some advantages. On the other hand, participants agreed that they often underestimate the great *human resources* to be found in CIVPOL returning from mission, who could be called into share their experiences during the pre-deployment phase. UN induction programmes allow another opportunity for CIVPOL to receive country-specific information and more detail on the mandate to be fulfilled, although it was agreed that these inductions were not always satisfactory and that it was better to have information prior to deployment.

## **d) Resist pressure (temptation) to send CIVPOL under prepared**

As for the brevity of pre-deployment training, it was suggested that dialogue needs to be undertaken with the UN (at the government level), to ensure that pressure is not put on countries to provide CIVPOL without adequate time for pre-deployment training. In some cases, it was agreed, the Police Commissioner (or his/her national authorities) should refuse a request rather than send personnel on PKO under-prepared. Another option would be to train a pool of officers for overseas PKO, rather than "jump" only when a request is received from the UN.

## **e) Develop a standard training syllabus**

Pacific participants agreed that it would be useful to develop, at a regional level, a basic training syllabus setting out a list of issues to be covered in CIVPOL pre-deployment training, which should include a minimum time allocation to each topic. This syllabus could be based on the UN Standard Generic Training Modules (SGTM), supplemented by additional topics where a particular need had been identified, such as computer skills (often lacking in Pacific countries) or deeper training in human rights.

According to one Asian participant with substantial experience in training of CIVPOL for PKO, it would be difficult to adopt a "pro forma" training syllabus suitable for diverse policing missions. The style of policing - executive or community – usually determined the skills and hence the training required. In his view, any such training syllabus needed to have the capacity for adjustment to fit the particular mission needs. Other participants noted that it was often not so clear cut, as missions could evolve or CIVPOL could be deployed for one purpose but find themselves undertaking other tasks.

Another officer with experience in several PKO insisted that skills must be developed on two different levels: for commanders and for the regular troops.

---

<sup>5</sup> It was, however, noted that to date the primary focus of the ARF in the area of peacekeeping has been on the military. Some shift in mindset would be required to consider the needs of CIVPOL as well.

## **f) Improve basic policing standards**

One point underscored by some one Pacific participant, and supported wholeheartedly by others, was the limited impact that pre-deployment training – whether it be a matter of days or weeks – could have unless policing standards at the domestic level were brought to a satisfactory level. According to this participant, a lack of training throughout a police officer's career could result in deficiencies in some areas of policing, such as human rights. Practices developed over many years are difficult to rectify through pre-deployment training and CIVPOL are thus likely to fall back on their domestic experiences while on mission, rather than implement newly learned techniques.

On this point, there was consensus on the need to lift policing standards generally to a common minimum standard throughout the region. While it was felt there is no need to "reinvent the wheel" to develop a set of minimum standards (as these already exist through tools such as the SGTMs), police forces need to be supported to attain these minimum standards - or higher, if they so aspire. It was noted that efforts are already being made in this regard through the Pacific Regional Policing Initiative (PRPI), which has developed a model recruit training course on the basis of a Training Needs Analysis conducted in 2005. This is currently being piloted in Vanuatu and PRPI plans to introduce it next in Kiribati and Tonga. a)

## **1.2 Language and cultural dimensions of PKO**

### **a) Better cultural understanding**

All participants emphasised the importance of cultural understanding in the preparation of CIVPOL for PKO, not least because of the impact a lack of such understanding (or even a perception thereof) could have on CIVPOL security. Pacific participants felt that they had some advantages in this regard when on regional PKO, as they generally have a good understanding of the local culture and misunderstandings rarely occur. Negative comments have been made about "Westerners", on the other hand, who are often perceived as "too busy", without time to stop to say hello, and can be criticised for errors such as wearing sunglasses when talking to people.

Some participants were critical of the adequacy of in-country cultural training on UN missions, which meant that they usually had to rely very heavily on local liaison officers to explain cultural dimensions. It was agreed that national contingents could nevertheless better prepare their CIVPOL for PKO by incorporating some aspect of cultural awareness into their pre-deployment training programmes, through calling on resources such as experts from universities, dedicated language specialists and representatives of religious communities.

Some participants expressed the view that in order to achieve a more partnered approach on PKO, cultural training for CIVPOL needs to be supplemented by an in-country communications strategy to the local community. This could highlight aspects such as the CIVPOL mission, the challenges CIVPOL confront and the culture of the contributing force (as culture is a "two-way street"). As communications is primarily a management issue, it was felt that better training of police commanders could be provided in this regard.

### **b) Language training**

Some participants identified language training as an important tool in the preparation of CIVPOL for PKO, both in terms of improved interoperability between contributing CIVPOL contingents and for communication with the host nation police/communities.

It was agreed that for regional missions in the Pacific, such as RAMSI, language is not usually a significant problem, as most parties in the mission space can converse in English. It was nevertheless still considered important for CIVPOL to learn basic greetings in the local language – either during pre-deployment training or in-country training - as a sign of respect for the local population. Countries that have the resources should also invest in a more strategic and proactive approach, to train selected people in the language of identified countries/regions. However, it was acknowledged that such training can be very expensive and is a long-term process if fluency is the goal. Until this is achieved, language training would usually need to be complemented with locally engaged interpreters.

### **1.3 Better coordination with other actors, especially within the security sector**

Workshop participants agreed that interoperability between CIVPOL of different nations (between international / regional forces themselves or with the local police force), and between CIVPOL and the military, requires improvement. Apart from the language and cultural problems mentioned above, the following issues were listed among those that CIVPOL confront on PKO when working with others in the security sector:

- Competition and lack of trust between contingents;
- Insistence on autonomy at the expense of integration;
- Authority figures surrounding themselves with people from their own country (favouritism);
- Different ways (between CIVPOL countries) of responding to physically threatening situations - e.g. when routinely armed police working alongside routinely unarmed colleagues, each is likely to respond differently to a threatening situation. Tensions may arise between CIVPOL who tend to resolve a situation by reaching for their gun and/or by conducting arrests, and those who consider that alternative policing methods (talking to the chiefs, negotiation) may produce better results;
- Differences in operating tactics and command and control;
- Lack of understanding by the international police of local procedures, law and tribal law, when these are in conflict with experiences back home;
- Clear variances between the police and military in responses to incidents. Police tend to be more reactive and robust whereas the military tend to be more strict and structured with longer planning cycles.

One security sector partner that was specifically highlighted in terms of CIVPOL training needs were Formed Police Units (FPU), such as BRIMOB (the Mobile Brigade of the Indonesian police) in Indonesia. These paramilitary/gendarmerie units usually have a clearly defined role on UN missions (crowd control) and their methods of operating are usually closer to policing methods than to those of the military, but most CIVPOL have an inadequate understanding of their role and way of operating.<sup>6</sup>

It was agreed that achieving better interoperability was the responsibility of all agencies in the security sector. While not all of the above problems could be overcome through training,

---

<sup>6</sup> One participant raised the question of the law that applied to such units and wondered whether IHL applied to them. Another pointed out that they would rarely become a party to the conflict, especially when under UN mandate, so usually not. The ICRC legal adviser agreed with this presumption but said it was always a factual matter that depended on the circumstances of the case.

It was felt that training could play a key role towards improved intra-sector understanding. It was suggested that CIVPOL conduct regular joint desk-top and field exercises in mission areas as well as in known partner countries (eg. the Philippines, Malaysia or Australia, which know they will be operating together in Timor Leste). Regular in-country contact meetings could supplement the above, as could police exchange programmes. Training for CIVPOL in topics such as communication skills and stress management could also help improve relations on mission.

Participants considered that CIVPOL/military interoperability and understanding at the national level could also be improved through increased communication. The Malaysian participant mentioned that this process has already begun in Malaysia, with members of the Malaysian armed forces from the Peacekeeping Centre and CIVPOL Training institutes each giving a lecture in the other's training programmes on their role and function on PKO. The military and CIVPOL also share materials.

An initiative also exists in Australia, according to which Terms of Reference have been agreed between the IDG and the Australian Chief of Defence Force, under which have been established a number of working groups to try to address interoperability issues across the three military services and police. These include:

- command, control, communications and computing (C4);
- intelligence (obtaining a better understanding of the mission environment);
- joint operations, including joint planning;
- doctrine, education and training;
- logistics and facilities (how to better share facilities);
- capability development / technology

The initiative is very new so the results are yet to be seen.

#### **1.4 Encountering situations not routinely faced in domestic policing**

Workshop participants from countries that have experienced internal armed conflicts considered their CIVPOL to be generally well prepared for a range of situations they could encounter during international PKO. Nonetheless, it was agreed that most CIVPOL are confronted with unfamiliar situations on mission. Examples of such situations,, which could involve security risks, include: landmines, child soldiers, roadblocks; armed mobs and health risks, such as food and water contamination. Added to these aspects could be internally displaced people / refugees or mass graves, which raise a host of issues. Less dramatic, but nonetheless important, were very practical issues such as how to provide an escort without training in the proper formation of a convoy, or how, and in what circumstances, to wear a bullet-proof vest ("without training, we might wear it on our head!"), especially where CIVPOL was required to work unarmed.

The workshop participants considered that training could play a key role in improving CIVPOL knowledge in these areas. At the national level, challenges could be partially addressed through the development of a standard minimum training syllabus, as described above. Scenario-based training was also deemed important – presenting participants with different and challenging situations to develop their ability to think laterally. It was felt that on UN missions, there was also a need for improved in-country induction training that covered topics like the above.

Again, participants suggested that the starting point could be for CIVPOL to improve communication within the region. This should enable a better understanding of each other's specific capabilities and experience, which could be drawn on in respective training programmes.

## **1.5 Managing the post-mission strategy**

All workshop participants agreed that very little attention has so far been paid to the management of CIVPOL post-mission, including assistance with re-integration into the home environment. While some countries are starting to address this issue more systematically, on the whole "debriefings" were recognised to be inadequate. Most such debriefings were still aimed at accumulating knowledge about the mission environment (usually through a written report), rather than being considered as a tool for providing personal support to the individual.

It was pointed out that CIVPOL returning from a PKO often face personal issues as well as career development issues. They may feel undervalued in light of their recent experiences and have concerns about their place back the team, particularly if their position has been filled during their absence. A high rate of marriage breakdown has been noted among returning CIVPOL in some countries, and suicides have also occurred. In addition to this human dimension, a failure to address the psychological impact of PKO can be expensive, through the payment of compensation claims.

It was agreed that post-mission strategy is essentially a management and leadership issue, rather than one of training. Pre-departure preparation could nonetheless include a session on some of the issues CIVPOL may face during their mission (especially loneliness and stress) and upon their return. This session could be provided, for example, by other returned CIVPOL. In addition, workshop participants considered that commanders should be trained to recognise problems among their CIVPOL on mission and how to respond. Indeed, all officers could be encouraged to support their colleagues showing signs of depression.

A proper post-deployment reintegration programme was considered essential, although the content of that programme should be adjusted to meet the cultural context. At a minimum, this should include health checks – both physical & mental – and an offer of counselling services to both the individual CIVPOL & their families. In some situations, the local priest may be the appropriate person to provide these services; other professionals should also be identified.

A need was identified to share experiences in this area across countries, eg. at regional forums, through bilateral Commissioner discussions or through the establishment of a training supervisors' network. The skills of external agencies and NGOs could also be employed to assist with the psychological aspects of debriefing.

## **2. WHERE TO FROM HERE?**

Participants expressed the desire not to lose the momentum from this workshop and agreed that a follow-up meeting would be most useful. They also identified a number of other forums in which to continue discussions:

### **2.1 United Nations**

One participant asked if APCML and ICRC could influence the UN Department of Peace Keeping Operations (DPKO) to address some of the concerns raised during the workshop, for example by encouraging it to host a similar workshop in future; set up a "train the trainers" course for trainers of CIVPOL bound for UN PKO or make improvements to in-country induction programmes. Bruce Oswald advised that APCML does not have any institutional contact with the UN. Moreover, the appropriate mechanism for raising such concerns would normally be through the national authorities, which are member states of the UN. He reminded participants that the training of CIVPOL was in any event a national responsibility,

which could not be deflected onto the UN. This view was supported by one participant. Roland Bigler, on behalf of the ICRC, advised that the ICRC has regular contact with the UN, both in the field and at Headquarters level, however, it would be up to the ICRC Headquarters in Geneva to decide if it wished to pursue any recommendations with the UN based on the outcomes of this workshop.

## **2.2 IAPTC**

Australia will host the third meeting of the International Association for Peacekeeping Training Centres (IAPTC) in November 2007. Police have a seat at this forum, although the IAPTC has to date been primarily focused on the military dimensions of PKO. As the host, Australia offered to propose to the IAPTC that countries in the region without their own peacekeeping centres be invited to attend. This idea was wholeheartedly endorsed by participants.

## **2.3 PICP**

The next meeting of the Pacific Islands Chiefs of Police (PICP) will be held in October 2007. The PICP meeting was seen by workshop participants as a useful forum in which to prepare for the IAPTC meeting in November.

It was explained to participants that the PICP had previously considered a project that envisaged the creation of a regional standby unit for PKO. This proposal was not endorsed at the political level (only four Ministers were prepared to make a commitment) and the proposal was abandoned. Another participant noted, however, that the issues discussed during this workshop, including concrete training needs for CIVPOL in the region and problems encountered during / after missions, were not addressed in that proposal. The workshop therefore identified two new possible project proposals that could be put forward for consideration at the next PICP meeting:

- i) Post-mission support strategies.
- ii) Development of a basic regional training syllabus for CIVPOL on PKO.

The Samoan Commissioner offered to present the working paper from the workshop to the PICP Conference in October 2007 and to work with PICP to prepare a project proposal on one or both of these topics. The limited resources of the PICP Secretariat were acknowledged in terms of the number and scope of projects it could take on at any given time.

Another project proposal put forward by one participant was that PICP study the question of the impact on national police forces of contributions to UN missions. Discussion ensued on this topic, with one Pacific Island representative noting the financial benefits brought into his country through CIVPOL deployments to UN missions and suggesting that others would be keen to follow suit. Other participants expressed concern about the sustainability for small police forces of sending CIVPOL overseas, especially as UN missions require 8 years CIVPOL experience, thus often taking the most experienced personnel out of domestic police forces. No agreement was reached on this proposal.

## **2.4 PRPI**

The workshop was advised that the Pacific Regional Policing Initiative (PRPI) already holds an annual Heads of Training meeting. Participants were very enthusiastic about the establishment of a similar Heads of Training meeting for officers involved in training for PKO.

## **2.5 APCML**

A participant involved in PKO training mentioned that almost all training delivered by the APCML focuses on the military, which contradicts the ever growing needs of CIVPOL in PKO. He suggested that APCML consider developing a security sector training course, including CIVPOL and other actors from this sector. Bruce Oswald took note on behalf of APCML.

## **2.6 Other larger national training structures – eg. Australia or Malaysia**

As previously mentioned (see 1.1(b) above), workshop participants were keen to explore potential partnerships between CIVPOL training institutions within the region. One participant asked if countries with advanced national training institutes, such as Australia or Malaysia, could run a "train the trainers" course to help improve training capacity among Pacific island states deploying CIVPOL to PKO. Another Pacific participant added that it was doubtful his country would ever have the capacity to train CIVPOL for international PKO, for which they would turn to the IDG in Australia. The establishment of mobile training team was considered as an alternative to sending officers bound for PKO to existing training installations.

## **2.7 Asia-Pacific regional conference**

One participant suggested that other means of collaboration between Asian and Pacific CIVPOL could be explored, such as an annual Asia-Pacific Heads of Trainers conference, and requested the support of the ICRC and APCML in this regard. Others agreed that this was an excellent initiative.

## **CONCLUSION**

From the organisers' perspective, the principal aim of the workshop – to make a regional contribution to the debate on training needs for civilian police in peace keeping operations - was met. The workshop demonstrated clearly that the question of training is central to the improvement of the quality of CIVPOL in PKO.

The thirteen participants brought to the workshop various levels of experience and expertise. Some exercised command responsibility, while others contributed from the perspective of the trainer. All expressed a strong commitment to the discussions, which suggest that the workshop corresponded to a real need and was welcomed by all.

The high quality of reflection during the workshop resulted in an impressive list of challenges facing CIVPOL in the context of PKO. Some of these were unique to police contingents from small countries but most were felt across the region. Participants explored various ways to meet these challenges at the national, regional and international level. They made a number of concrete proposals that can be now taken forward in a variety of forums.

Feedback from workshop participants was very positive. In particular, several officers noted that this workshop was the first time that CIVPOL from the region had come together to discuss concerns about the preparation of CIVPOL for PKO. Many thanked the APCML and ICRC for the initiative and expressed a desire that both institutions remain involved in future. The workshop organisers hope that the majority of expectations were met, even if some of the specific objectives were probably outside the scope of the workshop.

The APCML and ICRC were delighted to have the opportunity to host this event and look forward to continuing the dialogue with CIVPOL in the Asia-Pacific region in future.

## **ANNEX**

### **Further challenges facing CIVPOL when undertaking PKO**

In addition to the five key matters discussed at length and highlighted in the Working Paper, workshop participants raised a number of other challenges that confront CIVPOL on PKO:

#### **General**

- Many CIVPOL are motivated by monetary return from deployments, rather than ideological considerations, so it can be difficult to promote their respect for human rights
- The law of the host country prevented full participation of CIVPOL as police officers, e.g. with respect to the exercise of police powers
- Conflict between the standards applicable in the contributing country and those in the host country may sometimes lead to confusion as to which standards should apply.
- Difficulties of CIVPOL to adjust to the local environment

#### **Difficulties when dealing with the local civilian population**

- Resistance/opposition from local civilian elements, including local police, to the CIVPOL presence. There is potential for CIVPOL to be welcomed at the start of a mission but goodwill can deteriorate over time. Such resistance / opposition can make the CIVPOL role unclear and lead to a sense of resentment among both CIVPOL and local elements.
- Unrealistic expectations of the local community as to the role and function of the international police (which can be managed to some extent by a communications strategy)
- Difficulty to engage local factions and religious groups, often due to a lack of understanding among both CIVPOL and local groups of the cultural attributes of each group.
- Lack of sensitivity of CIVPOL toward the local population, who might be traumatised (training is needed in this area).

#### **Management of Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)**

- IDP management in camps – do CIVPOL police camps or ask the IDPs to police them?
- The IDP numbers, composition and location of camps can make it difficult to effectively provide security with existing police capacity. For example, Timor had over 60 camps in Dili which were impossible to service. A balance must be struck between security and convenience to the IDPs.
- Problems can arise when the IDP camps become better than home locations. How can CIVPOL convince IDPs that home locations are secure again (and are these locations secure in reality or is it just the will of the politicians that they go home)?
- Issues with reintegration of IDPs upon return to their community.

#### **Management of detainees**

- Need increased support to local police with respect to management of detainees. If we expect local police to abide by international standards then we must provide support to them.

#### **Relationships with humanitarian organisations**

- Police have limited understanding of the mandates of these organisations.
- Better coordination is required between humanitarian agencies and police to ensure a safe and secure approach to providing aid to groups in need (eg. Do humanitarian agencies need police security during a food distribution to IDPs?)
- The relationship should be viewed as a partnership to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes. Agencies provide aid and police would like this to occur with security.
- Some agencies tend to accept allegations of police misconduct as gospel before corroborating those allegations.

#### **Investigation of war crimes, crimes against humanity**

- Some CIVPOL are prepared and trained to investigate such crimes and some are not.
- The basics of investigation are manageable but the more technical aspects such as forensics and technical support can be scarce - as you would expect in remote areas or countries in crisis.