



About This Series

Working with a wide array of partners from non-governmental organizations, governments, militaries, international organizations, and the private sector, the United States Institute of Peace is helping develop common doctrine, frameworks, and methodologies in support of peacebuilding. This is the first of several Strategic Frameworks that the Institute is helping to craft, including frameworks for conflict prevention and peacemaking.

About USIP

The United States Institute of Peace is an independent, nonpartisan, national institution established and funded by Congress. Its goals are to help prevent and resolve violent conflicts, promote post-conflict stability and development, and increase conflict management capacity and tools. The Institute does this by empowering others with knowledge, skills, and resources, as well as by directly engaging in peacebuilding efforts around the globe.



United States Institute of Peace
1200 17th Street NW
Washington, DC 20036

WWW.USIP.ORG

STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK:

Fragile States and Societies Emerging from Conflict

Since the end of the Cold War, the United States and the international community have repeatedly supported societies emerging from conflict. Multinational interventions in Cambodia, Somalia, Haiti, Bosnia, Kosovo, Sierra Leone, Liberia, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Afghanistan, and Iraq have cost thousands of lives and hundreds of billions of dollars. None of these operations has been an unqualified success. Many have faced costly, and at times deadly, obstacles. These experiences have clearly demonstrated that “peacefare” is not as developed as warfare. Military organizations worldwide organize, plan, train, and fight using clearly established doctrine and strategic frameworks. There is no similar doctrine or strategic framework to support peacebuilding once major fighting ends.

To help mitigate this problem, USIP developed a strategic framework for fragile states and societies emerging from conflict. This framework has several important features. First, it is crafted to be useful to (and ideally shared by) all the actors involved in post-conflict situations (i.e., military, government, NGO, IGO, private sector, and host nation leaders). Second, it is organized around end-states—the ultimate goals of societies emerging from conflict. Third, it includes critical leadership responsibilities that are crucial to mission success. Finally, it is designed to allow for easy customization, recognizing that each post-conflict mission will be unique.

This framework is most valuable in planning and organizing operations, but it also has great value as an underlying structure from which training and education programs, monitoring efforts, and coordination mechanisms can cascade. It also has value as an organizing framework for cataloging documents, resources, and effective practices (which USIP is currently doing as part of its *Peacefare Initiative*).

The framework was first presented by Daniel Serwer and Patricia Thomson in “A Framework for Success” in *Leashing the Dogs of War* (eds. Chester Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall). It builds on the research and expertise of the United States Institute of Peace. It also draws upon the work of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), the Association of the U.S. Army (AUSA), and RAND. In addition, it incorporates the input of leaders of international interventions collected during discussions at the Institute, as well as the input of the U.S. State Department’s Office of the Coordinator for Reconstruction and Stabilization and the Joint Warfighting Center of the Joint Forces Command.



UNITED STATES INSTITUTE OF PEACE

Framework for Success: Fragile States and Societies Emerging from Conflict

(All rights reserved. Please do not reproduce without appropriately citing the United States Institute of Peace)

| DESIRED END-STATES | SAFE AND SECURE ENVIRONMENT | RULE OF LAW | STABLE DEMOCRACY | SUSTAINABLE ECONOMY | SOCIAL WELL-BEING |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|
| CRITICAL LEADERSHIP RESPONSIBILITIES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build unity of purpose among military, NGOs, IOs, government authorities, and private sector ▪ Develop and execute integrated plans that are based on the peace agreement or mission mandate ▪ Ensure involved players have the authority they need to succeed and adequate financial and staff resources ▪ Build and maintain legitimacy ▪ Engage the international community; establish peaceful relations with neighboring countries ▪ Build constituencies for peace; deploy effective strategic communications and public awareness campaigns ▪ Identify and address original and emerging drivers of conflict; manage spoilers ▪ Collect and use intelligence / manage information effectively ▪ Manage transitions from military to civilian and from international to local control | | | | |
| KEY OBJECTIVES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prevent renewal of fighting (e.g., enforce ceasefire; secure weapons/stockpiles; disarm, demobilize, and reintegrate former fighters) ▪ Protect civilians (e.g., counter organized crime, de-mine) ▪ Ensure freedom of movement (e.g., for civilians, relief workers, peace monitors) ▪ Protect key historical, cultural, and religious sites, as well as important buildings, property, and infrastructure ▪ Protect witnesses and evidence of atrocities ▪ Protect international borders/airspace/ports of entry ▪ Build effective security forces, under civilian control | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Establish coherent, legitimate, and just legal frameworks (e.g., constitution, criminal, and civil frameworks) ▪ Build effective and independent courts ▪ Build effective police, customs, immigration, and border control forces ▪ Build effective corrections system ▪ Build effective legal profession/bar ▪ Protect human rights ▪ Ensure equal access to justice and equal application of the law ▪ Promote public awareness and legal empowerment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Build effective and legitimate executive institutions—national, regional, and local levels (e.g., ministries, civil service) ▪ Develop legitimate systems of political representation—national, regional, and local levels (e.g., legislatures) ▪ Promote free and responsible media ▪ Promote the creation of political parties ▪ Promote robust civil society and civic participation (including minorities and marginalized groups) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Reconstruct infrastructure (e.g., electricity, communications, transportation) ▪ Promote sound fiscal/economic policy ▪ Build effective and predictable regulatory and legal environment ▪ Build effective financial and economic institutions (e.g., banks) ▪ Create viable workforce ▪ Promote business development and sustainable employment; increase access to capital ▪ Protect, manage, and equitably distribute natural resources/revenues ▪ Limit/contain corruption and illicit economy | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ensure population is fed ▪ Ensure population has water ▪ Ensure population has shelter ▪ Meet basic sanitation needs ▪ Meet basic health needs ▪ Build effective education system ▪ Enable displaced persons and refugees to return or relocate ▪ Address legacy of past abuses (e.g., truth commissions) ▪ Promote peaceful coexistence (e.g., inter-ethnic, interfaith) |

▪ The end-states, leadership responsibilities, and objectives included above are not presented in any particular order—neither in terms of priority nor sequencing. There is no “one-size-fits-all” solution, and the above framework will need to be tailored as circumstances warrant.

▪ *Source:* Daniel Serwer and Patricia Thomson, “A Framework for Success: International Intervention in Societies Emerging from Conflict,” in *Leashing the Dogs of War*, eds. Chester Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall (Washington, D.C.: United States Institute of Peace Press, 2007), 369–387.